

## 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 Jul’hoan<sup>(1)</sup> 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 Jul’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 Glui and Glana, 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 Jul’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 Jul’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 Glui and Glana. From this standpoint, the longitudinal studies of the Glui 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 Glui and Glana initiated by Tanaka, apart from Thomas Widlok, who has worked intensively among the ǀAkhoe 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 Glui and Glana.

The Glui 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 Glui and Glana. Subsequently, the Glui and Glana gradually began to form settlements. !O!kom (a.k.a. !Koi!kom), which is administratively called Xade, became the largest community of Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui and Glana with respect to various aspects of their social life, including language, rituals, folk knowledge, and kinship systems.<sup>(2)</sup> 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 Glui constantly *ŋ!àrē* (sense) each other among their fellows who are “co-present”, the five senses of the Glui sense the wilderness differently, and their bodies are affected by sensation differently. —The journey to the wilderness, for the Glui, would also be an exploration of what “nature” really is (Sugawara, 1998a: 316).

Here Sugawara (1998a) positioned the concept of *ŋ!àrē* (to sense) at the core of Glui lifeworld. The concept is used by Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui and Glana people but also to researchers attracted by their distinctive lifeworld, as pioneered by Tanaka’s studies. In order to understand the lifeworld of the Glui/Glana 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 Glui people.

For example, Sugawara (1993) clarified how cultural norms and attitudes regarding gender, sexuality, and politeness are embodied among the Glui, down to minute differences in sitting postures. The frequencies and patterns of grooming also

reflect the underlying social and emotional relationships of the Glui people. According to Sugawara (1993), the practice of grooming among the Glui people has a certain common ground with that occurring among macaques. At the same time, differences between the Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui.

Second, through his meticulous analysis of conversation among Glui 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 Glui people. Sugawara's strong academic interest in face-to-face interaction then inevitably led him to the analysis of daily conversation among the Glui people. Cognitive Semantics (e.g., Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Johson, 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 Glui 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

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 Glui people. Through the detailed analysis of their conversation the audience can recall the lived experience of their affairs. The art of narrative among the Glui/Glana 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. Glui people can use the word Glana to characterize the Glui-Glana relationship and emphasize the contrast between them. In addition to their self-designations Glui and Glana, the Glui/Glana use the word *Kúā*, which is a generic term for various groups of San, to denote themselves. In addition, *†Ébè* indicates the Bantu people, typically their neighboring Bakgalagadi agropastoralists. *Kúā* and *†Ébè* are often used as contrasting categories to characterize the relationship between the Glui/Glana and the Bakgalagadi. Moreover, when they complain of someone's inappropriate behavior, they can use the word *†Ébè* as adjective (i.e., *†Ébè*-like behavior). Analogously, when they criticize the policy of the Tswana-dominated government, the government can be represented by the word *†Ébè*.

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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 Glui 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 *η!àrē* (to sense) at the core of the Glui lifeworld. With the concept of *η!àrē*, Glui 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, Glui people transform their own corporeal involvement in the world. Such a transformation of the body is highly relevant to their food restrictions as well. Glui 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 Glui 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 *zāku* (*dzāā-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 *zāku* 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-



tionships that Sugawara has also investigated.

**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 to his analysis, there were more Glui than Glana 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 Glui and Glana 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 Glui and Glana 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 (Neanderthals) 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 Glui and Glana 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 Glui/Glana 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 Glui/Glana 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 Glui/Glana 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 context of the naming.

Lastly, Sugawara tried to explicate the connotations of proper names. The peculiar feature of the Glui/Glana 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 everyday 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 Glui/Glana 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 custom of the Glui/Glana embodies a collective mnemonic device.

When we consider social relationships among the Glui/Glana, kinship relations must inevitably be taken into consideration. Indeed, among most San groups, kinship provides the central organizing principle of the society (Lee, 1986). As with other groups of San, the kin classifications of the Glui/Glana 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 Glui, based on her field research since the 1990s, focusing on the interpretation of same-sex sibling relationships.

Glui 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 relationships 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 relationship.

What led the researchers to interpret the same-sex sibling relationship as a joking relationship is the direct observation that such siblings are physically close with each other. However, this can be misleading, since there is a general tendency to physical separation according to sex difference (cf. Sugawara, 1990, 1993). Moreover, the categories of avoidance or joking are not linguistically identified in Glui. 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 sibling 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 relationships. Instead, several casual address forms are used within same-sex sibling relationships as well as within same-sex parent-child relationships (but only from senior to junior). *!aosena* 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 Glui: 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 Glui/Glana. 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 Glui grammar. Nakagawa identified nine aspect markers (*cì*, *lò*, *lò-cì*, *hā-cì*, *kùà*, *cùcì*, *lùlò*, *wà*, and *-hā*), including five progressive particles (*hā-cì*, *kùà*, *cùcì*, *lùlò*, 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-cì*, *kùà*, *cùcì*, *lùlò*, and *wà* mark the contrasts of [ $\emptyset$ 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 experiences in a †Akhoe Hailom 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 interjections 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 understand 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 Glui and Glana,” is based on his fieldwork since the late 1990s and demonstrates how the Glui/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 analysis of their interactions.

In a region of scant rainfall that varies greatly by location and year, the Glui/Glana developed a vast body of ecological knowledge that fuses nature and culture. It allowed them to acquire ample bush foods by moving frequently and flexibly within their huge living area, now encompassed by the CKGR. Their ecological knowledge, which enables a multi-scale migration strategy, may be summarized 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 provide valuable resources; and (4) a conceptualization of dry valleys composed of sequences of woodlands or basins, which are used as routes for nomadic movement. 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 knowledge to this new geographical setting.

Takada found that several Glui and Glana individuals remained eager to conduct foraging excursions around the new settlement. These hunters began accumulating 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 (*lqāā*), 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 Glui/Glana activate their keen wayfinding 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 Glui/Glana 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 Glui/Glana perception of the environment matches Sugawara's, which positioned the concept of *η'ārē* (to sense) at the core of the Glui lifeworld. Glui/Glana 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 Glui and Glana San," discusses the reorganization process of Glui/Glana 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 Glui/Glana 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 Glui/Glana.

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 Glui and Glana 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.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** I would like to express my gratitude to the government of Botswana for providing us with permission to conduct this research (OP 46/1 XLII (43)). This work is financially supported by JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) “Cultural and ecological foundations of education and learning: An anthropological study on rhythm, imitation, and exchange (Project No. 24242035 headed by Akira Takada)” and JSPS Program for Advancing Strategic International Networks to Accelerate the Circulation of Talented Researchers “Network formation for reconstructing the paradigm of African Area Studies in a globalizing world (Project No. J2701 headed by Shigeki Kaji)”.

## NOTES

- (1) Though many early studies call this target group the !Kung, in this introduction, I adopt their self-designation, Jul’hoan. Recent studies increasingly use Jul’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 Glui and Glana (e.g., Takada 2002).

## REFERENCES

- Barnard, A. 1992. *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bleek, D.F. 1929. *Comparative Vocabularies of Bushman Languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Diener, I. 2001. Ethnicity and nation-building: Towards unity respectful of heterogeneity? In (I. Diener & O. Graefe, eds.) *Contemporary Namibia: The First Landmarks of a Post-apartheid Society*, pp. 231–257. Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers, Windhoek.
- Eriksen, T. 1995. *Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology*. Pluto, London.
- Fraser, N. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the ‘Postsocialist’ Condition*. Routledge, New York.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Doubleday & Company,

- New York.
- 1961. *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis.
- 1981. *Forms of Talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Gordon, R.J. 1997. *Picturing Bushmen: The Denver African Expedition of 1925*. Ohio University Press, Athens.
- Gordon, R.J. & S.S. Douglas 2000. *The Bushman Myth: The Making of a Namibian Underclass (2nd edition)*. Westview Press, Colorado.
- Hymes, D.H. 1972. On communicative competence. In (J.B. Pride & J. Holmes, eds.) *Sociolinguistics*, pp.269-285. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Ikeya, K. 2002. *Hunter-gatherers and the states: Historical ethnography of subsistence among the Kalahari San*. *Senri Ethnological Monograph*, 4 (in Japanese). National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka.
- Kent, S. (ed.) 2002. *Ethnicity, Hunter-gatherers, and the 'Other': Association or Assimilation in Africa*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson 1980. *Metaphors We Live by*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. Basic Books, New York.
- Lee, R.B. 1979. *The !Kung San: Men, Women, and Work in a Foraging Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1986. !Kung kin terms, the name relationship and the process of discovery. In (M. Biesele with R. Gordon & R. Lee, eds.) *The Past and Future of !Kung Ethnography: Critical Reflections and Symbolic Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Lorna Marshall*, pp.77-102. Helmut Buske Verlag, Hamburg.
- 1992. Art, science, or politics? The crisis in hunter-gatherer studies. *American Anthropologist*, 94: 31-54.
- 1993. *The Dobe Ju|'hoansi (2nd edition)*. Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth.
- Lee, R.B. & I. DeVore (eds.) 1968. *Man the Hunter*. Aldine Atherton, Chicago.
- 1976. *Kalahari Hunter-gatherers: Regional Studies of the !Kung San and Their Neighbors*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Lee, R.B. & M. Guenther 1991. Oxen or onions? The search for trade (and truth) in the Kalahari. *Current Anthropology*, 32: 592-601.
- 1993. Problems in Kalahari historical ethnography and the tolerance of error. *History in Africa*, 20: 185-235.
- 1995. Errors corrected or compounded? A reply to Wilmsen. *Current Anthropology*, 36: 298-305.
- Lee, R.B. & R.K. Hitchcock 2001. African hunter-gatherers: Survival, history and the politics of identity. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 26: 257-280.
- Marshall, L. 1976. *The !Kung of Nyae Nyae*. Harvard University Press, Massachusetts.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1945. *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Gallimard, Paris.
- 1960. *Signes*. Gallimard, Paris.
- 1964. *Le Visible et L'invisible, Suivi de Notes de Travail*. (edited by Claude Lefort) Gallimard, Paris.
- Moerman, M. 1988. *Talking Culture: Ethnography and Conversation Analysis*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Osaki, M. 2001. A chronology of the Central Kalahari. In (J. Tanaka, ed.) *Kalahari Hunter-gatherers: Past and Present* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- Sacks, H. 1992. *Lectures on Conversation, Vol. I*. Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Sacks, H., E.A. Schegloff & G. Jefferson 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of



- turn taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4): 696–735.
- Schegloff, E.A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Vol. 1*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Silberbauer, G. 1981. *Hunter and Habitat in the Central Kalahari Desert*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Solway, J.S. & R.B. Lee 1990. Foragers, genuine or spurious? Situating the Kalahari San in history. *Current Anthropology*, 31: 109–146.
- Sugawara, K. 1990. Interactional aspects of the body in co-presence: Observations on the Central Kalahari San. In (M. Moerman & M. Nmura, eds.) *Culture Embodied. Senri Ethnological Studies*, 27: 79–122.
- 1988. Visiting relations and social interactions between residential groups of the Central Kalahari San: Hunter-gatherer camp as a micro-territory. *African Study Monographs*, 8(4): 173–211.
- 1993. *Anthropology of Body—Everyday Behavior of the G!ui Kalahari Hunter-gatherers* (in Japanese). Kawadeshobou Shinsha, Tokyo.
- 1998a. *An Ethnography of Talking Body—The Life World in Bushmen (1)* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 1998b. *Anthropology of Conversation—The Life World in Bushmen (2)* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 2010. Posture. In (J. Tanaka & K. Sugawara, eds.) *An Encyclopedia of G!ui and G!ana Culture and Society*, pp. 95–96. Laboratory of Cultural Anthropology, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.
- 2012. Interactive significance of simultaneous discourse or overlap in everyday conversations among G!ui former foragers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44: 577–618.
- 2015. *A Phenomenology of Hunting/Hunted Experiences: Syntony and Metamorphosis among the Bushmen* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- Takada, A. 2002. Social changes among the Central Kalahari San: The analysis of population dynamics, subsistence activities, and child weight (in Japanese). *Journal of African Studies*, 60: 85–103.
- 2015. *Narratives on San Ethnicity: The Cultural and Ecological Foundations of Life-world among the !Xun of North-central Namibia*. Kyoto University Press & Trans Pacific Press, Kyoto and Melbourne.
- Tanaka, J. 1980. *The San, Hunter-gatherers of the Kalahari: A Study in Ecological Anthropology*. Tokyo University Press, Tokyo.
- Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara 1996. Introduction. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 22: 3–9.
- Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara (eds.) 2010. *The Encyclopaedia of the G!ui and G!ana Culture and Society*. Laboratory of Cultural Anthropology, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.
- Traill, A. & H. Nakagawa 2000. A historical !Xóõ-G!ui contact zone: Linguistic and other relations. In (H. Batibo & J. Tsonope, eds.) *The Current States of Khoesan Languages in Botswana*, pp.1–17. IRD, Gaborone.
- Werbner, R. 2004. *Reasonable Radicals and Citizenship in Botswana: The Public Anthropology of Kalanga Elites*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Widlok, T. 1999. *Living on Mangetti*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Wilmsen, E.N. 1989. *Land Filled with Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 1990. The real Bushman is the male one: Labour and power in the creation of Basarwa ethnicity. *Botswana Notes and Records*, 22: 21–35.
- Wilmsen, E.N. & J.R. Denbow 1990. Paradigmatic history of San-speaking peoples and current attempts at revision. *Current Anthropology*, 31: 489–524.

## APPENDIX

## Kazuyoshi Sugawara's Major Publications

## Single Authored Books

- Sugawara, K. 1993. *Anthropology of the Body: Everyday Behavior of the G!ui Hunter-gatherers in Kalahari* (in Japanese). Kawadeshobou Shinsha, Tokyo.
- 1998. *An Ethnography of Talking Body: The Life-World of the Bushmen I* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 1998. *Anthropology of Conversation: The Life-World of the Bushmen II* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 1999. *If We All Were the Bushmen* (in Japanese). Fukuinkan Shoten Publishers, Tokyo.
- 2002. *The Emotional Ape=Man* (in Japanese). Koubundo, Tokyo.
- 2004. *Living as the Bushmen: Thinking Words and Body in the Wilderness* (in Japanese). Chuoukouron Shinsha, Tokyo.
- 2007. *Anthropology of Resources* (in Japanese). The Open University of Japan Press, Tokyo.
- 2010. *Words and Body: Anthropology of 'Pre-language'* (in Japanese). Koudansha, Tokyo.
- 2015. *A Phenomenology of Hunting/Hunted Experiences: Syntony and Metamorphosis among the Bushmen* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- Toba, S. 2010. *The Trinity in a Closed City* (in Japanese). Koudansha, Tokyo.

## Edited Books

- Sugawara, K. (ed.) 2005. *Construction and Distribution of Body Resources: Correlations between Ecological, Symbolic and Medical Systems*. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo.
- 2006. *Challenges to the Fieldwork: Introduction to Anthropological Practice* (in Japanese). Sekaishisousha, Kyoto.
- 2007. *The Sharing of Body Resources* (Anthropology of Resources Series 9) (in Japanese). Koubundo, Tokyo.
- 2013. *Anthropology of Embodiment: Cognition, Memory, Language and the Other* (in Japanese). Sekaishisousha, Tokyo.
- Sugawara, K. & M. Nomura (eds.) 1996. *The Body as Communication (Body & Culture Series 2)* (in Japanese). Taishukanshoten, Osaka.
- Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara (eds.) 2010. *An Encyclopedia of G!ui and G!ana Culture and Society*. Laboratory of Cultural Anthropology, Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.
- Uchibori, M., K. Sugawara & M. Intoh (eds.) 2007. *Anthropology of Resources* (in Japanese). The Open University of Japan Press, Tokyo.

### Journal Articles and Book Chapters

- Sugawara, K. 1975. Analysis of the social relations among adolescent males of Japanese monkeys (*Macaca fuscata fuscata*) at Koshima Islet (in Japanese with English abstract). *Anthropological Science*, 83(4): 330–354.
- 1979. Sociological study of a wild group of hybrid baboons between *Papio hamadryas* and *P. anubis* in the Awash Valley, Ethiopia (Doctoral Dissertation 1) *Primates*, 20(1): 21–56.
- 1980. The structure of social encounter among the out-troop males of Japanese Macaques (in Japanese). *Kikan Jinruigaku*, 11(1): 3–70.
- 1982. Sociological comparison between two wild groups of *Anubis-hamadryas* hybrid baboons (Doctoral Dissertation 2). *African Study Monographs*, 2: 73–131.
- 1984. Spatial proximity and bodily contact among the Central Kalahari San. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 3: 1–43.
- 1987. Auto-contact behavior in everyday conversations: Toward the natural history of micro experiences (in Japanese). *Kikan Jinruigaku*, 18(1): 130–200.
- 1988a. Social relations and interactions between residential groups among the Central Kalahari San: Hunter-gatherer camp as a micro-territory. *African Study Monographs*, 8(4): 173–211.
- 1988b. Social relations and face-to-face interactions between visitor and resident among the Central Kalahari San: Observations on visiting activity in !Koi!kom community (in Japanese with English abstract). *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology*, 12(4): 1031–1111.
- 1988c. Ethological study of the social behavior of hybrid baboons between *Papio anubis* and *P. hamadryas* in free-ranging groups. *Primates*, 29(4): 429–448.
- 1990. Interactional aspects of the body in co-presence: Observations on the Central Kalahari San. In (M. Moerman & M. Nomura, eds.) *Culture Embodied. Senri Ethnological Studies*, 27: 79–122.
- 1991. The economics of social life among the Central Kalahari San (Glanakhwe and Glwikhwe) in the sedentary community at !Koi!kom. In (N. Peterson & T. Matsuyama, eds.) *Cash, Commoditisation and Changing Forgers. Senri Ethnological Studies*, 30: 91–116.
- 1996. Some methodological issues for the analysis of everyday conversation among the !Gui. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 22: 145–161.
- 1997. A Name as a mnemonic device: An ethnological study of personal names among the Central San (!Gui and !Gana) (in Japanese with English abstract). *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology*, 22(1): 1–92.
- 1998a. Resonance and iteration: Communication through the long time. In (E. Hatano & Y. Yamada, ed.) *The Enigma of Communication* (in Japanese). Minervashobo, Kyoto.
- 1998b. Violence in an egalitarian society: ‘Myth’ and reality of the Bushmen. In (M. Tanaka, ed.) *The Anthropology of Violence* (in Japanese). Kyoto University Press, Kyoto.
- 1998c. Ecology and communication in egalitarian societies: Japanese studies of the cultural anthropology of southern Africa. *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*, 1: 97–129.
- 1998d. The ‘egalitarian’ attitude in everyday conversations among the !Gui. In (A. Bank, ed.) *The Proceedings of the Khoisan Identities & Cultural Heritage Conference*, pp. 232–240. Institute for Historical Research, University of Cape Town/Infosource, Cape Town.
- 2001a. Introduction to part I: Symbolic categories. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 27: 3–9.

- 2001b. Cognitive space concerning habitual thought and practice toward animals among the Central San (lGui and lGana): Deictic/indirect cognition and prospective/retrospective intention. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 27: 61–98.
- 2002a. Optimistic realism or opportunistic subordination?: The interaction of the lGui and lGana with outsiders. In (S. Kent, ed.), *Ethnicity, Hunter-gatherers, and the “Other”: Association or Assimilation in Africa*, pp. 93–126. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- 2002b. Embodied thought: Explanation and understanding of incidents among the lGui Bushmen. In (S. Tanabe & M. Matsuda, eds.) *The Ethnography of Everyday Practices* (in Japanese). Sekaishisousya, Kyoto.
- 2002c. Emotion and act-space: Embodied mind for anthropology (in Japanese). *Journal of Cultural Anthropology*, 3: 2–24.
- 2003. An evolutionary theory of emotion. In (M. Nishida, K. Kitamura & J. Yamagiwa, eds.) *The Origin and Evolution of Human Nature*, pp. 31–62 (in Japanese). Shouwa-do, Kyoto.
- 2004a. Possession, equality and gender relations in lGui discourse. In (T. Widlok & W. Tadesse, eds.) *Property and Equality Vol. 1: Ritualization, Sharing, Egalitarianism*, pp. 105–129. Berghahn Books, Oxford.
- 2004b. The modern history of Japanese studies on the San hunter-gatherers. In (A. Barnard, ed.) *Hunter-gatherers in History, Archaeology and Anthropology*, pp. 115–128. Berg Publishers, Oxford.
- 2005a. Introduction: Toward the anthropological understanding of body resources. In (K. Sugawara, ed.) *Construction and Distribution of Body Resources: Correlations between Ecological, Symbolic and Medical Systems*, pp. 1–6. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo.
- 2005b. Body configuration as resource in the experience of ‘the hunter and the hunted’: Narratives of the lGui Bushmen. In (K. Sugawara, ed.) *Construction and Distribution of Body Resources: Correlations between Ecological, Symbolic and Medical Systems*, pp. 56–78. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo.
- 2006. Experience of loss, narrative of boundary: Oral discourses of the death and sorcery among the lGui Bushmen. In (S. Tanaka & M. Matsuda, eds.) *The Practices of Micro Anthropology: Agency, Network, and Body* (in Japanese). Sekaishisousya, Kyoto.
- 2007. Biologization of the life world and the implications of this for anthropological thought: General comments on research concerning the circulation of human body parts. In (A. Deguchi, ed.), *Circulation of Human Body Parts: Local, National and Beyond*, pp. 63–73. Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Tokyo.
- 2008. How is the memory of ritual articulated with ‘now-and-here’ context?: A reconstruction of the lost initiation ceremony of male lGui Bushmen. In (H. Wazaki, ed.), *Multiplicity of Meaning and the Interrelationship of the Subject and the Object in Ritual and Body Texts: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference Studies for the Integrated Text Science (21st Century COE Program International Conference Series No. 11)*, pp. 67–87. Graduate School of Letters, Nagoya University, Nagoya.
- 2009. Speech acts, moves and meta-communication in negotiation: Three cases of everyday conversation observed among the lGui former-foragers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(1): 93–135.
- 2012a. Interactive significance of simultaneous discourse or overlap in everyday conversations among lGui former foragers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44: 577–618.
- 2012b. Invisible agents in a contact zone between animals and humans: From the

- discourse analysis among the Glui hunter-gatherers (in Japanese). *Contact Zone*, 5: 19–61.
- 2014a. «2013 Japanese Society of Cultural Anthropology Award Lecture» A long way toward life in the wilderness: In what sense is fieldwork an immediate experience? *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology*, 15: 5–31.
- 2014b. Interaction and relational frame: Oral discourse and gesture of the Glui foragers in southern Africa (in Japanese with English abstract). *Contact Zone*, 6: 6–29.
- Sugawara, K., T. Fujita & H. Hosoma 2005. Redistribution of body resources in the succession of a traditional folk dance: An attempt to understand the transformation of *Nishiure Dengaku* in central Japan (in Japanese with English abstract). *Japanese Journal of Cultural Anthropology*, 70(2): 182–206.
- Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara 1996. Introduction. *African Study Monographs Supplementary Issue*, 22: 3–9.
- Tanaka, J. & K. Sugawara 2000. The !Gui and !Gana of Botswana. In (R.B. Lee & R. Daly, eds.) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Hunters and Gatherers*, pp. 195–199. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

——— Accepted *December 13, 2015*

Author's Name and Address: Akira TAKADA, *Graduate School of Asian and African Area Studies, Kyoto University, 46 Yoshida-Shimoadachi, Sakyo, Kyoto 606-8501, JAPAN.*

E-mail: takada [at] jambo.africa.kyoto-u.ac.jp