J. van Bremen

Indonesian studies in Japanese anthropology

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 144 (1988), no: 2/3, Leiden, 248-258

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

JAN VAN BREMEN

INDONESIAN STUDIES IN JAPANESE ANTHROPOLOGY¹

Three main subjects have been selected for this introduction to Indonesian studies by Japanese anthropologists and scholars of related disciplines. One is the place of Southeast Asian and Indonesian studies in Japanese anthropology as a whole. The other pertains to Indonesian studies as an interface between Japanese and Western anthropology. The third is the impact of Japanese Indonesian studies upon the work of others studying Indonesia. As I am not an Indonesianist myself, I will not pass judgement on the actual contents of the studies as contributions to Indonesian studies proper.

Anthropology became an academic discipline in Japan when the Imperial University of Tôkyô (the present-day University of Tôkyô) established the first chair in this subject in 1893. The Society for Anthropology (Jinruigakkai) had been formed nine years earlier, while one can trace indigenous traditions and roots in social surveys and culturologies produced much further back in history (see Terada 1981).

Although physical anthropology occupied the dominant place at the university in the first half of the twentieth century, important work was nevertheless also done by members of ethnological societies, and by scholars engaged in ethnological research in institutes, museums and universities. The establishment in Formosa of the Taihoku Imperial University (the present National Taiwan University) in 1928, for instance, promoted the study of Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The head of the Institute of Ethnology here was the ethno-historian Utsurikawa Neno², a student of Roland Burrage Dixon's and a pioneer of

1 I am indebted to the University of Amsterdam, the Stichting Isaac Alfred Ailion Foundation, and the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Scientific Research for the support which enabled me to make a study of Japanese anthropology in Japan, for three months at the Keio University in Tôkyô, and three months at the National Museum of Ethnology at Osaka, in 1986. I thank these institutions for the place they made for a visiting researcher and for the help and hospitality which they so generously extended.

2 In conformity with Japanese usage, Japanese names are given here family-name first, and personal name second.

JAN VAN BREMEN, Reader in Japanese Anthropology and Intellectual History at Leiden, obtained his Ph. D. from the University of California at Berkeley. Specialized in Japanese anthropology and Confucianism, he is the author also of *The Moral Imperative and Leverage for Rebellion: An Anthropological Study of Wang Yang-ming Doctrine in Japan*, Ann Arbor: Michigan University Microfilms International, 1985, and 'The Religious Nature of Popular Confucianism in Japan', in: I. Nish (ed.), *Contemporary European Writings on Japan*, pp. 164-8, London: Norbury, 1988. Dr. van Bremen may be contacted at the Centre for Japanese and Korean Studies, P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden.

Indonesian studies in Japan. Prominent Japanese Southeast Asianists worked here, among them Mabuchi Tōichi, known also in the West through his English-language publications.

Such centres of learning in peripheral areas and colonies deserve closer study. They played an important role in the establishment and further development of anthropology in all countries where major traditions arose. The nature and directions in the development of anthropology in the Netherlands, to cite an example outside Japan, were deeply influenced by ethnology as practised and taught about and in the Dutch East and West Indies. The particular process is highlighted by, for example, the shifts from 'the ethnology of the Dutch Indies' (Schrieke 1936) and 'colonial ethnology' (Duyvendak 1938), to the approach embodied in the 'modern history and sociology of Southeast Asia' (Wertheim 1947), and at present the study of the relations of power and dependency within Asia and between Asia and Europe (Breman 1987).

The first graduate school of cultural and social anthropology in Japan was opened as late as 1949. Today there are nearly ten such schools, and their number is increasing, because the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka and a few other institutions are also offering graduate courses in anthropology.

The birth of modern cultural and social anthropology in Japan is to a large extent linked to the activities of a Circle formed in 1928 by a dozen or so anthropologists, who deeply influenced subsequent developments. Among the founding members were such nestors of Japanese ethnology as Yawata Ichirō, Egami Namio, and Oka Masao, who concentrated on questions of the ethnogenesis of Japanese culture and society, and the religious anthropologist Furuno Kiyoto, who played a leading role in the introduction of French scholarship in Japan, and also did some work on Indonesia.

This circle eventually grew into the Japanese Society of Ethnology (*Nihon minzokugakkai*). At its foundation in 1934, it had 332 members. In 1964, its membership had reached the figure of 672, and when the Society celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1984, it counted 1,300 members (*Nihon* 1986:iv). The present overview deals mostly with them.

One celebrated pioneer and master of cultural and social anthropology in Japan working on Indonesia was Uno Enkū. Uno is looked upon as one of the founders of the modern anthropology of religion in Japan. He formed his ideas on the subject in the 1910s and 1920s, while he worked most of his life on an intricate study of rice rituals in Southeast Asia, which was published in a lengthy volume by the Society for Oriental Studies [*Tōyō Gakkai*] in 1940.

Like most of the work of Japanese Indonesianists in the first half of the century, Uno's studies were based mainly on library research and on the study of Western publications – Dutch and others. But Uno also did some work in the field. In 1925, he spent half a year in Southeast Asia,

and in 1939 three months in China. Field research grew in importance in Japanese anthropology at this time. Mabuchi Tôichi, for example, after prolonged fieldwork among the indigenous peoples of Taiwan in the 1930s, did field research in Celebes in 1943. Others worked elsewhere.

Since the Second World War, and especially during the past fifteen years, fieldwork has increased tremendously in Japanese anthropology. A strong impulse was given by the Japanese Society of Ethnology in 1957, when it sponsored the first of three joint research expeditions to Southeast Asia. In 1960, a research team was sent to Indonesia, namely to Java, Bali and Lombok. In 1963 the Ministry of Education instituted an overseas research fund, and with the growing prosperity of Japan, the duration of fieldwork projects increased, as did the compass and number of fieldwork locations. This increase has been particularly strong in the 1970s and 1980s, and is continuing at present, also with respect to Indonesia.³

Indonesian studies have a number of institutional footholds in Japan. The establishment of the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Kyôto University in 1963 and the foundation of the Center for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa at the Tôkyô University of Foreign Languages in 1964 gave Indonesian studies a firm place in the Japanese university. The Institute of Oriental Culture [Tôyô bunka kenkyûsho] of the University of Tôkyô is also an important bastion of Indonesian studies.

The establishment in 1974 of the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, as an integral part of the Japanese university system, was an event of prime importance to anthropology and to Southeast Asian studies in Japan. The museum regularly publishes research findings in Japanese and English, receives visiting scholars and trainees, and takes the initiative in organizing joint research projects, international workshops and symposia, some of them relating to Southeast Asia.

The Museum is the largest research institution dedicated to ethnology in Japan, with a staff of about sixty-five full-time researchers, and five research departments. Four of these departments are based on the cultural and geographic divisions of the world. So East, Central and North Asia form the province of the First Research Department, while Southeast, South and West Asia are the domain of the Second Research Department. The Fifth Research Department is devoted to ethnic art, technology, oral culture, and the use of computers in ethnological studies.

3 I gratefully acknowledge the permission to consult the draft of the article 'Anthropology in Japan' written by Professor Yoshida Teigo for the Département d'Anthropologie, Université Laval, Québec, Canada. It describes developments in Japanese anthropology between 1980 and 1985. With respect to Indonesia, Yoshida did fieldwork in Java in 1959, again in Jakarta in 1967-1968, and in Bali in 1974-1975.

An important function of the National Museum of Ethnology is that as an inter-university research institute. Staff members do research individually, but the Museum at the same time runs more than twenty joint research projects, each for a duration of two or three years. These projects are implemented in cooperation with other specialists and centres, and so involve nearly three hundred researchers.

Some of these projects are concentrated exclusively on the Southeast Asian field, while others merely include this field. One of the museum's two long-term projects constitutes an example of the latter. It is a ten-year programme entitled 'Comparative Analyses with respect to Japanese Ethno-Genesis' [Nihon minzoku bunka no genryû no hikaku kenkyû], which is now in its final year. Southeast Asian studies occupy a prominent place in it, as they are planned to also in the next long-term project, 'The Comparative Study of Ethnic Cultures in Asia and the Pacific'.

History and peasant consciousness in South East Asia (Turton and Tanabe (eds) 1984) is a collection of twelve studies on topics which formed the subject of intensive discussion for a week at the Sixth International Ethnological Symposium organized by the Museum in 1982. The Symposium brought together two scholars from Europe, one from North America, five from Japan, and four from Southeast Asia. Three of the studies contributed concerned Indonesia, three Malaysia, and three Thailand. The Philippines, Vietnam and Japan each were the subject of one.

The qualities and spirit of the project were characterized as follows by Andrew Turton and Tanabe Shigeharu (1984:1-2) in the introduction:

'The papers cover quite a wide range of peoples and historical periods, and are contributed by social anthropologists, historians and a political scientist. There is also considerable variety in scope and style within and between papers... And yet there is also considerable convergence of approach, with anthropologists committed to the study of archival materials, and historians and political scientists committed to field investigations and methods of oral history. Whatever their particular emphasis, all contributors are concerned to place their studies in the historical context of whole social formations and of economic and political as well as cultural and ideological relations and processes. And all authors engage, more or less explicitly, in a critical debate with received sources and hypotheses.'

This should be music to the ears of Southeast Asianists everywhere and stir their curiosity.

A short-term project aimed exclusively at Indonesia was carried out under the sponsorship of the Museum in 1976, when a team of researchers conducted a range of surveys among the Galela of north Halmahera (Ishige (ed.) 1980). Missions are also sent to Southeast Asia

regularly to obtain specimens for the Museum's collection; such missions were sent to Indonesia in 1975 and 1977, to Malaysia in 1974 and 1987, to New Guinea in 1974 and 1984, to the Philippines in 1978, and to Thailand in 1974.

Lastly, as an illustration of the kind of individual research being done on Indonesia in this institution, I shall take as an example the work of a new member, Sugishima Takashi, who joined the Second Research Department of the Museum in 1987, and recently worked among the Lionese of Central Flores. He has published several papers on the Lionese, among them studies of their material culture and its symbolism (Sugishima 1986, 1987). Of course, Sugishima is not the only member of the Museum's staff who is working on Indonesia; there are others who, like him, are working on New Guinea.

At the time of its thirtieth anniversary, in 1964, the Japanese Society of Ethnology compiled the report *Nihon minzokugaku no kaiko to tenbô*. It appeared in 1966, and contains brief statements about the past and about the course of development in the thematic and regional fields to be discerned in Japanese anthropology in the 1960s. At the same time, it summarizes the contributions to these areas by members of the Society and lists their major publications. An abridged version was published in English as *Ethnology in Japan; Historical Review* in 1968.

The work of the members of the Society has been subsumed under five sub-disciplines in this report, viz.: historical ethnology, social anthropology, material culture, culturology (*bunkaron*), and folklore. Work has also been done in seven adjoining areas, moreover, namely those of physical anthropology, archaeology, history, geography, sociology, religious studies and linguistics. Geographically, these studies are focused on Japan and the Ryukyus, North, East, and Southeast Asia, Oceania, West Asia and Africa, and America.

The importance of Southeast Asian studies is clear from the report. It has been recognized as a regional field in its own right, but is also receiving attention in other fields. The work of Ôbayashi Taryô is a good example. A graduate of the University of Vienna, like several other Japanese anthropologists, Ôbayashi has been engaged in the comparative study of Japanese and Southeast Asian cultures since the 1950s. He has made studies of Indonesia, Indo-China, the Philippines, the Ryukyus, Japan, and Northeast Asia, in particular of the mythology of these areas.

In the general framework of the area as a whole, one of the four sub-chapters of the section on Southeast Asia is devoted to Indonesia. Written by the Indonesianist Nishimura Asahitarô, who has been working on Indonesia since the early 1940s, it gives an outline of the origins and development of Japanese Indonesian studies from the 1890s to the time of writing, which covers nearly thirty pages.

The developments over the past two decades have been summarized

in *Nihon no minzokugaku 1964-1983*, which was published in 1986 to mark the Society's fiftieth anniversary. The spectacular growth of Japanese anthropology in these twenty years is immediately apparent. Members are now working in twenty anthropological sub-fields, and fieldwork has intensified and been extended to all parts of the world. Most of the fieldwork was done in Africa, Japan, Southeast Asia, South America, Oceania, and East Asia. Northeast Asia and Europe were studied less, but the situation appears to be changing, certainly with regard to Europe.

The Southeast Asian area has been divided into a continental and an insular region in this survey. The part on the insular area is divided into two sections. One contains a review of studies made in the Philippines, written by Kikuchi Yasushi and Muratake Seiichi. The other summarizes research done in Indonesia and Malaysia. This area has been further divided into the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, described by Uchibori Motomitsu, Java and Borneo, reviewed by Maeda Narifumi, and East Indonesia, discussed by Kurita Isamu.

Taking the Society's output as a whole, the review lists about 5,000 Japanese-language publications and around 600 publications in foreign languages by the members in the period concerned, who also translated roughly 300 foreign papers and books into Japanese. Thus, as Okada Hiroaki calculated, between 1964 and 1983, members of the Japanese Society of Ethnology on average published one study in twelve in a language other than Japanese, in 99% of the cases in English.⁴

The question is, how much of this material finds its way into the studies of others and how much is utilized of what is available. Going on impressions, this seems to vary. Japanese anthropologists have been publishing in international journals and with international presses all through this century, even though many of their foreign-language publications have also appeared only locally, and consequently are difficult to obtain or have remained unknown abroad.

To give some idea of the situation, I shall cite one or two recent examples. Studies by Japanese Indonesianists such as the article in the *Journal of Asian Studies* of 1980 and the book, *Matriliney and migration: Evolving Minangkabau traditions in Indonesia*, published by the Cornell University Press in 1982, by Katô Tsuyoshi, are directly available to most scholars. Further, a study entitled 'A Cultural Analysis of the Sawito Incident', by Sekimoto Teruo, of the University of Tôkyô, will be made accessible in English in the forthcoming volume, *Studies in popular*

4 I am drawing here on the typescript version of a lecture, 'Current trends in Japanese anthropology', delivered on April 15, 1987, by Professor Okada Hiroaki, of Hokkaido University, at the Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, the University of Alberta, Canada. I wish to thank the author for letting me use his paper, and Dr. Pamela J. Asquith of the University of Alberta for drawing my attention to it.

millenarian movements in China and Southeast Asia, to be published by the University of Hawaii Press.

In Japan itself, new channels for the communication in English of work by Japanese anthropologists have been created in the 1970s and 1980s. By now it should be possible to perceive the effects of these efforts. One large-scale initiative has been the publication of the *Senri Ethnological Studies*, an English-language series produced and circulated by the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka since 1978.⁵ It is apparently successful. To cite an example of its effects from the Netherlands, one finds that the above-mentioned *survey* among the Galela of north Halmahera (Ishige (ed.) 1980) has been consulted for a study of the Tobelo for a doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Leiden this year (Platenkamp 1988), because it has appeared in this series in English.

To give an example of a small-scale project: the Japanese Society for Oceanic Studies began publishing an annual journal in English in 1985. Entitled *Man and Culture in Oceania*, it is giving non-Japanese Oceanists access to Japanese research in this field, while being open to them for the publication of their original results, book reviews and communications.⁶ The scope of the journal is broad, as specified in the following:

'The relevant scientific fields include physical and cultural anthropology, linguistics, prehistory and archaeology, human ecology, geography, etc., and the geographical regions of research will be Polynesia, Micronesia, Australia, and Island Southeast Asia, although research on adjacent areas, e.g., Taiwan and the Malay Peninsula, is also acceptable when the theme is relevant to the interests of Oceanists.'

With respect to Indonesia, Fukushima Masato, of the Department of Anthropology of the University of Tōkyō, for example, published the article 'Kebatinan mystical sects and the meaning of spirit possession in Javanese culture' in this yearbook (Volume 3, pp. 29-46) in 1987.

Ishikawa Eikichi and Ushijima Iwao (1987) published an English-language overview of Japanese studies of Micronesia between 1884 and 1986. It appeared in the *Senri Ethnological Studies* series, in a volume entitled *Cultural uniformity and diversity in Micronesia*, edited by Ushijima and Sudō. It is the English-language version of a collection of reports resulting from a joint research project, *Studies on the Ethno-History of Micronesian Folk Culture*, carried out between 1982 and 1984.

5 The series is obtainable from the National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Expo Park, Suita, Osaka 565.

6 The Japanese Society for Oceanic Studies has its address at the Department of Social Anthropology, Tōkyō Metropolitan University, Yagumo, Meguro-ku, Tōkyō 152.

With the language barrier thus out of the way, there is little that need hamper mutual understanding and communication. As Ushijima Iwao and Sudô Ken-ichi stated in the English preface to the said volume:

'The main objective of the joint study program reported here' has been to summarize the findings of pre-war Japanese scholars and to present the results of "Micronesian Studies" conducted by Japanese researchers over the past 15 years. A further objective has been to analyse the links between the basic culture of Micronesia and the various cultures of individual societies. In other words, both the uniformity and the diversity of Micronesian folk culture has been the common theme of the scholars who participate in this project.'

In this approach one can discern parallels with, for example, the 'field of ethnological study' – a concept and method used in many Dutch studies of Indonesia.

The study of Southeast Asian cultures has long been a major concern in Japanese anthropology, and Japanese anthropologists have studied at academic centres in Europe, America, and Asia all along. The economic historian and Indonesia specialist Kano Hiroyoshi of the Institute of Oriental Culture of the University of Tôkyô, for instance, was a visiting researcher in Holland in 1987. Work in Indonesian studies confronts Japanese scholars with Dutch anthropology and sociology, exciting their interest and criticism (Kano 1980, 1984; Itagaki 1968; Yamada 1966). I do not know how many Americans, Europeans, and Asians go to Japanese centres of Southeast Asian and Indonesian studies. My impression, however, is that their number is not insignificant and that it is growing.

Uno Enkû was perhaps the first Japanese anthropologist and Indonesianist to come to Holland. At the age of thirty-five, he went to Europe in the autumn of 1920, and stayed there for nearly three years, working in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and England. He studied the religion and social organization of Pacific peoples with Marcel Mauss in Paris, and, after visiting several places in the German world, went to Leiden. He did library research there, and more in Cambridge later. He studied the anthropology of religion, and continued his research on Southeast Asia. Uno returned to Japan in the spring of 1923 (Uno 1940:I; Itô 1978:220). Not surprisingly, American and European studies dominate his work. His monograph *Shûkyô minzokugaku* (Uno 1929) appeared in 1929, and became a standard work, which was reprinted before, during and after the war. Restricting ourselves to examples from Dutch anthropology, one finds reflected in the book the ideas of J. J. Fahrenfort, G. van der Leeuw, and E. van Ossenbruggen, pertaining to the primitive mentality, and of A. C. Kruyt, A. W. Nieuwenhuis, and G. A. Wilken, regarding animism. Likewise, ideas from foreign studies predominate in Uno's *Maraishiya ni okeru tômai*

girei (Uno 1940). Besides his ethnographic information, Uno took some of his ideas and concepts, for example the notion of soul-substance (*reishitsu*), from Western anthropologists such as A. C. Kruyt, making him the first to stress its significance in Japan (Itô 1978:221).

In an obituary written in 1950, Mabuchi Tôichi (Mabuchi 1974, III:511) clearly took it for granted that readers of the *Japanese Journal of Ethnology* had heard of Kruyt. Mabuchi had reviewed studies by Kruyt in the journal ten years earlier (Mabuchi 1940). But even then he could expect some familiarity with the work and ideas of Kruyt among Japanese Indonesianists well-read in Western and Dutch anthropology like himself. An obituary of the Dutch ethnologist G. J. Held appeared in the journal eight years later. It is written in a similar spirit (Mabuchi 1958). Held's merits as an Indonesianist are commended, and, among other things, he is recognized as a forerunner of applied anthropology.

Increasingly, Japanese translations of both new and classical Indonesian studies texts are becoming available. For example, *Die Gottesidee der Ngadju-Dajak in Süd-Borneo* by Hans Schärer, published in 1946, appeared in Japanese translation in 1976. Just recently, eleven selected essays in Dutch anthropology became available in Japanese translation (P. E. de Josselin de Jong et. al., 1987). This volume contains studies such as those by J. B. P. de Josselin de Jong on the trickster (1929) and on the Malay Archipelago as a field of ethnological study (1935), by F. D. E. van Ossenbruggen on the Javanese notion of *montja-pat* (1918), Th. G. Th. Pigeaud on Javanese divination and classification (1928), and W. H. Rassers on the Javanese drama (1925), a part of the *Korawaçrama* by J. L. Swellengrebel (1936), and an essay on local groups and double descent in Kodi, West Sumba, by F. A. E. van Wouden (1956). The translation was made by Gô Tarô, Endô Hisashi, and Miyazaki Kôji. Miyazaki studied at the University of Leiden, where he obtained an M.A. degree in anthropology in 1979; he received a doctoral degree there for his study *The king and the people; The conceptual structure of a Javanese kingdom* (Miyazaki 1988) in June 1988. The latter is based on field research in Yogyakarta in 1981-1983 and on library research at Leiden in 1977-1979 and in 1987-1988. Miyazaki has published about Indonesia and Dutch anthropology in English (1979) and in Japanese (1980, 1984).

In this fragmentary and superficial survey, an outsider has attempted to show that Japanese research on Southeast Asia is far from insignificant. All in all, it must add up to a valuable store of descriptive and analytical material, of which some is available in English and such languages as Bahasa Indonesia. With the wide dissemination of foreign anthropology in Japan, and the familiarity of some Japanese anthropologists with specific foreign schools as a result of undergraduate and postgraduate study and research and through translations, there are now not many

barriers that obstruct communication.

Japanese Indonesian anthropology has its place in Indonesian studies. But, as Schwimmer (1982) complained not long ago, generally in the West little interest is shown in the anthropology practised in what are taken to be 'peripheral centres', and the attention remains fixed upon the dominant nuclei in the West. Is it an exaggeration, however, to say that this attitude extends to 'non-western anthropology' as a whole? In general, little notice seems to be taken of the fact that there are eminent anthropological schools – by tradition and in stature – in, say, India, China, or Japan, to stay in the region we are dealing with. Anthropologists from India, Thailand or Japan are better informed about anthropological trends and developments abroad, while also having their own schools. The day has come when a more extensive use is beginning to be made of the total anthropological stock that exists in the world.

REFERENCES

- Breman, J., 1987, *Het dorp in Azië als koloniale schijngehalte*. Amsterdam: Centre for Asian Studies Amsterdam. [Inaugural address Amsterdam.]
- Duyvendak, J. Ph., 1938, *Ethnologische belangstelling*. Groningen/Batavia: Wolters. [Inaugural address, Rechtshoogeschool te Batavia.]
- Ethnology in Japan: Historical review*, 1968. Tōkyō: K. Shibusawa Memorial Foundation for Ethnology. [Published by the Japanese Society of Ethnology.]
- Fukushima, M., 1987, 'Kebatinan mystical sects and the meaning of spirit possession in Javanese culture', *Man and Culture in Oceania* 3:29-46.
- Ishige, N. (ed.), 1980, *The Galela of Halmahera; A preliminary survey*. Osaka: The National Museum of Ethnology. [Senri Ethnological Studies.]
- Ishikawa, E., and I. Ushijima, 1987, 'Micronesian Ethnological Studies in Japan, 1884-1986', in: I. Ushijima and K. Sudō (eds), *Cultural uniformity and diversity in Micronesia*, pp. 397-423. Osaka: The National Museum of Ethnology. [Senri Ethnological Studies 21.]
- Itagaki, Y., 1968, 'A review of the concept of the "Dual Economy"', *The Developing Economies* 6-2:143-151.
- Itō, M., 1978, 'Uno Enkū. Inasaku to shinkō' [Uno Enku. Wet-rice cultivation and beliefs], *Nihon Minzoku bunka taikei* [Selections from Japanese Ethnology] 11:203-398. Tōkyō: Kōdansha.
- Josselin de Jong, P. E. de, et al., 1987, *Oranda kōzō jinruigaku* [Dutch structural anthropology]. Tōkyō: Serika shobo. [Translated from the Dutch by K. Miyazaki, H. Endō and T. Gō.]
- Kano, H., 1980, 'The economic history of Javanese rural society: A reinterpretation', *The Developing Economies* XVIII:3-22.
- , 1984, "'Nijū keizai" to "nōgyō inboryūshion" wo koete. "Nōminteki jikyū seisan" saikō' [Beyond the 'Dual Economy' and 'Agricultural Involution': Peasant subsistence economy reconsidered], *Tōyō bunka* [Oriental Cultures] 64:5-44.
- Katō, T., 1980, 'Rantan Pariaman: The world of Minangkabau coastal merchants in the nineteenth century', *Journal of Asian Studies* XXXIX-4:729-52.
- , 1982, *Matriliney and migration: Evolving Minangkabau traditions in Indonesia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kokuritsu, 1984, *Kokuritsu minzokugaku hakubutsukan jūnen shiryō shūsei* [A compilation of ten years' data on the National Museum of Ethnology]. Osaka: The National Museum of Ethnology.

- Mabuchi, T., 1940, 'Kuroito chûô Serebesu ni okeru seibu Toraja zoku' [Review of A. C. Kruyt, *De West-Toradja's op Midden Celebes*], *Minzokugaku kenkyû* [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology] 6-6. [Reprinted in *Mabuchi Tôichi Chosakushû* II:177-79.]
- , 1950, 'Ko Kuroito hakase to Indonesia minzokugaku' [The late Dr. Kruyt and the ethnology of Indonesia], *Minzokugaku kenkyû* [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology] 14-3. [Reprinted in *Mabuchi Tôichi Chosakushû* III:511-23.]
- , 1958, 'Ko Heruto kyôju (1905-55) to sono minzokugakuteki gyôseki' [The late professor Held and his ethnological merits], *Minzokugaku kenkyû* [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology] 22-1/2. [Reprinted in *Mabuchi Tôichi Chosakushû* III:525-38.]
- Mabuchi*, 1974, *Mabuchi Tôichi Chosakushû* [Selected papers by Mabuchi Tôichi]. Tôkyô: Shakai shisôsha. [Three volumes.]
- Miyazaki, K., 1979, *Javanese classification systems: The problem of 'maximal correspondence'*, Leiden: Instituut voor Culturele Antropologie. [ICA Publicatie 35.]
- , 1980, 'Oranda kôzôshugi to bunruitaikei kenkyû' [Dutch structuralism and the study of classification systems], *Minzokugaku kenkyû* [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology] 45-1:52-59.
- , 1984, 'Oranda kôzôshugi' [Dutch structuralism], in: T. Ayabe (ed.), *Bunka jinruigaku 15 no riron* [Fifteen theories in cultural anthropology]. Tôkyô: Chuôkôronsha.
- , 1988, *The king and the people; The conceptual structure of a Javanese kingdom*. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.]
- Nakane, C., 1984, *Zaidanhôjin minzokugaku shinkôkai gojûnen no ayumi. Nihon minzokugaku shûdan ryakushi* [A concise history of the fifty years' progress of the Japanese Society of Ethnology]. Tôkyô: Zaidanhôjin Minzokugaku Shinkôkai.
- Nihon*, 1966, *Nihon minzokugaku no kaiko to tenbô* [A retrospect and prospect of Japanese ethnology, published by Nihon minzokugakkai]. Tôkyô: Minzokugaku shinkôkai.
- Nihon*, 1986, *Nihon no minzokugaku 1964-1983* [Japanese ethnology 1964-1983, published by Nihon minzokugakkai]. Tôkyô: Kôbundô.
- Platenkamp, J. D. M., 1988, *Tobelo; Ideas and values of a north Moluccan society*. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.]
- Schärer, H., 1946, *Die Gottesidee der Ngadju-Dajak in Süd-Borneo*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schrieke, B. J. O., 1936, 'Koloniaal volkenkunde' en 'Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië'. Groningen: Wolters. [Inaugural lecture Amsterdam.]
- Schwimmer, E., 1982, 'Structural and symbolic anthropology in the Netherlands today', in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong and E. Schwimmer (eds), *Symbolic Anthropology in the Netherlands*, pp. 1-11. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Sekimoto, T., forthcoming, 'A cultural analysis of the Sawito incident' in: C. Suzuki (ed.), *Studies in popular millenarian movements in China and Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Sugishima, T., 1986, 'Furôresu tô rio zoku rise chiiki ni okeru dentô kaoku no kenchiku kôzô' [The construction of the Lionese house in Licé, Central Flores], *Butsushitsu bunka. Kôkogaku minzokugaku kenkyû* [Material Culture; A journal of Archaeological-Folkloric Studies] 47:60-79.
- , 1987, 'Rio zoku ni okeru jujutsuteki shûkyôteki tochi shoyûken. One ria ni mirareru nyûbô no chôkoku ni kan suru bunseki' [Magico-religious land ownership among the Lionese: An analysis of the sculpture of breasts found in Oné Ria], *Minzoku Kenkyû* [The Japanese Journal of Ethnology] 52-1 (Supplement): 30-61.
- Terada, K., 1981, *Nihon no jinruigaku* [Anthropology in Japan]. Tôkyô: Kadokawa.
- Turton, A., and S. Tanabe (eds), 1984, *History and peasant consciousness in South East Asia*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology. [Senri Ethnological Studies 13.]
- Uno, E., 1929, *Shûkyô minzokugaku* [Anthropology of Religion]. Tôkyô: Oka shoin.
- , 1940, *Maraishiya ni okeru tômai girei* [Religious rites and ceremonies in connection with rice-planting and eating in Malaysia]. Tôkyô: Tôkyô bunku ronsô 28.
- Wertheim, W. F., 1947, *Het sociologische karakter van de Indo-maatschappij*. [Inaugural lecture. Amsterdam.]
- Yamada, H., 1966, 'Boeke's view of Eastern Society'. *The Developing Economies* 4-3.