

play of visual and verbal imagery, it also encourages thought about the role of these stories and images in Buddhist discourse.

Susan C. Tyler
Kyôto, Japan

YAMADA RYÛJI 山田隆治 and SHIRATORI YOSHIRO 白鳥芳郎 eds. *Dentô shûkyô to minkan shinkô* 伝統宗教と民間信仰 [Major Religions and Folk Belief]. Nanzan Studies in Cultural Anthropology I. Nagoya/Japan: Nanzan Anthropological Institute, 1982. 240 pp. (in Japanese with long English summary). US\$10.00

This collection of essays, the first of several projected volumes to be edited by the Nanzan University Anthropological Institute, is the fruits of four years of research activities, which began in 1979. Anthropology is currently enjoying a certain boom period in Japan. The Nanzan Institute was one of the ground breakers of the discipline here, and has come to play a leadership role in the field through publications such as *Asian Folklore Studies* and other activities. The publication under review will expand that role into new areas, and it is gratifying to see such activities from the Nanzan Institute.

It is significant that this first collection of essays takes religion as its major topic of importance. It is, of course, impossible to ignore the fact that cultural anthropology must deal in some way or other with religion. This collection, however, is much more positive in its approach than is common, representing an attempt to use religion as a perspective from which to gain a total perspective on the areas to be studied. This is, perhaps, an inevitable direction for an institute with the traditions such as those found at the Nanzan Institute to take.

The significance of this volume could be briefly summarized as follows: it deals with the question of the extent of the relationships between religions with a fixed doctrine (called "traditional religions" in the book) and religions, or customs, which grow from daily life. The major thrust of Japanese cultural anthropology is currently in investigations of the primacy of the so-called "little traditions." The tendency, therefore, has been to gather information primarily on how living local religions have been changed by their encounters with the "major" religions such as Christianity or Buddhism. This might be seen as an allergic reaction to theology.

It is natural enough that the anthropological approach to religion should differ from that of theology, but it does not mean that we should make light of the question of how fixed religious doctrine has influenced daily life. The major characteristic of this book might be said to be its appeal on behalf of an approach which would create some interest in the question of the mutually dependent activities of religion on both the doctrinal and the daily life levels, and especially emphasize the active participation of religion on the doctrinal level. The essay by Yamada, in particular, clearly demonstrates this tendency.

The categories "great tradition" and "little tradition" are used by nearly everyone these days. Research such as I noted above, which is based on the primacy of the little traditions, has probably resulted in a loss of meaning of the term "little tradition" as defined by Redfield. Concepts do tend to mature, and it is doubtful that Redfield would object to what has happened to this one, but there is a need to put things in perspective. In this book, too, we find terms like "great tradition and

little tradition," and "imported religion and indigenous religion" used in tandem, and definitions of the differences in the concepts. It is necessary, however, to follow this up with case studies that will flesh out the concepts as they are used here. Even granted this necessity, one still finds oneself, on completion of this volume, forced to rethink the meaning and the sophistication of the concepts.

This series promises to be concerned above all with religion, from an anthropological perspective, and I await the next volume with great interest.

Akaike Noriaki
Aichi Gakuin University
Nagoya, Japan

DOMENIG, GAUDENZ. *Tektonik im primitiven Dachbau. Materialien und Rekonstruktion zum Phänomen der auskragenden Giebel an alten Dachformen Ostasiens, Südostasiens und Ozeaniens. Ein architekturtheoretischer und bauethnologischer Versuch.* (Tectonics of primitive roof construction. Documents and reconstruction concerning the phenomenon of protruding gables on old roof forms of East Asia, Southeast Asia and Oceania. Attempt at an approach from the theory of architecture and the ethnology of building). Zürich: Organisationsstelle für Architekturausstellungen ETH-Hönggerberg, 1980. 197 pp., 334 photos and drawings, bibliography. Paper sFr. 24.—, ISBN 3-85676-012-10.

For a long time the roof structures of Indonesian houses in particular have challenged the minds of ethnologists and given rise to a number of theories, the most popular of which was probably the explanation of these forms as representations of ships. While all of these theories might do something to make the salient feature of those roofs, i.e. their more or less protruding gables (*Kraggiebel*), logically intelligible, most of them provide hardly more than a common sense guess as to why the roofs are constructed the way they are. Domenig uses a thorough structural analysis and a kind of evolution theory based on the inherent logic of the structures themselves to refute such common sense type of explanations as insufficient. From this point of view he does not entirely dismiss the theory that interprets certain forms of the roofs as ships, but he considers such an interpretation to be secondary, because it is first of all symbolic and does not explain how or why the roofs are constructed in this form. There are considerably more compelling reasons that explain why the roofs have taken this form.

After criticizing former theories Domenig develops his own argument whose core is an attempt to delineate the possible direction the evolution of forms might have taken from a primitive conical hut to the present, ethnographically documented elaborate roofs with protruding gable (*Kraggiebel Dach*). At the beginning of this evolution he postulates a conical hut with the roof built directly on the ground and its top adorned by a crown of rafters protruding into the air. This attempt at reconstructing a process is based on two conditions of a disparate nature, one being tectonic, the other more ideological or symbolic. Interpreting archaeological evidence from Japan and South China he comes to the conclusion that the first structure showing the basic features of protruding gables was one built from two pairs of rafters pitched against each other after the individual rafters of each pair had first been bound together in the form of scissors. By inserting a horizontal log where the pairs of rafters cross each other it