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HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO 1945

The formal study of anthropology in Japan dates back to the eighteen-eighties. In 1884, the Anthropological Society of Tokyo (the present Anthropological Society of Nippon) was founded by Shōgoro Tsuboi, and its journal, Zinruigaku Zassi, was first issued in 1886. Tsuboi had been appointed the first professor of anthropology at the University of Tokyo in 1893, at which time the Department of Anthropology had been established. This department and the Anthropological Society represented by Tsuboi and later by his successor, Ryūzō Torii, at first embraced both physical and cultural anthropology, and continued to be the center of Japanese anthropological study in a broad sense until after World War I. For various reasons, however, both institutions gradually focused their attention upon physical anthropology and prehistory, and the term “anthropology” came to be used in the German sense (i.e., the equivalent of “physical anthropology” in the United States). Many of the graduates from this department, and a large percentage of the members of the Anthropological Society, were anatomists at various medical schools.

Linguistics was introduced into Japan as a separate field of study
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in 1886. In that year an English scholar, B. H. Chamberlain, was appointed the first professor of linguistics at the University of Tokyo, and the Linguistic Society of Japan was founded a decade later. Subsequently, various linguistic studies were initiated, especially in the analysis of the Japanese language.

Research in archaeology was begun in 1896 with the founding of the Archaeological Society of Japan. Although some Japanese scholars had been interested much earlier in the study of prehistoric remains, it was an American, Stephen Morse, who first introduced systematic methodology into Japanese archaeological investigations. In 1887 he excavated a shell mound in a suburb of Tokyo. This event marked the first systematic research of its kind in Japan and stimulated keen interest in archaeology among Japanese historians, who thereafter excavated many sites. As a consequence, archaeology developed as one of the branches of history rather than of anthropology.

Unlike physical anthropology, linguistics and archaeology, ethnology, or cultural anthropology, initially led a rather orphaned existence. The Department of Anthropology at the University of Tokyo, as we have seen, was essentially an institute for physical anthropology, and as a result, cultural anthropology had little support. In 1928, however, several young scholars interested in this field founded a small study group, called the “APE Circle.” This felicitous abbreviation stood for Anthropology, Prehistory, and Ethnology, and signified the aim of the Circle’s members to pursue the study of man in its broadest sense. Membership in the Circle gradually increased, and, in 1934, it became the Japanese Society of Ethnology. Minzokugaku Kenkyū was first issued the following year as the Society’s journal.

Since then this Society has constituted the center of ethnological and cultural anthropological study in Japan. Sociologists, historians, and others interested in the study of primitive cultures joined the Society, and field work was carried on in Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, Micronesia, Formosa, and elsewhere. In 1943, the Institute of Ethnology was founded in Tokyo and was attached to the Ministry of Education. Influenced by the wartime situation, the Institute had as its aim to study peoples in Asia, and it was staffed by leading ethnologists under the direction of Masao Oka.
In addition to this Institute, activities in a few other Asian universities ought especially to be mentioned. The Institute of Ethnology at the Taishoku Imperial University (the present National Taiwan University at Taipei, Formosa) was founded in 1928, and became an active center for the study of Formosan aborigines. In Korea, most of the ethnological studies were undertaken by members of the Department of Sociology at Keijo Imperial University (the present University of Seoul, Korea), whereas the Museum of Hokkaido University played a leading role in Ainu studies.

Another important group related to the development of ethnology in Japan was the Japanese Folklore Society, established in 1935 under the leadership of Kunio Yanagita. This group is interested primarily in the study of various folk customs and folk beliefs in Japan, and hence their "folklore" is equivalent to the German Volkskunde, and might better be translated as "folk ethnography." Although many of the Society's members were local schoolteachers and other amateurs, and though some of their studies were "antiquarian," the enormous body of data they compiled is most valuable.

This brief historical survey may suffice to indicate some emergent characteristics of Japanese anthropology. Each branch of the science developed independently; most anthropologists pursued special interests in their own circles, and were ignorant of developments in other fields of anthropology.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: 1945 TO THE PRESENT

With the end of World War II, every branch of social and cultural science, like the country as a whole, was released from former militaristic and despotic restrictions. Freed from the doctrine of the divine origin of the Emperor, and with the mandate to revise completely all history textbooks, historians and archaeologists took the lead in studying the real origins and development of the Japanese nation. As archaeologists became busy digging and writing, the number of amateur archaeologists and regional clubs increased with an astonishing speed.

On the other hand, work in Japanese ethnology momentarily seemed to have come to a complete standstill. Japanese scholars
could no longer work in Korea, Formosa, Sakhalin, or the South Seas. The Institute of Ethnology, established as part of the war effort, was closed, and most ethnologists lost their jobs. In 1946, however, American anthropologists, among them Passin, Pelzel, Bennett, and Ishino, began to come to Japan (as members of the Civil Information and Education Section of the Occupying Forces) and conducted field work in rural communities. Jobless Japanese ethnologists joined the various C.I.E. projects as staff members, and in this way American anthropological trends were rapidly introduced into Japan, and the C.I.E. became a bridge toward reconstructing ethnology there.

Thanks also to the efforts of C.I.E., a large number of American publications in anthropology were introduced. The most influential of these was Ruth Benedict’s *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, which created a great stir even among the general public. This book, published in 1946, was translated into Japanese in 1949, and soon became a best seller. Although this work, as Bennett and Nagai point out in their review, contained a number of questionable points and factual errors, readers were nevertheless impressed with the fact that an anthropologist who had never been to Japan could have had such insight into the basic structure of Japanese culture. The general public was especially surprised to learn that anthropological interests extended beyond collecting stone-age skulls or describing exotic customs.

Popularization of the term cultural anthropology was further accelerated by a large number of popular books and articles published by psychologists, for the first time exhibiting an interest in personality studies, psychoanalysis, and mass communication studies, into which they introduced important recent works in cultural anthropology. And sociology, too, similarly influenced by American trends and emancipated from crippling restrictions, began to undertake systematic analyses of postwar Japanese society. With the change in educational policy, the number of sociology departments in Japanese universities immediately increased. Japanese ethnologists benefited from this trend, since many of them were graduates from sociology departments and hence could now find posts as sociology teachers. With their jobs secured, ethnologists energetically
directed their interests toward field work in Japanese rural communities.

In 1950, for the first time since the war, joint annual meetings were begun by the Japanese Society of Ethnology and the Anthropological Society of Nippon. In 1951–52, members of the Society of Ethnology jointly sponsored several studies of the Ainu of Hokkaido. About this time the League for the Study of Human Affairs was established by nine interrelated scientific societies: anthropology, ethnology, folklore, sociology, psychology, geography, linguistics, archaeology, and the science of religion. The League strives to achieve integration among related social sciences, and every year it promotes joint areal research in various parts of Japan.

Since about 1952, world conditions have once more enabled Japanese anthropologists to work abroad. Field studies were gradually initiated in India, the Himalayan area, Southwest Asia, South America, and elsewhere. The increased research activity led to the expansion of anthropological instruction in colleges and universities, which met with considerable success. In Tokyo, a Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology at Tokyo Metropolitan University and a Department of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tokyo (separate from the Department of Anthropology) were established. In Nagoya, a Department of Anthropology, embracing linguistics, archaeology, and cultural anthropology, was established at the Nagoya Catholic University. In addition to these independent departments, several departments of sociology, economics, political science, history, and the like, began to offer introductory courses in ethnology and cultural anthropology. By the spring of 1959, forty-nine colleges and universities were giving such courses (110).

These events have ushered in a new epoch in the history of Japanese anthropology. The increase in number of students reached began to swell the ranks of young ethnologists, who, in 1957 established the Social Anthropology Circle, and began to publish a quarterly journal, *Shakai Jinruigaku*. Today the Japanese Society of Ethnology has a membership of six hundred, and the Anthropological Society of Nippon (mostly composed of physical anthropologists and archaeologists) a membership of three hundred.

Although the study of man in Japan thus seems to be becoming
increasingly firmly entrenched, its future development depends upon the correction of certain defects. As has been pointed out, most scholars have long pursued their special interests in narrow circles and so have remained ignorant of work in other fields of anthropology. The recent establishment of anthropology departments and new course-offerings in the field, and the attraction of students with broader interests, have in part overcome this parochialism. However, compared with the variety of anthropology courses offered in American or European universities, the program is still unsatisfactory and unbalanced. This condition is due in large measure to small budgets, a restricted number of staff members, and inadequate libraries and museums. Limited financial resources also create serious impediments to overseas studies.

At present many more teaching positions are urgently needed for trained ethnologists, who suffer greatly from limited opportunities in comparison with their colleagues in sociology and psychology.

But the most serious problem of all, which anthropology shares with other branches of social science in Japan, is that of language. Most works by Japanese scholars are written in Japanese, and are therefore accessible to only a few foreigners. Hence international communication has been seriously restricted, with the result that Japanese scientists have been isolated from effective criticism from abroad. Recently, however, an increase in the number of young scholars capable of handling European languages has been gradually improving the situation.

With this brief history of anthropology in Japan we shall now turn to a more detailed review of the contributions made in each subfield of anthropology within Japan itself and then to publications concerning culture areas outside Japan.

JAPANESE STUDIES

Physical Anthropology

Japanese physical anthropologists have traditionally focused their attention upon the regional varieties of physical types. A country-wide study by Matsumura, restricted to a consideration of the cephalic index and stature, was published in 1925 (167). After the war a "Somatometric Group" was established by twenty-two physical anthropologists from fourteen medical schools, and extensive studies
were carried out on 57,000 subjects in more than one hundred villages extending from one end to the other of Japan. Imamura (73, 74), for example, compares stature, head length, and head breadth, and points out that a large part of the Japanese population resembles that of South China, a smaller part the Koreans and the Ainu. On the other hand, according to Kohama (141), who summarized the indices and discussed the origin of the Japanese, the present Japanese somatotype can be divided into two major types—one to be found predominantly in northeastern Japan and the northern coastal area, the other in the Osaka-Kyoto district. The former bears a similarity to the Ainu, the latter to the Koreans. Hence he speculates that, in prehistoric times, a group of people migrated from Korea and occupied the central part of Japan, where the first type of Japanese had been distributed from earlier times.

Various scholars have discussed the pedigree of the Japanese people based upon the study of prehistoric skeletal remains. Kiyono (132) first concluded that the present Japanese population was formed by inter-breeding between Jōmon period Japanese and newcomers from the continent and the South Sea islands. More recently Kanaseki (113), who worked on bones of the Yayoi period Japanese, has asserted that a fairly large number of immigrants must have come from South Korea to the northern part of Kyushu, bringing with them the various new culture elements that characterize the Yayoi culture. The various hypotheses concerning prehistoric migrations have been quite important in relation to other studies in archaeology, culture history, linguistics, and social anthropology, which will be mentioned later.

Hasebe (51, 52) opposes these migration theories, emphasizing that the difference between Japanese of the present period and of the Jōmon period in physical characteristics should rather be attributed to the difference in cultural environment or living conditions. The same position is taken by H. Suzuki (265, 266).

The study of fingerprints has been extensively carried out in nearly all parts of Japan by a team of twelve anthropologists. Koike (145), the leader of this group, has classified the prints from more than 200,000 subjects into four types and discussed their regional distribution. Furuhata (35) has been most active in the study of blood groups. Using ABO, MN, and Rh classification systems, he has
analyzed regional distributions and further discussed the affinities of the Japanese with adjacent peoples.

A photographic analysis of the Japanese facial structure, body build, posture, growth, and the like was recently published as *We Japanese: Part I, The Body* (246). Although this work was originally intended for the general public, it marks an important contribution to the study of Japanese physical types.

Analyses of environmental influences upon the human body include studies on the influence of war upon stature (122), of social environment upon sex differences (313, 314), and of living conditions upon senility (143). Kōhara (144) has discussed the distribution of *ama* (women divers) in certain fishing villages in relation to their physique and natural environment.

In the field of genetics, an intensive large-scale "Twin Research Project" was undertaken at the University of Tokyo jointly by physical anthropologists and psychologists. The results of studies of 1,000 sets of twins are now available (300). The study of growth of Japanese-American hybrids was jointly conducted by Suda and others (67, 247), and Ogata and Terada report on a statistical study of the extent of resemblance between parents and children (201). A research project now in progress by Tsubaki and others on physical traits of aristocrats in Japan may yield significant data for studies in genetics.

Finally we should mention work based upon the study of skulls, bones, and teeth (29, 50, 163), a study of racial characteristics of the palmaris longus muscle (269), and a study of human posture and locomotion by the method of electromyography (148).

**Primatology**

The study of primate behavior in Japan has been developed to an unusual degree primarily owing to the efforts of Imanishi and his students. Frisch (26a) has made an excellent summary of the history and characteristics of this field in a recent paper. He notes that:

"For the last ten years Japanese primatologists and ecologists have been conducting intensive research on the life of populations of wild monkeys inhabiting their islands. The fieldwork, organized on a scale without precedent in the study of primate behavior, has begun to bear
fruit. . . . Shortly after the war, Kyoto University saw the foundation of a Primate Research Group under the direction of Professor Denzaburo Miyadi and Dr. Kinji Imanishi. The group's chief interest revolved around studies in ecology and social behavior. A few years later, an Experimental Animal Research Committee was formed at Tokyo University, whose main concern was the experimental use of monkeys for medical research. Cooperation developed between the two groups and eventually, in 1956, brought about the formation of the Japan Monkey Center. This organization includes at present 15 researchers, . . . and aims at providing a meeting place for all scientific disciplines that can contribute to a better understanding of the nature and evolution of primates" (pp. 584–85).

Frisch also points out that Japanese studies in primate behavior have three altogether original features. First, they are based on the individual identification of all members of the group. Second, a large number of colonies, all composed of the same animal species, are being observed simultaneously. And, finally, a continuous follow-up study is made (see 75–78, 80, 97, 175). In 1957 the Center sent two teams out on field trips, one to central Africa and the other to Southeast Asia. Imanishi has published two works (79, 81) stemming from this project on results of observations of gorilla behavior.

Archaeology

Until the end of World War II, most Japanese archaeologists were absorbed only in problems of local chronology and minute classifications of pottery types; they were not interested in the reconstruction of world history. As a result, they paid very little attention to relations with surrounding areas and cultures. The reason for this may be the fact that archaeology in Japan did not develop as a branch of anthropology, and was often tinged with antiquarianism. Japanese archaeologists were on the whole isolated from publications of foreign scholarship and had little communication with scholars abroad. But this situation has gradually changed. Certain publications in the last five years—the Handbooks of Japanese Archaeology (117), Illustrated Outline of Japanese Culture History (139), Illustrated Dictionary of Archaeology (176), and Outline of World Archaeology (136, 250, 319)—may be regarded as indicative of the trend in development of recent Japanese archaeology. The remainder of this section will be
devoted to a summary of the present status of research in terms of the conventionally designated prehistoric periods.

Preceramic period. Systematic studies of a preceramic site in Iwajuku, Gumma Prefecture, have continued over the more than ten years since the site was first excavated. Already more than one hundred sites have been discovered, and studies in chronology and area varieties are now under way. Most work, however, has been restricted to analysis of stone implements, and the reconstruction of the culture as a whole and of human life in this period remains a task for the future. Useful summaries of the status of work in this period are to be found in Serizawa (227, 228) and in Befu and Chard (17), who also include a bibliography of works on this period.

Jōmon period. Archaeologists began working on this period long before the war, directing most of their attention to the typological analysis of pottery. As a result, more than two hundred pottery types have been classified to date. No evidence of agriculture or use of metal has as yet been discovered.

One of the most significant events in recent studies is the C-14 date of ca. 7000 B.C. determined for the earliest phase of the Jōmon period (251). This finding roughly coincides with that estimated by typological pottery analyses. Detailed discussions of available evidence from this period are to be found in Groot (48), Kobayashi (134), Serizawa (228), Yamanouchi (315), and Yawata (319).

Yayoi period. Investigations related to this period began some time after the investigations of the Jōmon period, and the main focus has been upon pottery types. The Yayoi period is estimated to have lasted for about six hundred years (from ca. 300 B.C. to ca. A.D. 300), and to date has simply been classified into several phases based upon typological evidence (137).

An excavation of the Itatsuke site in Fukuoka Prefecture, which is regarded as belonging to the earliest phase of this period, made it clear that rice cultivation, weaving, and the use of iron were already well developed (108). Moreover, excavation at the huge Toro site in Shizuoka Prefecture (107), a project conducted jointly by archaeologists from several universities, and undertaken on a larger scale than any excavation to date, yielded valuable clues for understanding early irrigation techniques and the structure of an entire community.
Elsewhere, remains of human bones discovered at the site of Doi-gahara in Yamaguchi Prefecture gave evidence that the inhabitants in this period were of a physical type completely different from the Jōmon Japanese (114, 111).

*Kofun (Ancient Tomb) period*. This period, believed to be chronologically later than Yayoi, is known through a few sites rich in burial remains. Research before the war progressed slowly because of the high cost of excavation and the greater interest in the more numerous sites of other periods. Since the end of the war, more systematic and careful studies have been made both of the tombs and of the communities with which they are associated. Among other things, recent studies of these sites have revealed the presence of an iron industry and of salt manufactures. The present state of studies of this period is summarized by Gotō (47), Kobayashi (134–36), and, in English, by Groot (48).

In passing we should mention a very promising contribution to the ever growing arsenal of archaeological dating methods: namely, Watanabe's technique for determining the age of prehistoric remains by measuring the direction of remnant magnetism of the baked earth with which the artifacts are associated (307).

**Cultural-Historical Studies**

Various scholars have attempted to reconstruct Japanese culture history by means of comparative ethnological analysis of various culture traits. Oka, strongly influenced by the German *kulturkreislehre*, has published extensively on Japanese ethnohistory over the past twenty-five years. From analyses of myths, folk customs, social organization, and the like, he suggests that Japanese culture history can be reconstructed in terms of five different strata. The earliest, he asserts, must have diffused from some coastal part of the continent, the second from Austroasiatic peoples, the third from the Tungus, the fourth from some group belonging to the Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian) peoples, and the fifth from the Altaic-speaking peoples (209–12). This hypothesis has subsequently been subjected to critical evaluation (90).

Matsumoto (165), Mishina (171–73), Numazawa (192), Matsu-mura (168, 169), and Obayashi (197, 199) have contributed rather extensively to the literature dealing with the genealogy of Japanese
myths. Seki (224, 225) has made a number of studies of folktales and legends, and has tried to classify them into various types. Ishida (88, 89) has made a comparative ethnological study of the kappa (Japanese water spirit) legend.

**Linguistics**

B. H. Chamberlain, the Englishman who became the first teacher of linguistics at the University of Tokyo, first encouraged the development of this science in Japan. Thanks largely to the effort of Ueda and others, linguistic theories of the West were gradually introduced and studies of the Japanese language were undertaken by various scholars.

The study of the Japanese phonemic system was advanced primarily by Hashimoto (53) and Arisaka (8, 9). Hashimoto intensively analyzed the use of kana letters in Japanese classics of the eighth century, and found that at that time there were three mid-vowels (ī, ō, ē) in addition to the five vowels (a, i, u, e, o) that are found in modern Japanese. He further studied the Japanese phonemic system in the sixteenth century by analyzing a Japanese textbook written by Portuguese missionaries of the time. Subsequently Arisaka, taking his cue from Hashimoto's discovery, found that in ancient Japanese of the eighth century there were some regularities close to the "vowel harmony" that is widely distributed among the Altaic languages, and especially Turkish. These problems were further advanced by Ōno (218).

Accents of early and modern Japanese were extensively studied by S. Hattori (58) and others. The grammar of ancient Japanese was studied by Yamada and Yuzawa (311, 312, 321, 322), who provided us with many vocabulary compilations. Most of these studies concern Japanese classical language, but *Japanese Folk Vocabularies* (4 volumes), assembled by the Institute of Japanese Folklore (84), is an important handbook for the anthropological study of folk societies.

Dialects have been studied by Tōjō (279), Shibata (229, 231), and many others. Tōjō published the *Dictionary of Japanese Dialects* (280) and a *Classified Dictionary of Japanese Dialects* (281). Today the National Language Research Institute is conducting various in-
tensive and extensive research projects, including several psychologically-oriented studies.

The pedigree of the Japanese language has been repeatedly discussed by many linguists. Comparing Japanese with the languages of neighboring groups, Hattori (57, 59) and Murayama (181) have pointed out structural similarities with Korean and Altaic. At the same time Matsumoto (164, 166) and Izui (99, 100) have also pointed out certain similarities in vocabulary between Japanese and Malayo-Polynesian languages. On the basis of this evidence as well as of cultural-historical and archaeological data, Ono (219) recently hypothesized that the Malayo-Polynesian people were the first to come to Japan, and that their language came to be widely in use. With the coming of new immigrants from the continent at the beginning of the Yayoi period, he suggests, Altaic speakers began to assume a dominant position, greatly changing the emerging Japanese language. In 1957 a symposium devoted to a discussion of this hypothesis was jointly sponsored by a group of linguists, archaeologists, and physical anthropologists.

Social Anthropology

Research on Japanese rural villages was first started by students of folklore (Volkskunde) under the leadership of Yanagita. Their focus was upon folk customs, folk beliefs, folk ceremonies, folk arts, and material culture. Their studies were largely descriptive and paid very little attention to the systematic analysis of social organization. (For a historical review and bibliography of their works, see 45, 46, and 226.)

It was rural sociologists who began around 1930 to devote themselves to the study of Japanese rural society. Suzuki, influenced by American sociology, began community studies and analyzed the characteristics of Japanese rural society. In 1940 he published Principles of Japanese Rural Sociology (264), which also reflects the stimulus of American anthropological methods resulting from Embree's Suye Mura (published in 1939).

Other sociologists, such as Oikawa, Kitano, and Ariga, focused their attention upon the dōzoku and associated social relations in rural societies (e.g., 182). Dōzoku refers to an extended kin group
consisting of a main family and branch families which are closely linked by patrilineal descent ties. Considering the dōzoku as the basic unit of Japanese folk society, they analyzed it in great detail (7, 130, 208).

With the end of the war, the number of students in sociology rapidly increased; studies were conducted extensively in various villages, and rural sociology quickly developed along both the lines of community studies and social relations. The most stimulating work was done by Fukutake. In his book on the social character of Japanese villages (33), Fukutake classified the villages into two types, the dōzoku type and the kō-kumi type. Kō is a village religious association based upon criteria of age, sex, family status, and occupation; kumi is a regional group of neighboring families. The kō-kumi village type, therefore, is one in which members of the kō and the kumi play a dominant role, whereas in the dōzoku type, the dōzoku is the central social unit. According to Fukutake, the dōzoku type is mostly distributed in the northeastern part of Japan (hence may also be called the “northeastern type”), whereas the kō-kumi type is predominantly found in the southwestern area (“southwestern type”). He further points out that this regional difference is a function of socioeconomic factors, and that the dōzoku type will vary accordingly with changes in the socioeconomic development. Isoda (95, 96) supports this finding from his studies in the sociology of law.

Rural sociology during the past several years has continued to develop along these lines, with emphasis placed upon the analysis of socioeconomic factors in the village, and such related problems as attitudes and values of peasants, postwar changes (including those arising from land reform), and urbanization (34). (For a history of Japanese rural sociology see Hidaka, 63.) Problems concerning the sociology of the family are discussed in many works (see especially Kitano and Okada, 131).

After the war anthropologists also engaged in Japanese village studies, and based upon data accumulated by their field studies, the Japanese Society of Ethnology edited a dictionary of Japanese folk society and culture (109). Gradually, however, their work began to reflect a greater diversity of empirical concerns than that of the sociologists. They found, for example, that age-groups and related
customs were more important than dōzoku in fishing communities in the southern part of Japan. Some villages, moreover, tend to emphasize bilateral (rather than patrilineal) kinship ties as a pervasive social bond. Thus anthropologists gradually came to isolate a variety of structural features, including rites of passage and duo-patrilocl marriage.

These studies were largely stimulated by the comparative ethnological studies of Japanese culture elements by Oka (211–15), who pointed out, among other things, that dōzoku resembles the patrilineal kin group (xala or hala) among the Tungus, while age-groups and related customs among southern fishing villages may be of Malayo-Polynesian origin. Hence the regional difference noted in social organization might be interpreted from an ethnohistorical rather than from a socioeconomic point of view. Various field studies were undertaken to examine this hypothesis. Thus Gamō (38–40, 42) discusses the regional characteristics of social organization from a broader point of view than is suggested by the dōzoku–kō-kumi dichotomy. Research along this line has been actively conducted by younger scholars as well (see, e.g., 25, 43, 98, 129, 184, 206, 207, 214, 263, 267, 273, 274). During the past few years, work has tended to concentrate on the study of Amami Island and Izu Island at the southern fringe of Japan, where the age-grouping system, menstruation house, and associated phenomena are most clearly observed (41, 180, 190, 221).

Along with these studies a large body of data on folk customs collected to date by the Volkskunde group has been reorganized, with special attention to regional distribution of customs and their relation to social organization. The Handbooks of Volkskunde (13 volumes), edited by Oka and others (215), contain many articles that stem from this endeavor. Gōda's study of regional variations in ceremonies (44) is one example; Hori's analysis of folk beliefs in relation to social structure (64–66) is another. (For details of the history of Japanese village studies by anthropologists, see Muratake, 179.)

Finally, attention has come to be paid to a study of Eta, the most important outcaste group in Japan. In 1951, Jirō Suzuki and others (268) undertook extensive field work, including social psychological analyses, among Eta communities as one part of a Social Tension
Survey Project supported by UNESCO. Physical anthropologists, who joined the survey for somatometric research, concluded that the Eta are physically the same as other Japanese, thus refuting the common belief that they are of different origin.

*Psychocultural Studies*

Japanese psychology before the end of the war was largely influenced by German trends and by animal experiments designed to test perception and Gestalt theories. After the war, American social psychology and clinical psychology were rapidly introduced; neo-Freudianism, personality studies, and mass-communication studies became popular topics even among the general public. In addition to the Japanese Psychological Association, established in 1926, the Society for Applied Psychology was founded soon after the war and the Society of Social Psychology somewhat more recently. Although a number of studies began to deal with sociopsychological topics, very few of them were concerned with problems of Japanese national culture or national character. Among the latter we may note mass-communication studies by Minami and his group (116, 170), in which Japanese national character was analyzed by means of characteristic patterns abstracted from popular media—movies, radio dramas, fiction, and songs.

A few sociologists became interested in the analysis of psychological attitudes among different groups, including peasants (120, 151, 205). The personality of peasants was also studied by anthropologists and by some psychologists (5, 177, 188, 298, 299). From about 1950 the Rorschach test came to be applied to the study of personality by many psychologists. Several attempts at standardizing the Japanese Rorschach have been made (138), but all the data collected so far are derived from urban populations. Nevertheless, some anthropologists have used Rorschachs in studies of rural communities (69, 70, 234, 235). The most ambitious culture-personality field study undertaken to date was conducted by the Human Relations Interdisciplinary Research Group in Nagoya under the direction of Muramoto, a psychiatrist, with the cooperation of several psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists. De Vos and Wagatsuma (22), Murakami (178), and Wagatsuma (302) have reported on the results
of Rorschach and TAT testing. A new research project, conducted by a team of anthropologists and psychologists with financial support from the Yenching Institute at Harvard University, is now in progress. Its aim is to analyze regional variations in social organization, other culture traits, and personality.

Very few studies have been devoted to child-rearing patterns and their relationship to personality formation. Ishiguro (91, 92) finds an association between some personality traits and the method of infant feeding. Hoshino and others (68) summarized data on child-rearing patterns in Japan. Sofue and his associates (236) surveyed the distribution of the use of a special cradle among northern Japanese rural communities, and are further trying to analyze its influence upon personality. Sue (248, 249) intensively analyzed child-care practices observed in two villages.

Various studies of religion, of which Ishizuka's analysis of spirit possession is a good example (94), reveal beginning attempts at psychocultural explanations. Some researches conducted by the Institute of Comparative Education and Culture at Kyushu University include a psychological approach. Teigo Yoshida, who has directed the anthropological work of the Institute, has undertaken investigations on the relationship between culture and education in various types of rural communities in Saga Prefecture. It is expected that a monograph based on this study will be published in 1962 in both Japanese and English. One aspect of this study—an analysis of the sociocultural background of moral education in an industrial community and in neighboring villages—has already been reported by Yoshida and others (317, 320).

REGIONAL STUDIES AMONG NON-JAPANESE

The Ainu of Hokkaido

A "Short History of Ainu Studies," published in 1958 by Watanabe (306), summarizes the history of Ainu studies by Japanese anthropologists. It was around 1884–85 that contact between the Ainu and the Japanese suddenly became intensified, and as a result the Ainu gradually changed their mode of subsistence from traditional hunting and fishing to agriculture. Japanese interest in their customs was
also aroused at this time. But it was mostly European missionaries
who first undertook scientific research of Ainu culture. Among them,
John Batchelor’s works (14–16) were most influential. Stimulated by
Batchelor’s studies, Shōgoro Tsuboi, founder of the Anthropological
Society, and other Japanese scholars began to engage in Ainu studies
and published several works. Since then Ainu studies have developed
in three major areas: physical anthropology, linguistics, and material
culture. Linguistics and material culture were also linked to the study
of Ainu religion.

Linguistic research, carried out by Kintaichi, Chiri, and Kubodera
(19–21, 125–27, 150), is linked to the analysis of religion, since its
data largely consist of folklore and myths. Other studies deal purely
with structural linguistic problems of the Ainu language (18, 30,
31, 128), and Hattori (61) is carrying on promising lexico-statistical
studies of Ainu dialects.

Studies on material culture were also conducted in relation to re-
ligious phenomena, including work by Inukai and Natori on salmon-
fishing and bear-hunting ceremonies (85, 86, 189). Sugiyama (262)
and Takabeya (271, 272) have reported on studies of art, dwellings,
and other artifacts. Extensive cultural-historical analysis of house
types and inau cult sticks was recently undertaken by Ōbayashi (196,
198, 200).

Sociological and socioeconomic studies are reported by Hanehara
(49) and Takakura (276).

Japanese anthropologists have dealt mostly with particular aspects
of Ainu culture, so that there is an almost complete lack of ethnog-
ographic monographs that give holistic accounts of their life and so-
ciety. *The Ainu*, a compendium edited by the Imperial Academy of
Tokyo in 1944 (83), helps to fill this gap. The most systematic study
undertaken to date is the “Joint Research on the Saru Ainu of Hok-
kaido” conducted in 1951 by the Japanese Society of Ethnology, the
results of which are reported in a special number of *Minzokugaku
Kenkyū* (Vol. 16, no. 3–4, 1951). Included in this issue is a study of
the kinship system by Sugiura (261); an analysis of territorial groups
by Izumi (103); papers by Kubodera on ancestor worship (149), by
Segawa on Ainu women (223), and by Watanabe on ecological
aspects of Ainu life (304, 305); and personality and psychocultural
studies in preparation (see, e.g., 284).
Research in physical anthropology has been conducted for many years by Kodama and his colleagues, as indicated in the bibliography compiled by Suda (241). The joint research on the Saru Ainu mentioned above includes a paper on somatometry (140, 142) and studies of blood groups (133), finger and toe prints (232, 233), and taste blindness (147). In addition, Tanaka and Watanabe have recently reported on a study of growth (278) and a histological study of the skin (308).

Archaeological research is now actively carried out by various scholars, special attention being paid to the prehistoric relation of the Ainu with the Arctic culture in Siberia and Alaska.

**Kurile Islands and Sakhalin**

Studies in these areas were first conducted by Torii, who visited the Kuriles in 1899, South Sakhalin in 1911, and North Sakhalin in 1921. His works in ethnology and archaeology are available in Japanese and French (285, 290, 297). In 1937–38 Oka, Ishida, and others excavated in these areas and carried on ethnological and linguistic studies of the Gilyak and Orokko (54, 55, 87, 213).

**Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, and China**

Study of Korea was initiated by the Japanese Government-General when Korea was annexed to Japan in 1910, and a series of reports on village studies were subsequently published. The first systematic research project was undertaken jointly by the departments of Sociology and Religion at Keijo Imperial University (Seoul University) in 1927–32. Field work was done on the ethnology of Korean natives and especially on shamanism by Akamatsu and Akiba (1, 3, 4). Ogura (203, 204) has published on linguistic work; physical anthropological research of the Koreans has been actively conducted by Imamura, Kohama, Shima, and others of the Medical School, Keijo Imperial University (see Suda, 237).

Studies in Manchuria and Mongolia were pioneered by Torii, whose extensive field trips between 1905 and 1951 ranged over a large part of these areas. He has published a number of ethnological and archaeological reports on Manchuria, East Mongolia, and Siberia since 1914 (287–89, 291, 292, 294). Between 1933 and 1938 the departments of Sociology and Religion at Keijo Imperial University
jointly conducted field work among the Orochon, Goldi, and Dahur (2, 101, 102). Hattori (56) has published on the Mongolian language, Egami (23, 24) on archaeological work, and Kohama and Imamura on physical anthropological research (see 240, 243).

Torii, who visited China as early as 1902 to study the Miao (286, 293), also pioneered in Chinese studies. Later he excavated at various sites (295, 296). Studies in family structure and community organization were conducted during the war by Makino and other sociologists (32, 62, 160, 161).

The Ryukyu Islands and Okinawa

Ryukyuan studies in Japan were begun and have mostly been conducted by Volkskunde students. In “Japanese Volkskunde and Ryukyuan Studies,” Otō pays special tribute to Fuyu Ifa’s pioneering work in Ryukyuan studies, the Ko Ryukyu (“The Ancient Ryukyus”), which contains many papers contributing to the study of Ryukyuan language and ethnography, and to the ethnographic and Volkskunde researches of Yanagita and Orikuchi, who undertook field research on the islands about 1920. Yanagita found primitive forms of Japanese Shintoism in the religious life of the Ryukyuans, with control by organizations of female shamans, and has stressed the significance of these data for understanding the culture of early Japan. Orikuchi, too, made extensive studies of female shamans in the Ryukyus and of the so-called mare-bito (“stranger god”) belief. Subsequently Yanagita organized the “Nantō–Danwa-kai” (Southern Islands Conversation) and edited the Rohen-sōsho (“Fireside Series”), both of which report on anthropological work in the Ryukyus. The Volkskunde group have contributed extensively to work on folk customs, folk beliefs, and folk arts, literature, and language (123, 124, 183, 220, 316).

Preoccupied as they were with comparisons between the Ryukyus and Japan, the Volkskunde scholars paid little attention to ethnological comparisons with the Malay-Polynesian areas. Nor did they undertake community studies or analyses of social structure. Several social anthropologists have recently begun to study these problems. Mabuchi, who has done outstanding work, discusses the relationship between folk beliefs and social organization (158). He continues his
analysis in a recent article on the two types of kinship rituals among Malayo-Polynesian peoples (159). Some younger anthropologists have also contributed to field work on aspects of social organization (26, 202).

Linguistic studies begun by Ifa were continued by Miyanaga (174). Shibata (230) worked on the phonemic system of a dialect in the southern end of the Ryukyus, and Hattori (60) recently published on a glottochronological study of three dialects.

Relatively few archaeological studies were undertaken in the Ryukyus, and the data are still fragmentary. However, Yawata (318) and Kanaseki (112) have actively discussed the status of work so far accomplished in this area. In another of his bibliographies, Suda (242) has compiled the publications on physical anthropological studies between 1927 and 1941.

Formosa

Mabuchi (156) summarizes the history of ethnological studies in Formosa by Japanese scholars. The establishment of the Taihoku Imperial University (the present National Taiwan University at Taipei) in 1928 stimulated various studies by social and cultural scientists in Formosa. The Institute of Ethnology, under the leadership of Utsurikawa, a student of Dixon, was especially concerned with the study of the aborigines. At the outset (1930–32) the members of the Institute engaged in an extensive survey designed to contribute to problems of historical reconstruction. In the course of making field surveys, however, they became interested also in other aspects of culture. Mabuchi (152, 153–55, 157) devoted himself especially to social anthropological studies, later concentrating on the social and ritual life of the clan system among the central tribes. Okada, a sociologist at the Taihoku Imperial University, engaged in sociological studies both of the Formosan Chinese and of the social anthropology of the aborigines, focusing particularly on the study of aboriginal family life (216, 217). Furuno, who was at that time with the Imperial Academy of Tokyo, visited the aborigines several times. As a specialist on the sociology of religion, he was concerned with the survey of aboriginal ritual life (36, 37). Masuda, of the department of Agricultural Economics at the Taihoku Imperial University, first engaged in the
study of religious beliefs of the Formosan Chinese for several years, and subsequently undertook research on the marriage customs of the aborigines (162).

The Imperial Academy of Tokyo set about compiling a *Dictionnaire de termes de droit coutumier Indonésien*, which was to be published by the Royal Academy of Sciences of Amsterdam. However, a number of circumstances led to a delay in the appearance of the *Dictionnaire*, which was finally published in 1941 in Japanese, owing to the outbreak of the war in Europe (82).

Linguistic studies were carried out by Ogawa and Asai, both of the Institute of Linguistics at Taihoku Imperial University. Asai, in his summary of these works, points out that since the domination of Formosa by Japan, various handbooks on the languages, including conversation books and vocabularies, have been published by the Government-General and by governmental institutions in Formosa. Among the most reliable and useful of these for scientific study are three dictionaries (Japanese-Atayal, Japanese-Paiwan and Japanese-Ami) compiled by Ogawa in 1933 using the IPA symbol system. In 1930 Taihoku Imperial University inaugurated a systematic study of aboriginal languages, and published a report in 1935, titled *The Myths and Traditions of the Formosan Aborigines*. It includes phonetically transcribed texts of the important myths and folk tales of every tribe in its original language. In addition to these works, Ogawa worked on phonetics in terms of comparative linguistics. He cites evidence to bear upon (1) the theory of the q-sound, and (2) the dualization of t, d, n, and s in Indonesian languages (12). Asai himself (10, 11) has worked on Sedeq and Yami.

Kanaseki, who has conducted studies in archaeology and physical anthropology, reviews work in these fields (111, 114), and Suda (238, 239) has compiled useful bibliographies. Among the continuing prehistoric investigations is a recently published work by Kokubu on prehistoric knives (146).

Fujisawa (28), using the Rorschach test, has published the results of a psychological study of Formosan aborigines.

**Micronesia**

Sugiura, who became the first professor of cultural anthropology at the University of Tokyo, is responsible for most ethnological work
in Micronesia. His studies (252–60) were carried out between 1934 and 1941 while he was a research fellow at the South Sea Islands Government Office. They range over social organization, land tenure systems, economics, religion, and material culture. Specimens collected by him are now at the University of Tokyo.

Research in physical anthropology was conducted by various scholars and the results are indicated in the bibliography compiled by Suda (245).

Southeast Asia and Indonesia

Kano (115) carried on ethnological and archaeological field studies during World War II in the Philippines and in French Indo-China, Borneo, and other areas. A cultural-historical study on swine-breeding and a comparative analysis of kinship systems are reported by Oabayashi (194, 195).

The first postwar expedition to Southeast Asia was conducted in 1957–58, when the Japanese Society of Ethnology sent out a research team for a project titled, "The Unified Research of Cultures of Southeast Asian Countries." The team, led by Matsumoto and consisting of ethnologists, archaeologists, linguists, and botanists undertook an extensive survey of the Mekon area, while intensive studies were carried on in communities of Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia. The results are published in Minzokugaku Kenkyū (Vol. 23, no. 1–2, 1959) and elsewhere (13).

The same society in 1960 also sent out an Indonesian research team under the direction of Miyamoto. Field work was conducted in Bali, Lombok, and other areas (27, 93, 191). Indonesian studies are now in process by Yoshida and his colleagues from Kyushu University.

Suda, in another of his bibliographies (244), has compiled the results of wartime physical anthropological work.

India and Adjacent Areas

In 1953–54 and again in 1955–56, Nakane carried on field work on social anthropological problems related to the structure of primitive tribes in Tripura State, Sikkim, and Assam (185–87). Others have studied myths, beliefs, and culture history (see especially 193, 309, 310).
Field study in the Himalayan area has been conducted by Imamishi and his colleagues. In 1952 he led the Mountaineering Expedition Team from Kyoto University to Mt. Manaslu, and made a preliminary study of the ecological distribution of plants and animals as well as their relationship to human adaptation in the Nepal Himalayas. Kawakita and others carried on extensive research in the middle part of the Nepal Himalayas, and made a general survey of the peoples and cultures in this area (118, 119). And in 1957 an intensive study of one village was published, as *Peoples of Nepal Himalaya* (121). From a third of a series of investigations, in 1958, Iijima (71) and Takayama (277) have begun to report on some of the data relating to the Torbo area north of Mt. Dhauлагiri.

*Southwest Asia*

Anthropological study of this area was first undertaken by Umezao and other Kyoto University scholars, who did ethnological and linguistic work among the Mogols of Afghanistan in 1955 (301).

In 1956–57 archaeological research was conducted in Iran and Iraq by the Tokyo University Iraq-Iran Archaeological Expedition, consisting of eleven members under the direction of Egami. They excavated near Persepolis in Iran and near Mosul in Iraq, and in 1959 continued their excavations near Persepolis (282). During these excavations Ikeda, a member of the expedition, undertook a physical anthropological study of northern Iraqis and southern Iranians (72).

*The Americas*

In the New World to date Japanese anthropologists have studied most actively in South America. From 1952 through 1958 Izumi and his associates carried on studies of Japanese immigrants in Brazil (104, 105, 222, 270). These studies, involving the use of intensive interviews and psychological tests, were oriented toward the analysis of acculturation and adjustment processes. Studies of Japanese immigrants to California and Canada, respectively, were carried out by Beardsley, of the University of Michigan, and by Dore, of the University of British Columbia. Japanese anthropologists participated in these investigations, and the results are partially reported by them (303).
Izumi and the Scientific Expedition of the University of Tokyo have carried on archaeological studies in the Andean area over a period of years. In 1958 they made an extensive survey, the result of which has been recently published (283). More intensive excavations, yet to be reported, were conducted in 1960 at Tumbes and Kotoshi.

Aoyagi reports on an interesting study of occupational identification and occupational competence among successful businessmen in Nashville, Tennessee (6). And, finally, Oka and Sofue have begun preliminary studies on the Eskimo, as part of a joint project relating to the geography, archaeology, and ethnology of Arctic America, sponsored by Meiji University (Tokyo) Expedition to Alaska.

Other Areas (Africa, Melanesia, and Polynesia)

A number of young Japanese anthropologists more recently have developed an interest in African studies. Although none of them as yet has had a chance to go to Africa, they have established a study circle devoted to African studies, and members are preparing themselves for field work by discussing published works at monthly meetings. Some articles growing out of these meetings have already been published (see, e.g., 275).

Izumi and Suzuki carried on joint studies during the war in Melanesia, West New Guinea, on problems of social anthropology and physical anthropology (106). Suda's bibliography of South China and the South Seas (244) includes items on research in physical anthropology. Suzuki has resumed work in Oceania with a field trip to Polynesia in 1960 to study somatometric problems.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Japan, as in Europe, the various fields of anthropology developed originally as separate disciplines. Although collaborative work has taken place on an increasingly large scale, specialists in these fields still tend to be lodged in separate departments. Perhaps the most noteworthy research in physical anthropology has been in primatology, constitutional types, and osteology. Some of the contributions to structural and historical linguistics are very sophisticated.
Ethnology was early influenced by Kulturkreislehre and folklore (Volkskunde), and, with very few exceptions, shaped much of the prewar field work and theoretical analyses of culture. Work along these lines still continues, but, under strong American and British influence, the dominant interests of the younger generation lie in comparative studies of social structure and related problems.
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