

in its broad assertions and well written for easy comprehension by the layperson. Yet in places linkages among ideas are not clearly stated or adequately addressed, an inevitable result of the book's broad nature. For example, in various places in her introduction, Guth outlines a number of reasons for the new emphasis on cultural pursuits during the Edo period. Although many of these stemmed directly from the influence of Confucianism on all members of Edo society, she does not mention this unifying ideology until rather late in the chapter. Similarly, although Guth acknowledges Japanese literati artists' indebtedness to Chinese literati ideals, nowhere does she mention Daoist thought as an important aspect of the literati proclivity for self-cultivation, wanderlust, and reclusion. Elsewhere, she describes both literati painters and those of the Maruyama-Shijō school as sharing an interest in the natural sciences (p. 80), although she does not introduce literati artists in this context until later chapters. This type of problem occasionally plagues discussion of other artists and movements also, as their commentary is split between several relevant chapters.

Guth admits that an introductory text such as this cannot adequately address all aspects of the relevant artistic issues of this long era. Yet the clarity and organization of her text prove that a short volume can nevertheless successfully convey the sense of how the period's artists related to the environment in which they lived, traveled, and worked. Still, as only the most famous artists are represented, and usually by a single artwork, this book does not provide insight into the scope of any individual artist's accomplishments. Most Edo-period artists were famous for their eclecticism. Some, as she mentions, switched styles midway through their careers or to meet the requirements of a particular commission, and many consorted with others of differing aesthetic inclinations. Although Guth occasionally addresses these issues, some of these points may confuse the novice reader, as they lack adequate amplification and illustration. Among such instances are remarks on the "stylistic pluralism" of the Kano and Tosa/Sumiyoshi school painters (p. 58); the discussion of Goshun as Ōkyo's heir even though the illustration of his work is an early literati-style painting under the influence of his first mentor, Buson, as she mentions in the plate caption (p. 79); and evocative descriptions of paintings in styles not illustrated (as in the discussion of Buson on p. 71, Bunchō on p. 124, and Taiga on pp. 160-161). Additionally, while the brevity of the text is an asset for a basic work such as this, I

do think that, despite its cogently written introduction and first chapter, more concluding remarks would have been useful at the end of each chapter and at the volume's end.

Still, this book succeeds as a brief and reasonably priced overview of Edo art. Most publications on the subject are far more lavish (and expensive), specialized volumes. Many are exhibition catalogues which, by their nature, are subjective and, with few exceptions, limited in scope. The illustrations here are superb and well selected from a broad range of collections worldwide. Most include extended captions complementing discussions in the body of the text. The concise, well-organized timeline also adds to the book's usability as a textbook in introductory classes on Early Modern art or history, as do the books and articles listed in the bibliography. These are all materials in Western languages, mainly references to art, with a few basic history and literature sources cited, though specialists might question obvious omissions. Despite the criticisms noted above, this easily readable book should serve well as a basic textbook in the college classroom for students not actively involved with the discipline of art history who might otherwise shy away from examination of this important material evidence of Japanese civilization of the Early Modern period. The book should amply meet the needs of collectors or students of Edo art as well, as it provides a solid framework for understanding the place of art in Edo society.

Book Notice: *Archive Science and Modern Society*

Philip C. Brown, Ohio State University

Andō Masahito (安藤正人) 『記録史料学と現代—アーカイブズの科学をめざして』

Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1998. 352 pp., 18 pp. Index and English Abstract, 8 tables, 34 charts. ¥7,600.

At first glance the formal English title provided by this book's author seems to have little to do with the general purposes of *Early Modern Japan*. Our temporal focus is not modern. Our readership is not composed of archivists. Very few early modern scholars outside of East Asia make any use at all of manuscript materials, much less make consistent use of them. Printed collections like *Dai Nihon Shiryō*, collected works, *shiryō-hen* from prefectural or local histories and the like make up the

vast bulk materials upon which Western scholars construct their analyses of early modern Japanese history.

Yet even for scholars who rely exclusively on printed source materials (and this includes a growing number of Japanese scholars, too), the state of archival work in Japan has significant implications. Perhaps some reader will recall better than I the source of a story that has some wag claiming that the Great Kanto Earthquake and World War Two made the study of early modern Japanese history possible – their combined effect was to reduce the number of available documents to proportions that historians could grasp!

Whatever the story's source, and even if one assumes it to be apocryphal, personal experience has taught me that its premise is demonstrably false. While one might well argue that certain classes of documents shrank – notably those centralized in Edo/Tokyo and major urban areas – hundreds of thousands of documents remain, unprinted and uncatalogued. While many of these are documents held by descendants of village elites, there are also instances in which domain Elder's and even daimyo families keep documents shielded from public view.

The postwar boom in local histories routinely leads to the unearthing of new treasures. In the course of compiling materials for study, long-established local families are contacted to search out documents. Usually, families are forthcoming, allowing their documents to be cataloged (at least cursorily), read (at least those documents unlikely to raise touchy community issues or cause personal embarrassment), and even duplicated. Permission may well be granted to publish some or all of these documents in the large volumes of documents that frequently are part of prefectural histories and sometimes make up city, town and village histories.

All of this activity conveys a sense of tremendous energy directly toward uncovering new materials, cataloging them, and preserving them, yet such impressions are misleading. Even assuming complete cooperation from document holders, the handling and disposal of these treasures is far from certain. Indexes and classification of documents varies from superb to shoddy. Documents gathered may simply be returned to their owners uncopied, and copies of manuscript materials – poetry, tax records, maps, etc. – may simply be discarded. Even if retained by the editorial offices or the local education committee, the issue of proper storage and control of access often is not systematically addressed.

I do not wish to suggest that the situation is

entirely bleak. It is not. A number of localities where I have sought documents do a great deal to “get things right.” There are some very well organized volunteer efforts drawing participants from around Japan to “camps” specifically to catalog collections under the supervision of trained archival specialists. Princely sums are spent on new prefectural and other archives (*monjokan*) – marvels of controlled, high-tech environmental management and antisepsis (though many institutions lack staff to catalog their collections).

What I wish to stress is that there is tremendous room for improvement – not a surprising development in a context in which the archivists' profession is still very much in its infancy. Although efforts at classification pre-date the enactment of the Public Archives Law of Japan (1986), that legislation has done much to stimulate activity in the field. About a dozen prefectural archives have been constructed since its passage, and other prefectures have set up their own archive services. Despite this progress since, Andô still characterizes the Japanese situation as that of a developing country.

It is in this context that small groups of historians, librarians, and diplomatics specialists escalated efforts to promote more systematic thinking about the preservation and classification of documents and the legislation that might effectively support such programs. These groups and their successors continue to work for the development of professional archival standards and training programs as an essential part of that agenda.

Indeed, Andô's purpose in writing this work is to further professionalization: “[A] new archive science should be established as an autonomous discipline by integrating historical source studies and studies on archives administration. The present book is a part of the author's attempt to create a new archive science (“Abstract” p. 11).”

Developments in this direction have been part of broader corollary developments within the field. One is an increased concern, led by people such as Amino Yoshihiko, that valuable historical remains and documents are being destroyed by a combination of extensive land development and social change. In addition, recent emphases within the general field of archival studies have shifted from a focus on individual items to trying to understand the integrity of an entire archive and the nature of an organization's record keeping. Both of these developments contribute to a heightened sense of urgency and a feeling that archivists have a specialized mission.

Reflecting the increased concern to develop

sound professional standards, a growing number of individuals have a variety of new professional organizations, professional journals. Andô calls particular attention to articles that have appeared in 『記録と史料』, the *Journal of the Japan Society of Archives Institutions*, and the research publications of numerous archives institutions that have begun publication in the past ten years.

Chapter 1 “A Challenge to Archive Sciences” (「記録史料科学の課題」) argues that the field should be divided into two broad fields: archival sciences and archives administration. The majority of this chapter reviews recent studies of 1) the structural analysis of record groups, 2) arrangement and description of records, 3) archival survey, and issues of standardization and information systems, touching on the international context in the second and fourth subject areas.

Chapter 2, “Understanding Archival Structure: The Case Study of the Satô Family Papers of Iwade Village in Echigo Province” (「記録史料群の構造的認識——越後国岩手村佐藤家文書を事例」) explores Andô’s experience in cataloging a major collection (11,000-plus items) from the area of modern Niigata prefecture. This analysis in part reflects changes in Andô’s thinking about principles of archival classification over the many years he was engaged in compiling the four volumes of indexes to the collection. The classification scheme that results clearly reflects both divisions of time and function of the different categories of documents: 1) Tokugawa-era village group (大肝入) functions, 2) Tokugawa-era official village records, 3) Iwade village modern (Meiji and later) official records, and 4) private Satô family records.

Chapter 3 explores “Theory and Method in Archival Surveys” (「記録史料調査の論理と方法」). The first section defines Andô’s view of what a survey should accomplish. In his view, an important component of this work is careful re-cording of the original condition and order in which the materials were found, compiling an outline description of the number and kinds of materials, and designing a program for processing the record group. Two examples from Ibaragi and Shimane prefectures are examined.

Chapter 4, “Arrangement and Description of Archives” (「記録史料の編成と目録記述」), tackles three different objectives. It begins with a general theory of archival description. Andô argues that although attention has focused on this problem since the introduction of Western principles in the 1980s, such principles are not yet common knowledge among Japanese specialists.

Through elaboration of basic principles, Andô suggests the need for an integrated archival processing scheme. His discussion focuses on production of a catalog that reflects the collection’s structure and is of maximum use to potential users. The second section explores international descriptive standards, particularly those of the U.S., Canada, and Great Britain. The final section looks more closely at two experiments in archival description at both “macro” and “micro” levels.

“The Present Situation in Appraisal Theory” (「記録評価選別論の現在」), Chapter 5, commences with a review of the history of appraisal theory – the principles for evaluating which of the myriad documents, maps, video tapes, floppy disks, etc. should be retained, catalogued and stored – in Europe and then explores the influence of more recent work in the West. He concludes that new developments in this area have a broad potential impact on the development of future archival systems and the archival profession in Japan.

The final chapter, “Archives in Modern Society” (「現代アーカイブズ論」), looks at the Public Archives Law of Japan (1987) which formally recognized public records of historical importance as the “people’s common property”, and the draft of a Freedom of Information Bill. He finds both wanting. In particular, he suggests the need for legislation covering private archives and calls for the establishment of formal programs of record management in all government agencies. In the case of the Freedom of Information bill, there is no provision for records management of any sort. The last section looks at the preservation of Western court records as a model for Japan, especially in light of the 1992 decision by Japan’s Supreme Court to destroy all original records of civil cases accumulated by the Supreme Court and District Courts over five decades.

As some of the examples Andô discusses in his final chapter suggest, archival practice in Japan is sometimes considerably different from the practices found in the U.S. and Europe. Such practices are not always favorable to the preservation of records valuable to historians. Students of early modern Japan have a vested interest in activities designed to protect Japan’s cultural, social and political legacies by defining professional standards of archival judgement and the implementation of laws, administrative procedures, and practices.