

REFERENCES CITED:

BLACKER, Carmen

1975 *The catalpa bow. A study of shamanistic practices in Japan.* London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

EARHART, H. Byron

1970 *A religious study of the Mount Haguro sect of Shugendo.* Tokyo: Sophia University.

GUTHRIE, Stewart Elliott

1980 A cognitive theory of religion. *Current Anthropology* 21, 181-203.

Peter KNECHT

HAROOTUNIAN, H. D. *Things Seen and Unseen. Discourse and Ideology in Tokugawa Nativism.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988. xiv+494 pages. Index. Paper US\$14.95; ISBN 0-226-31707-2. Cloth US\$40.00; ISBN 0-226-31706-4.

Although it had a humanistic side, such as the liberation of human emotions that were repressed under the feudal regime, *kokugaku* 国学 (national learning) has usually been defined as an ideology supporting the declining Tokugawa regime from the standpoint of the ruled. Some consider *kokugaku* to be lacking in modernity, a fact reflected in the incomplete character of Japan's modernization.

In his recent book, H. D. Harootunian defines *kokugaku* (which he translates "nativism") as a discourse and intends to change the concept of ideology itself. He criticizes the definition of *kokugaku* as being the ideological support for the Tokugawa polity on the part of the ruled. Such a definition implicitly or explicitly presupposes that ideology is a reflection of infrastructure and does not have an autonomous meaning. Harootunian, however, emphasizes that ideology has a semi-autonomous function and produces reality rather than reflects it. Based on the theory of textual productivity, he traces the transformation of *kokugaku* texts that were of critical importance to the Tokugawa polity and the process which formed an epistemology that included ideology as a discourse.

According to Harootunian, work in Tokugawa Japan was divided into mental and manual labor. The space where people lived and worked was relegated to marginal areas and lost its meaning. Ordinary life was segmented. Production became reproduction and lost its original meaning. Immediate experience was forfeited. Anxiety appeared among the ordinary people, caused mainly by Neo-Confucianism as the official discourse. By its strategy of dichotomy, Neo-Confucianism introduced the division of subject/object, ruler/ruled, and whole/part. As a consequence the ruled were excluded from the sphere of subject and signification. They were bound into a social constitution as mere objects of governance and prevented from giving their existence a tangible meaning by themselves. *Kokugaku* intended to give a new immediacy and wholeness to the ruled, who (in the first place) had been alienated from a wholeness which was the source of their meaningful human experience, and to their immediate life in the native environment ("habitus"). In other words, *kokugaku* "made an 'unnamed' experience into public commonsense as a means to authorize the constitution of groups that had not hitherto gained access to signifying practices" (33-34) by a metonymic strategy that emphasized the contingent relationship of the part to whole.

Nativism is concerned with the identification and constitution of the "I" and the "Other." The reason why nativism problematizes language is that language relates to self-identification. Motoori Norinaga insists on the transparency and materiality of language. According to him language is not distinguished from bodily action. But by the introduction of Chinese letters (Chinese thought) the immediacy of language was muddled and there emerged segmentation and dichotomy. By imitating and reciting ancient songs, Motoori wanted to retrieve immediacy and make antiquity function "as a transcendental signified" (93). By "misrecognizing" antiquity understood in such a way as "I" and by excluding Chinese letters (Chinese thought), Motoori gave a function of identification to the imitation of ancient language. In this framework, Harootunian describes the discursive movement of nativists such as Motoori, Hirata Atsutane, and their successors in late-Tokugawa. Recitation of ancient elegant poems was the concern of Motoori, while retrieving the rural community became a central problem in Hirata's discourse. Whereas Motoori deified humans, Hirata depended on the cosmic narrative and humanized "the divine by making the archetypal event of creation the necessity of human production, practice, worship, and work" (120). Harootunian clarifies how nativism constituted a critical discourse but then lost its critical moment after the Meiji Restoration, and finally resulted in the turning inward of discourse as evidenced in such areas as Japanese social science, *minzokugaku* 民俗学 (ethnology) and *Nihonjinron* (discussion about the uniqueness of Japan) in modern Japan.

I approve the author's intent to provide a discursive analysis of *kokugaku*. However, it seems to me that there is room for some critique. First, were ordinary people and villages in Tokugawa society really marginalized and isolated? Although he doesn't discuss the infrastructure of Tokugawa society, Harootunian seems to take for granted the definition of Tokugawa society as a feudal society. The part/whole scheme assumes an isolated and alienated part. And so Harootunian devalues the intellectual and economic intercourse between different regions and classes. But the division and segmentation in Tokugawa Japan must be thought of in relative terms, in the sense that division and segmentation, that is the alienated part, must be thought of as a fiction.

Second, Harootunian distinguishes the part/whole scheme from Romanticism which tries to return to an original golden age. But Romanticism in the 19th century was involved in its own manner in the identification of "I" and "nation." Romanticism and nationalism differ mainly in the kind of "I" they misrecognize, i.e., the inner "I" or the collective "I." But both exhibited the symmetrical structure of identification. The problem of nativism must therefore be defined as one of Romanticism or nationalism. In relation to this point, Harootunian interprets Motoori's concept of *mono no ahare* 物のあはれ as a transparent and immediate expression of inner emotion, while Motoori does not understand the transparency of language to be the result of the relation of subject and expression (inner "I") but of the character of Japanese as a privileged language system (collective "I").

Although I cannot agree on some points with its concrete descriptions, Harootunian's book gives an opportunity to discuss the discursive aspect of *kokugaku*, and of the polemics presently going on in the Japanese intellectual world.

Susumu SAKURAI
Tōkaigakuen Women's College
Nagoya, Japan