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INTRODUCTION TO THE SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUE “NATURAL HISTORY OF COMMUNICATION AMONG THE CENTRAL KALAHARI SAN”

Akira TAKADA
Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University

1. THE CENTRAL KALAHARI SAN

The San have been the subject of extensive research since the early 20th century, if not longer. Researchers have represented them in various ways, including as a minority people of Southern Africa, as contemporary hunter-gatherers, as an underclass within the regional politico-economic system, and as an indigenous people spread over Southern Africa. In the first half of the 20th century, stimulated by the actions of the local government undertaken to promote white tourism and immigration, and by the rising general interest in human evolution, explorers and travelers began to journey deep into the Kalahari Desert in search of the “genuine bushman” (Gordon, 1997: 103–104, 110–111). The San thus came into the spotlight, and studies on them progressed. The San actually consist of various groups, distinguished by language, locale, and practices. Research began with the enthusiastic collection of the languages and folklore of those San whose living area brought them into contact with white colonialists (e.g., Bleek, 1929). Then researchers appeared who attempted to describe the daily life of the San, and anthropological studies based on participant observation were carried out among them. One of the pioneers of this kind of study, Lorna Marshall, conducted a detailed study of the social organization of the Ju’hoan in the Nyae Nyae region, in present-day Namibia.

In the second half of the 20th century, interdisciplinary research expeditions began to be organized. One large-scale research group in particular, based at Harvard University and led by the evolutionary biologist Irven DeVore and the spirited anthropologist Richard Lee, greatly influenced the study of the San. This research group considered, based on the knowledge that human society for most of its history had been based on foraging activities, the contemporary San, as hunter-gatherers, to be the key to reconstructing ancient forms of human society (Lee & DeVore, 1968, 1976; Lee, 1979). It was already known at that time that many San groups associated socially with neighboring peoples. However, the degree of association varied considerably among particular regional and linguistic groups. The researchers, therefore, pursued the people least affected by the “outside” world, beginning their study among the Ju’hoan, who lived near the border between Botswana and present-day Namibia in 1963. Soon thereafter, the young Japanese anthropologist Jiro Tanaka, who had been trained in primatology and then cultural anthropology, sailed for Southern Africa in 1966, beginning his study on ecological anthropology among the Gûû and Gîî, who were thought to have
led a nomadic lifestyle in the central part of the Kalahari Desert for a long time.

These researchers, later referred to as “traditionalists”, promoted synchronic analyses of livelihood activities and social structures, focusing on how the San, as contemporary hunter-gatherers, have adapted to the harsh natural environment (Lee & DeVore, 1968, 1976; Lee, 1979; Tanaka, 1980). They asserted that San society was based on “egalitarian” principles and that, with the exception of a minimum division of labor, every adult male and female participated in society on an equal footing (Tanaka, 1980: 94). Such assertions were broadly accepted, not only in academia but also among the general public, as a model for hunter-gatherer societies in general.

A significant turning point was reached, however, in the latter half of the 1980s. Movements emerged that criticized earlier studies, claiming that they neglected to analyze the San’s history or their associations with neighboring ethnic groups. A group of researchers inspired by E. N. Wilmsen, often referred to as the “revisionists”, argued that the San were merely groups who had been transformed into an underclass within a larger politico-economic system, which also included their neighbors, and that they had been forced to lead a foraging-based nomadic life (Wilmsen, 1989). Further, these researchers harshly criticized those (the “traditionalists”) who had carried out previous studies, claiming that they had created an illusion of an “isolated and autonomous San society” (Wilmsen, 1989, 1990; Wilmsen & Denbow, 1990).

The evidence presented by the revisionists, however, was not adequate to support their claims. As such, Lee and the other traditionalists fiercely denied the claims of the revisionists, particularly concerning areas in which the San, particularly the Juǀ'hoan, were in contact with neighboring ethnic groups, the degree of contact, and their interpretation (e.g., Solway & Lee, 1990; Lee & Guenther, 1991, 1993, 1995; Lee, 1992). This debate, which became known as the “Great Kalahari Debate”, attracted much attention. Active moves emerged, triggered by this debate, to recreate the history of the San in a way that transcended the frameworks of both the traditionalists and revisionists. Accordingly, with the exception of certain groups of the Juǀ’hoan, the extent of whose contacts across cultural boundaries is still being argued, it has been confirmed that the San had long maintained politico-economic relations with neighboring groups (Gordon & Douglas, 2000; Lee & Hitchcock, 2001; Osaki, 2001; Ikeya, 2002).

Nevertheless, the image of the San as nothing more than a collective underclass created within a politico-economic system, as argued by the revisionists (Wilmsen, 1989: 32, 270–271, 324–325), seems one-sided. There are diverse relationships between the cultural dimensions of ethnicity and politico-economic situations, and this provides an interesting study theme in itself (Fraser, 1997; Diener, 2001). Moreover, while the image of the San has become diversified as a result of the Great Kalahari Debate, it is hard to say that the viewpoint of the San themselves has been sufficiently reflected. Hence, a number of attempts have been made to transcend the Great Kalahari Debate and explore the San and their agency as embedded in structures of regional society (e.g., Widlok, 1999; Kent 2002; Takada, 2015).

In this vein, it is interesting to reconsider how the deep involvement of San
peoples with their environment is related to the cultural dimensions of ethnicity and politico-economic situations. Takada (2015) proposed that in order for the bundles of conventions that characterize a group of people to be consistent for each individual, it is necessary that there be an interactional space that has a sustainable and continuous structure. The environment of the Central Kalahari certainly affords such a space for two neighboring San groups, the Gǀui and Glana. From this standpoint, the longitudinal studies of the Gǀui and Glana conducted by Jiro Tanaka and his colleagues over half a century merit particular attention. All the authors in this volume are members of the research project on the Gǀui and Glana initiated by Tanaka, apart from Thomas Widlok, who has worked intensively among the ǂAkhoe Hailom, another San group. All authors have shared close academic exchanges (see the preface to this volume). Below, I briefly outline the ethnographic background of the Gǀui and Glana.

The Gǀui and Glana are said to have lived a nomadic lifestyle in the central part of the Kalahari Desert for a long period. In 1961, the Bechuanaland Protectorate established the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (hereafter CKGR), which almost completely overlaps the living area of the Gǀui and Glana. Subsequently, the Gǀui and Glana gradually began to form settlements. !Oi !om (a.k.a. !Koi!kom), which is administratively called Xade, became the largest community of Gǀui and Glana. Since the independence of the Republic of Botswana in 1966, the Botswana government has been implementing the Remote Area Development Programme (hereafter RADP), which focuses on rural development and poverty reduction, and most Gǀui and Glana people have become target beneficiaries of this program. In 1986, the government of Botswana decided to encourage CKGR residents to resettle outside the reserve. Eleven years later, the government began to relocate residents of CKGR to new settlements established outside the Reserve. Among these, Kx’oensakene (administratively known as New Xade) is the largest. Migration to such resettlements snowballed in the following years. A local NGO filed suit against the implementation of this policy, claiming that this constituted forced relocation. Consequently, 189 residents who had moved to Kx’oensakene in 2002 were allowed to return to villages located inside the CKGR. Despite this landmark victory, it is still difficult for the Gǀui and Glana to move freely within the CKGR, much less engage in hunting and gathering there, because the right to live in the CKGR was not conferred upon the majority of the Gǀui and Glana, namely those who had been relocated before 2002.

Since the publication of Tanaka’s seminal work on ecological anthropology, multi-disciplinary research projects have explored diverse research topics regarding the Gǀui and Glana society. Consequently, their nomadic lifestyle and the recent social changes among them have been well documented (cf. Tanaka, 1980; Tanaka & Sugawara, 1996, 2010). These studies indicate a close and inseparable relationship between the Gǀui and Glana with respect to various aspects of their social life, including language, rituals, folk knowledge, and kinship systems. Therefore, Tanaka (1980) and his colleagues have adopted the designation “the Central Kalahari San”, used in the title of this volume, to indicate both these groups. Their studies, which represent what is called the Kyoto School of African Studies, are distinctive in that they emphasize acute empirical observation of
everyday practices by lay people and a holistic attitude to the linkage between nature and society. Among others, Kazuyoshi Sugawara, Emeritus Professor of Kyoto University, who recently retired from Kyoto University in March 2015, and to whom this whole volume is dedicated, has ardently pursued this intriguing topic, which has been given the name “Natural History of Communication among the Central Kalahari San”.

2. NATURAL HISTORY OF COMMUNICATION

The perspective of the natural history of communication is aptly indicated in the following text from Sugawara (1998a):

In the same way as the bodies of the Gǀui constantly ŋǃàrē (sense) each other among their fellows who are “co-present”, the five senses of the Gǀui sense the wilderness differently, and their bodies are affected by sensation differently. —The journey to the wilderness, for the Gǀui, would also be an exploration of what “nature” really is (Sugawara, 1998a: 316).

Here Sugawara (1998a) positioned the concept of ŋǃàrē (to sense) at the core of Gǀui lifeworld. The concept is used by Gǀui with regard both to their fellows and to the wilderness. Sugawara asserted that, through their deep involvement in the natural environment of the Kalahari Desert, the Gǀui people have developed a deep sympathetic attitude to nature and, thus, they collaboratively activate a keen sense of the minute changes in their surroundings. This attitude applies not only to the Gǀui and Gǀana people but also to researchers attracted by their distinctive lifeworld, as pioneered by Tanaka’s studies. In order to understand the lifeworld of the Gǀui/Gǀana from their point of view, it is of particular value to scrutinize how they communicate with each other.

Sugawara and his companions have undertaken their studies on the social interaction of the Central Kalahari San using multi-disciplinary approaches, including ecological anthropology, human geography, social anthropology, linguistic anthropology, linguistics, philosophy, and area study. Sugawara himself has published a large number of books and papers. The bibliography of his major publications is given as an appendix at the end of this article. Moreover, his accomplishments go beyond this. Sugawara’s contributions to the above approach can be categorized in (but cannot be limited to) the three categories outlined below.

First, Sugawara promoted studies on the micro-analysis of social behavior of the San. Sugawara started his academic career as a field primatologist. He conducted his PhD fieldwork in Ethiopia on social relationships among several troops of hybrid baboon. He then applied systematic methodologies adapted from primatology and ethology to the detailed observation of everyday practices among Gǀui people.

For example, Sugawara (1993) clarified how cultural norms and attitudes regarding gender, sexuality, and politeness are embodied among the Gǀui, down to minute differences in sitting postures. The frequencies and patterns of grooming also
reflect the underlying social and emotional relationships of the Gǀui people. According to Sugawara (1993), the practice of grooming among the Gǀui people has a certain common ground with that occurring among macaques. At the same time, differences between the Gǀui people and macaques are obvious. For example, while the practice of grooming among macaques basically reflects and constructs intimacy between individuals, the practice of grooming among the Gǀui people corresponds to inherent sexual differences, which are also associated with their posture and positioning while grooming. The unique behavioral patterns of grooming among the Gǀui people are governed by conventions that have accumulated in their society. Moreover, he demonstrated that what appears to be a simple residential space to an outsider is actually divided into several different places by psychological barriers and is thus filled with various cultural meanings for Gǀui people. The practice of greeting, the distribution of food, and the movement of camp members make it possible to establish, maintain, and reconstruct these cultural meanings.

Using such analyses, Sugawara (1993) tried to overcome the dichotomies between human and animal and between nature and culture, which are deeply inscribed in Western ways of thinking. It should be noted that he did not adopt an evolutionary perspective in this ambitious attempt, as is premised in most primatological and ethological works. Instead, he used these methodologies to bracket prejudices derived from the external view taken by the theoretical frameworks of researchers and their own culture and to examine more closely the mechanisms that construct the social reality of the Gǀui.

Second, through his meticulous analysis of conversation among Gǀui people, Sugawara has succeeded in describing nuanced ethnographic details of everyday life, particularly emotional conflicts with respect to sexuality, ethnicity, and modernity. Through exchanging utterances, people articulate complex meanings, which intrinsically construct their lifeworld. Sugawara was already attracted to such acts of meaning when he enthusiastically employed primatological and ethological methodology to analyze the social behavior of the Gǀui people. Sugawara’s strong academic interest in face-to-face interaction then inevitably led him to the analysis of daily conversation among the Gǀui people. Cognitive Semantics (e.g., Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 1999), Conversation Analysis (e.g., Goffman, 1959, 1961, 1981; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Moreman, 1988; Sacks, 1992), and Phenomenology (e.g., Merleau-Ponty, 1945, 1960, 1964) provided him with the methodological and theoretical tools for this exploration.

Note that the Gǀui language is of particular interest for various academic disciplines, including linguistics, anthropology, and communication studies. The languages of the San are closely related to the languages of the Khoekhoe (whose main subsistence activity was livestock raising), and these are known collectively as Khoisan languages. Typological features of Khoisan languages are: certain prosodic features of words, complex consonants, and an original, elaborate click system (Traill & Nakagawa, 2000). These features have attracted the general attention of students of communication. Nevertheless, because of the extreme difficulty of acquiring sufficient language skills to make valid analyses, there are few studies that empirically discuss the intriguing relationships between these languages
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and the societies in which they are spoken. Sugawara pioneered this domain of research. For example, Sugawara (1998a) documented in detail how a man, who was known to have relations with seven women (Tanaka, this vol.), managed the furious jealousy of his lovers and the widespread mistrust of their kin through his exquisite narratives. Sugawara documented the subtleties of human affective life in polygamous and extramarital relationships among the Gǀui people. Through the detailed analysis of their conversation the audience can recall the lived experience of their affairs. The art of narrative among the Gǀui/Gǁana is also recognized in their storytelling, which is shown in the rich variety of their folklore.

Sugawara (1998a) also described how everyday conversation (re)constructs the boundary between groups. Gǀui people can use the word Gǀana to characterize the Gǀui-Gǁana relationship and emphasize the contrast between them. In addition to their self-designations Gǀui and Gǀana, the Gǀui/Gǁana use the word Kūā, which is a generic term for various groups of San, to denote themselves. In addition, ǂÉbè indicates the Bantu people, typically their neighboring Bakgalagadi agropastoralists. Kūā and ǂÉbè are often used as contrasting categories to characterize the relationship between the Gǀui/Gǀana and the Bakgalagadi. Moreover, when they complain of someone’s inappropriate behavior, they can use the word ǂÉbè as adjective (i.e., ǂÉbè-like behavior). Analogously, when they criticize the policy of the Tswana-dominated government, the government can be represented by the word ǂÉbè.

Sugawara’s analysis suggests that these ethnonyms are not rooted in the fixed traits of certain peoples, but that basic components of their conventional idioms are embedded in socio-cultural contexts. Since the independence of the republic of Botswana, the government has tried to integrate minority groups within the country, including various groups of the San, into the state and develop a national identity. It was under this policy of “one nation consensus” (Werbner, 2004) that the government began to implement the RADP in the 1970s, and the relocation program of CKGR residents outside the reserve followed in the 1990s. In contrast to their original intention, however, these policies focused attention on various kinds of group differences and resulted in enhancing the ethnic identity of San as a minority group.

Third, Sugawara tackled several key theoretical issues on communication in general and renovated our understanding about the roots of sociality. While engaging in the analysis of conversation among Gǀui people, Sugawara noticed that several people often talk to each other simultaneously. This awakened his suspicion of the universality of the turn-taking system (hereafter TTS) in conversation. Research in Conversation Analysis has made important contributions to the humanities and social sciences, as it has empirically demonstrated that ordinary conversation, which appears to be chaotic to the naïve point of view, is actually governed by delicate rules through which people maintain social order. TTS has been premised as the most fundamental and universal device in human communication (e.g., Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Sacks, 1992; Schegloff, 2007). TTS has been characterized by the following features: As verbal language mainly utilizes the sense of hearing, we must recognize the “one at a time rule”; that is, only one party speaks at one time in order to avoid misunderstanding or “con-
versational trouble”. When a turn comes close to the possible completion point of the utterance, the current speaker may indicate the next speaker. If not, then, anyone who participates in the conversation can initiate the next turn. Ordinary conversation is moved forward according to this and other rules.

According to Sugawara (1998b, 2012), however, the Gǀui people do not necessarily follow the rule that one person speaks at a time when they engage in ordinary conversation. Rather, overlapping utterances are frequently observed. He collected such cases and classified them into three types: (a) antagonistic (more than two speakers talk competitively), (b) cooperative (more than two speakers talk cooperatively), and (c) parallel (more than two speakers talk independently). These types of overlapping utterances are also distinctive in relation to the context in which they occur. That is, an orientation towards the “mutual entrainment” of speaking activities and an orientation towards the ego-centric perspective of the speaker are distributed differently in each of three types. He concluded that overlapping utterances among the Gǀui are suffused with a specific form of interaction that has deep roots in the egalitarian nature of their culture.

In my understanding, the frequent overlapping utterances observed among the Central Kalahari San are inseparable from their distinctive participation frameworks (Goffman, 1981) of communication. It is necessary, therefore, to take into consideration the kind of participation frameworks TTS is, or is not activated within. This consideration inevitably facilitates the discussion of the linkage between features of the speech event (Hymes, 1972) and aspects of a particular society, a discussion that Conversation Analysis research has largely passed over.

Sugawara’s contribution to communication studies is also exemplified in his theoretical exploration of human-animal relationships. Recently it has become fashionable among socio-cultural anthropologists to discuss human-animal relationships while claiming an “ontological turn” for the humanities. Nevertheless, Sugawara, who has focused on the wilderness since his childhood, draws a line to this trend. In his theoretical explorations, he adopts “phenomenological empiricism”, in which a firm grounding is created in direct experiences, and describes the continuities and gaps that he found between his and Gǀui people’s experiences (Sugawara, 2015: 36). Taking this attitude, he aims to reformulate the concept of evolution, which constitutes the fundamental and standard theory of human origin in the contemporary world.

As mentioned above, he positions the concept of ŋǃàrē (to sense) at the core of the Gǀui lifeworld. With the concept of ŋǃàrē, Gǀui people often expect to communicate not only with common hunting prey, such as the springbok and the steenbok, but also with creatures of the natural world that do not have a direct use for them, such as the creeping millipede. According to Sugawara (2015), this expectation is totally different from the superficial empathy that naïve urban dwellers are apt to express. Through collaboratively activating a keen sense of their surroundings, particularly of animal behaviors, Gǀui people transform their own corporeal involvement in the world. Such a transformation of the body is highly relevant to their food restrictions as well. Gǀui people practice various food restrictions (súmú) depending on their gender and stage of life. Just smelling súmú (restricted food), they say, may cause death. However, it depends on the context.
...and the individual as to how strictly food restrictions are applied. It is not institutionalized norms but the acute corporeal senses, which transcend human, animal, and the material worlds, that govern the practice of food restrictions (Sugawara, 2015: 222). Based on these analyses, Sugawara (2015) asserted that the transformation of body between human and animal as well as among humans reflects inter-corporeal motivation, which integrates the experiences that the Gǀui people have accumulated in the wilderness.

The above themes and findings are only the tip of the iceberg that Sugawara has constructed under the heading of the natural history of communication. Together with his companions, the challenge is ongoing. This entire volume shows our work with respect to this intriguing approach. The reader will find that Sugawara’s wide range of pivotal works is reflected in each article, as is outlined in the next section.

3. SUMMARY OF ARTICLES IN THIS VOLUME

This volume consists of the preface by Tanaka, this introduction, and the following nine articles. Tanaka’s article, titled “Social Integration of the San Society from the Viewpoint of Sexual Relationships,” was originally published in 1989, based on his fieldwork, which was carried out between 1967 and 1984, and is reprinted here with minor revisions. Hunter-gatherer societies generally form small-scaled residential groups, which are often bonded by affinal and consanguineous ties. The nomadic lifestyle of the Central Kalahari San constituted no exception to this trend. Tanaka (1980) argued that the smallest unit of the society of the Central Kalahari San was the family, and several families made up a residential group, called a camp. Group membership was largely determined by kinship factors based on descent and marriage. Marital relationships themselves had a very fluid and elastic nature. The rates of polygamous marriage, divorce, and remarriage were quite high. Moreover, extramarital relationships, which are called zâku (dzâã-ku), were commonly seen in this society.

In this article, Tanaka exemplifies this by analyzing four cases of social clusters united by marriage and other sexual relationships. He found that the significance of zâku relationships lay in uniting two or more married families through sexual relationships. Moreover, not only current sexual relationships but also past ones function as a medium of relating oneself to others, playing an important role in making generalized reciprocity work well. He concludes that these sexual relationships constitute an important aspect of the principle of San social integration. However, he also expressed his difficulty in fully understanding the place of feelings of jealousy and love in such a social system (this vol.: 39). This predicament paved the way for Sugawara to conduct in-depth study of sexuality and affect among the San.

The next two articles deal with hunting activities among the Central Kalahari San. For them hunting is the primary medium of relation to wild animals. Therefore, detailed descriptions of hunting activities provide us with important resources for considering human-animal relationships within the Central Kalahari San, rela-
Ikeya’s article, “From Subsistence to Commercial Hunting: Changes of Hunting Activities among the San in Botswana,” examines hunting activities (mainly trap hunting and equestrian hunting) and the process of the transformation of hunting methods among the Central Kalahari San, based on his field research carried out between 1987 and 1993 at several camps within the CKGR. “The Current State” (this vol.: 42) thus indicates situations for several years around 1990, when most Central Kalahari San still lived inside the CKGR. In this article, Ikeya vividly describes the actual state of trap and equestrian hunting, in which he accompanied San hunters.

According his analysis, there were more Gǀui than Gǁana trap hunters. The main prey for trap hunting was steenbok, followed by duiker, springbok, and African wildcat. Trap hunting involves both setting traps and then checking on them at regular intervals. Combining trap hunting with dog hunting ensured a stable subsistence livelihood. In the meantime, the Gǀui and Gǁana first learned equestrian hunting in the 1960s from Bakagalagadi hunters. Equestrian hunting is undertaken either as a one-day hunting expedition from Xade, the main settlement, or as a hunting-camping expedition lasting several days. Dog hunters often collaborate with equestrian hunters. The longer the hunting expedition goes on, the more animals tend to be killed.

Over the past 30 years, the Gǀui and Gǁana hunters in the Xade area have changed the frequency of the four hunting methods they employ (bow-and-arrow hunting, dog hunting, trap hunting, and equestrian hunting). This change can be divided into four periods: (1) In the 1950s and 1960s solitary hunting using a bow and arrows was the main method used; (2) around 1982 equestrian group hunting became central; (3) from around 1984 to 1987 dog hunting became popular; and (4) from 1989 trap hunting was the main method. The reason for the recent shift to trap hunting is due to the spread of commercialism throughout the area, which raises the prices of animal skins and dried meat. Based on these analyses, he concluded that although the Central Kalahari San still practiced the traditional gift-giving and “equal distribution” using animal meat, they were increasingly shifting to commercial transactions of animal skins and dried meat by around 1990.

When Tanaka initiated his study on ecological anthropology among the Central Kalahari San, he was motivated by an evolutionary perspective: By using the lifestyle of contemporary hunter-gatherers as an example, he aimed to inquire into the evolution of human society (Tanaka, 1980: 137–139). Imanura and Akiyama’s article, titled “How Hunter-gatherers Have Learned to Hunt: Transmission of Hunting Methods and Techniques among the Central Kalahari San,” is an attempt to put new wine into this old wineskin. Their study was conducted as part of a larger project to find differences between paleoanthropic man (Nean-derthals) and anatomically modern Homo sapiens (AMH) with regard to their learning capacities and learned behaviors (see the project website <http://www.koutaigeki.org/eng/project/index.html>). Thus, they examine hunting methods used by the Central Kalahari San based on a literature review and their own fieldwork in 2013, intending to reconstruct how hunting methods evolved around the time
Neanderthals were being replaced by AMH.

They show that the Central Kalahari San use a wide variety of methods (e.g., using clubs, digging sticks, pike poles, flashlights, traps, slingshots, and sprinkled baits) to hunt small mammals and birds, in addition to better-known hunting methods using bows and spears to hunt large animals. It is also shown that not only adult men but also boys and adult women engaged in hunting activities. Boys begin learning how to “read nature” from the older boys at around the age of five. On the other hand, women might begin practical hunting activity only after marriage. For example, boys begin using a knife at around the age of five, receiving their own knife when they are about ten. Boys aged eight or older go deep into the bush to play at trapping. Once they reach about ten years of age, boys occasionally participate in horseback hunting with youths and adults. They learn hunting skills by combining observational learning and trial-and-error methods. Women are also engaged in trap hunting and dog hunting. They set up a trap while gathering the day’s food, or while hunting with a dog. Based on these findings, the authors suggested that, like the Central Kalahari San, early AMH must have used their imagination—as is probably reflected in their murals and other drawings—in relation to animals. Comparing the ability of AMH with that of Neanderthals, it is plausible that the unique tendency of AMH to take an interest in, and observe what animals might be thinking, is closely related to human evolution, in the sense that it prompted a change in humans’ cognitive abilities.

Sugawara’s article takes on one of the most intriguing philosophical issues, the proper name. His paper, titled “Personal Name as Mnemonic Device or Conversational Resource: An Ethnographic Study on the Naming Practice among the G|ui and Gǁana San,” was originally written in Japanese, based on his fieldwork between 1987 and 1994. Here he has translated it into English with minor revisions. In G|ui/Gǁana society, newborn babies are usually named by their fathers, after a conspicuous incident that occurred during pregnancy or infancy. In the analysis of these proper names, the following three aspects are distinguished: the signifying function of a name, the denotation of a name, and the connotation of a name.

First, he demonstrated the signifying function of proper names. He classified the subjects of the anecdotes after which 167 persons had been named into the following types: (1) circumstances of marriage; (2) the physical or mental condition of the mother during the prenatal or neonatal periods; (3) conflict; (4) the name of a land; (5) economic transactions; (6) sociability; (7) relationship with Bakgalagadi agro-pastoralists; (8) hunting and gathering; (9) the appearance or condition of the infant; and (10) others. He found that in more than 40 percent of the total cases, the subject of the anecdote was categorized as type (3). Accordingly, he asserted that the primary signifying function of G|ui/Gǁana names is to encode negative insinuations with regard to one’s conjugal partner, kinsmen, or co-residents.

Next, he discussed the denotation of proper names. Since most proper names among the G|ui/Gǁana are composed of common nouns and verbs, people cannot help evoking the literal meaning of a name, when the name is used. The result is that the encoded content of a name becomes open to the public and possibly
elicits re-interpretation, which may not necessarily coincide with the original con-
text of the naming.

Lastly, Sugawara tried to explicate the connotations of proper names. The pecu-
liar feature of the Gǀui/Gǀana naming practice is that the kinds of name are quite
divergent, resulting in a low proportion of individuals with the same name. The
diversity of proper names reflects the most essential characteristics of their every-
day conversation, with which naming is contiguous. According to Sugawara, this
feature stands in sharp contrast to the “homonymous method” among the Jul’hoan
(Marshall, 1976). The Jul’hoan make use of proper names to manipulate ongoing
social relationships. In contrast, through the process of naming, the Gǀui/Gǀana
associate a proper name with a specific socio-cultural context and, thereby, try
to establish the meaning of personal experiences. In this sense, the naming cus-
tom of the Gǀui/Gǀana embodies a collective mnemonic device.

When we consider social relationships among the Gǀui/Gǀana, kinship relations
must inevitably be taken into consideration. Indeed, among most San groups, kin-
ship provides the central organizing principle of the society (Lee, 1986). As with
other groups of San, the kin classifications of the Gǀui/Gǀana are associated with
avoidance and joking relationships, which are institutionalized contrastive behavioral codes or restrictions. Ono’s article, “Is Same-Sex Sibling an Avoidance or
Joking?” reconsiders the avoidance and joking distinctions among the Gǀui, based
on her field research since the 1990s, focusing on the interpretation of same-sex
sibling relationships.

Gǀui shows six basic consanguineous kin categories, namely grandrelative (senior
and junior), parent, sibling, cross cousin, and child, which are all classificatory.
The relationships of parent, child, and opposite-sex sibling are avoidance relation-
ships throughout all Khoisan kinship structures. Silberbauer (1981) interpreted the
other kin categories, namely grandrelatives, cross cousins, and same-sex siblings,
as joking relationships. Subsequent researchers accepted his model, which is also
recognized among other Khoe groups. In this article, however, Ono questions
whether the same-sex sibling relationship should be interpreted as a joking rela-
tionship.

What led the researchers to interpret the same-sex sibling relationship as a jok-
ing relationship is the direct observation that such siblings are physically close
with each other. However, this can be misleading, since there is a general ten-
dency to physical separation according to sex difference (cf. Sugawara, 1990,
1993). Moreover, the categories of avoidance or joking are not linguistically iden-
tified in Gǀui. Then, in order to further examine whether the same-sex sibling
relationship is one of avoidance or joking, Ono compared expected behaviors with
those of other same-sex relationships. The result indicates that the same-sex sib-
ing relationship is closest to the same-sex parent-child relationship, which is an
avoidance relationship. For example, the honorific plural forms are used neither
within same-sex sibling relationships nor within same-sex parent-child relation-
ships. Instead, several casual address forms are used within same-sex sibling rela-
tionships as well as within same-sex parent-child relationships (but only from
senior to junior). laosena gift-giving and borrowing without permission, both of
which are expected in joking relationships, are as inappropriate for same-sex sib-
ling relationships as they are for parent-child relationships. Thus, the same-sex sibling relationship should be interpreted as avoidance/respect, the same as the same-sex parent-child relationship.

As was outlined in the previous section, Sugawara shifted the core of his academic concern from the analysis of social behavior to that of conversation, thereby bridging behavioral and language sciences from an anthropological point of view. Nakagawa’s article, “The Aspect System in Gǀui: With Special Reference to Postural Features,” gives a brilliant response to this challenging task, from a linguistic perspective. Inspired by Sugawara’s (1993, 2010) ethnographic description of “posture”, this paper aimed to explore an aspect of the linguistic encoding of posture in Glui based on his field research, undertaken since the 1990s.

Sugawara (2010) identified 22 postures, which can be classified into 19 overt categories, as the “primary patterns of sitting and lying” and revealed the association between conventionalized postures and certain socio-cultural characteristics of the Gǀui/Gǁana. According to Nakagawa, these 19 categories are generally described by compounds, phrases or juncture constructions that contain one of three posture verbs, namely “sit”, “lie”, or “stand”. A similar posture-sensitive conceptualization, involving a three-way distinction of “sit”, “lie”, and “stand”, is also observed in the system of aspect markers, especially particles of progressives, of the Gǀui grammar. Nakagawa identified nine aspect markers (cì, lò, lò-ci, hā-ci, kùà, cìcí, lùũò, wà, and -hā), including five progressive particles (hā-ci, kùà, cìcí, lùũò, and wà), and demonstrates that the three-way distinction of posture (“sit” vs. “lie” vs. “stand”) is elaborately conceptualized and encoded in Glui grammar as an essential feature of the above five-way contrast of the progressive aspects. That is to say, hā-ci, kùà, cìcí, lùũò, and wà mark the contrasts of [∅ posture], [posture], [stand], [lie], and [sit], respectively. These findings suggest that posture verbs constitute important sources of the grammaticalization of tense/aspect markers of Glui language, as is common in other Khoe languages.

Anthropological inquiry can shed light on hidden aspects of language that most linguists neglect. Widlok’s article, titled “Small Words – Big Issues: The Anthropological Relevance of Khoisan Interjections,” exemplifies this. Inspired by Sugawara’s works on everyday interaction among the Glui, Widlok focuses on the use of interjections, which are ubiquitous in most languages. Most adult Japanese are able to use the interjection “eeto” in an appropriate way at an appropriate moment of conversation. However, it would not be easy for most Japanese to explain the actual meaning of this small word. For second language learners it is worse. It is extremely hard for them even to use “eeto” appropriately. This is probably because such interjections are fundamentally embedded in the context of interaction without having a clear lexical meaning and, thus, the study of those interjections can be a key to understanding communication. Consonant with a general principle of anthropology, interjections feature in “small places” but actually involve “large issues” (Eriksen, 1995).

As suggested by the above paragraph, interjections direct our attention to language as a social process rather than a given structure. For example, to understand what †Akhoe Hailom interjection “hana” (“Is it?”) means, one must know
what happened before it was uttered. However, this “before” may stretch back in
time and across speakers and domains. If one does not have enough social expe-
riences in a ǂAkhoe Haiлом village, it is hard to find the right understanding of
the expression. In other words, “every instance of ‘hana’ has to be studied, first
and foremost, with regard to the specific circumstances in which it was uttered,
with reference to the particular persons involved in that moment, within earshot
of the speaker and with reference to whatever speech act preceded the utterance”
(this vol.: 140). As interjections bridge language and the lived world, they open
the emotive quality of the speaker to the public. Therefore, the study of interjec-
tions provides researchers with rich entry points into anthropological research that
is grounded in detailed observation and the meticulous documentation of social
relationships, research that Sugawara has promoted.

**Takada**’s academic concern is also highly relevant to Sugawara’s: He aims to
overcome the dichotomy between nature and culture and sympathetically under-
stand the distinctive lifeworld of the Central Kalahari San through the detailed
analysis of their everyday interaction. His paper, titled “Employing Ecological
Knowledge during Foraging Activity: Perception of the Landform among the Guĩ
and Glana,” is based on his fieldwork since the late 1990s and demonstrates how
the Guĩ/Glana activate their rich ecological knowledge while they are engaging
in wayfinding practices. In this article, stimulated by Sugawara’s groundbreaking
works, Takada adopts Conversation Analysis as the primary method for the anal-
ysis of their interactions.

In a region of scant rainfall that varies greatly by location and year, the Guĩ/
Glana developed a vast body of ecological knowledge that fuses nature and cul-
ture. It allowed them to acquire ample bush foods by moving frequently and flex-
ibly within their huge living area, now encompassed by the CKGR. Their eco-
logical knowledge, which enables a multi-scale migration strategy, may be sum-
marized as follows: (1) an understanding of points with few ground obstacles;
(2) an immense knowledge of specific trees used as landmarks in the bushveld;
(3) an understanding of woodlands and basins as environmental nodes that pro-
vide valuable resources; and (4) a conceptualization of dry valleys composed of
sequences of woodlands or basins, which are used as routes for nomadic move-
ment. However, since the relocation policy was implemented in 1997, moving
them outside the CKGR, they have faced a lack of knowledge of landmarks and
a scarcity of traditional foods around the new settlement. Given this situation,
Takada examines how the Central Kalahari San applied their environmental knowl-
edge to this new geographical setting.

Takada found that several Guĩ and Glana individuals remained eager to con-
duct foraging excursions around the new settlement. These hunters began accu-
cumulating knowledge of local trees as landmarks, as they had in their previous
living area. Moreover, they used the trail of Tswana merchants as a frame of
reference to ascertain their relative location. The use of the trail is analogous to
their use of a dry valley (ǀqāā), an important landform for wayfinding in their
previous living area. The analysis of conversation recorded during a foraging
excursion in a dry valley indicates that the Guĩ/Glana activate their keen way-
finding sense through their distinctive use of utterances, gestures, and other signs.
Given the relatively flat terrain, keen senses are necessary to use a lqāā or a trail as a frame of reference. With such ability, they can easily make adjustments to take into account any deviations from the route, despite the dense bush that sometimes prevents them from perceiving each other’s position. Moreover, the use of utterances and gestures demonstrates how the Gǀui/Gǀana experience space. By locating their body at the center, they use ecological settings as a resource for communication, and embody the space. They thereby attempt not only to clarify the features of things that they face but also the possibilities that they may encounter. Here, Takada’s understanding of Gǀui/Gǀana perception of the environment matches Sugawara’s, which positioned the concept of ŋǃàrē (to sense) at the core of the Gǀui lifeworld. Gǀui/Gǀana use of ecological knowledge, which constitutes a variant of foraging modes of thought (Barnard, 1992), is distinctive in the interplay it shows between the accumulation of empirical observations and the use of embodied imagination in a changing environment.

Maruyama’s article, “Contemporary Dynamics of Residential Practices and Social Relationships among the Gǀui and Gǀana San,” discusses the reorganization process of Gǀui/Gǀana society after the relocation policy, which moved them outside the CKGR, was implemented, based on her field research from 2000 to 2012 in Kx’oensakene. Researchers have actively debated whether the nomadic lifestyle of the Gǀui/Gǀana shows discrete band units (e.g., Tanaka, 1980; Silberbauer, 1981; Sugawara, 1988). In this vein, Sugawara (1988: 206) pointed out that inconsistencies regarding the band concept among researchers are primarily due to confusion with regard to how to relate visible residential units to “belonging consciousness”, defined as “the range of people who recognize one another as potential co-residents”. He thus emphasized the importance of knowing how high fluidity in camp membership and residential patterns are manifested at the level of the “belonging consciousness” and how recent sedentarization has influenced this.

The above argument by Sugawara is of increasing relevance for considering ongoing issues concerning land and residence since the implementation of the relocation policy in 1997. In Kx’oensakene it has become impossible for residents to form camps. In this situation, some residents have left allocated residential plots and created informal mobile dwellings in the surrounding bush. Similar to former camps, bush dwellings function as a basic social unit for food sharing. In addition, social distances are clearly reflected in the allocation of huts. Such a lifestyle in bush dwellings is, according to residents, “beautiful” or “well-organized”. In that setting, they are able to maintain relationships based on relations between former co-residents, before the relocation.

Viewed from a long-term perspective, the locations and members of the bush dwellings shift every few months, or years, in search of natural resources or good neighbors. The membership of each residential group is always open to negotiation, and changes flexibly in response to a variety of situations, although the solidarity of the traditional co-residential grouping is maintained. For example, the court judgment in 2006, which allowed some of the Kx’oensakene residents to return to the CKGR, has created new tensions among them. Facing this difficult situation, many residents who were officially not allowed to return to the CKGR
have begun visiting their relatives or friends in the CKGR. Hence, the flexibility of their residential grouping has facilitated physical and social mobility among the Gǀui/Gǁana.

To conclude this introductory paper, let me express a sentiment. In 2016, our ongoing multidisciplinary research project regarding the Central Kalahari San will reach a half-century in duration, as Tanaka initiated his research in 1966. Despite rapid social changes in regional and global societies, as well as hasty shifts of the theoretical frameworks underlying our research projects during the past 50 years, the life of the Gǀui and Gǁana people have continued to attract us powerfully, which has resulted in our active involvement in them and their society throughout this time. May this volume be the point of departure for deepening our partnerships over the next half-century.
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NOTES

(1) Though many early studies call this target group the !Kung, in this introduction, I adopt their self-designation, Juǀ'hoan. Recent studies increasingly use Juǀ'hoan to refer to them (e.g., Lee, 1993; Takada, 2015).

(2) It should be remarked that recent social changes have generated considerable social, political, and economic differences between the Gǀui and Gǁana (e.g., Takada 2002).

REFERENCES


A. TAKADA

New York.


Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff & G. Jefferson 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of


Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara (eds.) 2010. *The Encyclopaedia of the Gǀui and Gǁana Culture and Society*. Laboratory of Cultural Anthropology, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.


APPENDIX

Kazuyoshi Sugawara’s Major Publications

Single Authored Books


Edited Books


Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara (eds.) 2010. *An Encyclopedia of Gǀui and Gana Culture and Society*. Laboratory of Cultural Anthropology, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.

Journal Articles and Book Chapters


A. TAKADA


——— 2012b. Invisible agents in a contact zone between animals and humans: From the
Introduction to the Supplementary Issue


——— Accepted December 13, 2015

Author’s Name and Address: Akira TAKADA, Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University, 46 Yoshida-Shimoadauchi, Sakyo, Kyoto 606-8501, JAPAN.
E-mail: takada [at] jambo.africa.kyoto-u.ac.jp