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Northern culture refers to the mode of life unique to northern areas in terms of ecology, society and culture, dating back to the advance into Northern Eurasia by modern man (Homo sapiens sapiens) in the history of human evolution and proliferation to North America. "Northern culture" describes a whole body of cultures, which have changed, descended and developed up to today. On the basis of this definition of northern cultures, changes of and products from northern studies in Japan are reviewed in each period: the Age of Exploration (c. 400-1867), the Age of Academics (1868-1945), and the Age of the World (1946-2000). As a result, research subjects for northern studies have changed from Ainu culture to a variety of cultures in broad northern circumpolar areas including Northern Eurasia, Japan and North America. Study methodology also has changed from folklore and ethnology to shizenshi — anthropology of nature and culture — and study objectives have shifted from the clarification of the origin of the Japanese and their culture to the clarification of universal issues in anthropological studies; i.e., "What are human beings?" Finally, since the northern studies have been developed to search for the universality of human beings, I present an outlook for the 21st century of anthropology as the Age of the Humanity.
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Introduction

For some people, the North was the periphery far away from the center. For some others, it was a frontier that must be explored. And for the people who lived there, it was the ordinary place of their everyday lives. Today, the North is also recognized as a home where people can get back the nature and humanity that have been largely lost during the process of
modernization. The North thus shows a various aspects in different times and for different people.

From the viewpoint of human history, the North was of course an important stage for human adaptation and evolution in the process of their advance and dispersion to the Northern Eurasia and to the New World from their native land of Africa. From an academic perspective, then, the North is a place for the intellectual challenges of understanding human beings, learning the wisdom of their ways of life and looking toward their future.

In this paper, I would like to review the changes and results of these intellectual challenges through studies of northern cultures, with the goal of discussing future prospects. I have conducted my studies in the framework of anthropology in general, and have never positioned myself as a specialist of northern studies in a relatively narrow sense. However, I might have been viewed objectively as a scholar of northern studies, based on my career of research and education at the Department of Anthropology of the University of Tokyo, universities in Canada, the North Asia Section of the First Research Department of the National Museum of Ethnology, and the Institute for the Studies of North Eurasian Cultures of Hokkaido University. Also, it is probably because my field covers the Athapaskan (Dene) in North America, the Ainu in Japan and the Koryak in Northern Eurasia, Mongolia, China, Tibet and India. Thus, even if it is insufficient, a review of northern studies in Japan from my point of view may be useful for people who study anthropology in the future. I would therefore like to discuss northern studies here from a comprehensive perspective and, at the same time, based on the experience of what I have mainly learned and specialized in. In the sections below, I describe what the "Northern Culture" is, as well as the eras of exploration, academics and the world. In the conclusion, I present an outlook for the future, which may be called the "age of the humanity."

What is "Northern Culture?"

Northern culture refers to the mode of life unique to northern areas in terms of ecology, society and culture, dating back to the advance into Northern Eurasia by modern man (Homo sapiens sapiens) in the history of human evolution and proliferation to North America. Northern culture is a whole body of cultures, which have changed, descended and developed up to today (IRIMOTO 1992a: 1-2, 11-2; 2004a: 1-2, 54).

I actually defined northern culture as mentioned above and stipulated the direction of our research in October 1990 when we launched the preparatory committee for the Hoppo Gakkai (Northern Studies Association, or NSA), founded the NSA in September 1991 and held the first international symposium in commemoration of the Association’s foundation at Hokkaido University in October of the same year. NSA was founded for the purpose of contributing to the understanding of human beings through studies of various northern cultures in Eurasia and North America, as well as through international exchanges. The Association has two functions; it is an association for regional studies and also an association for studies of human beings,
that is, anthropology in a broad sense. In terms of regional studies, the northern region is the
subject of the study, including Eurasia and North America, two important areas where
sufficient studies and information are lacking. Japan has historical, ecological, and cultural
characteristics indicative of its location on one end of the Eurasian continent. When one looks
at Japan as part of the northern Pacific Rim region, however, a close relationship with North
America is evident. Therefore, it is important to study Eurasia, Japan and North America, as a
continuous and unified northern region.

In the human evolutionary history, the Paleolithic culture of Japan is not unrelated to that
of northern Eurasia, and some northern characteristics are also recognized in the Jomon
culture, which followed Paleolithic culture. There are many ethnological aspects which
Northern Eurasian cultures, Northern American cultures, and Ainu culture have in common.
For example, the worldview behind the Ainu Bear Festival is based on the repetition of
reciprocity between humans and deities — that is to say, their logic behind it is that their game
animals are divinities wearing flesh and hides brought to humans as gifts, and divinities are
sent-off by humans to their divine world, receiving worship and return-gifts, including inau,
wooden sticks with shavings, home brew, and millet dumplings while being invited to visit the
human world again. Such a worldview is commonly found in a wide range of Northern
Eurasian and North American cultures. In addition, the shamanistic view of the world plays an
important role in northern cultures in connecting nature (deities) and human beings.

In ecological studies in northern regions, the main subject is how people live in northern
climates. For example, snowshoes, technologically related to regions with snow accumulation,
are most developed among the American boreal forest Indians, but are also found in Japan.
Breeding and rearing reindeer are characteristic of Eurasia, but are traditionally not
conducted in North America. In the latter region, the caribou (wild American reindeer), which
belongs to the same biological species as the reindeer, occupies this niche only as game
animals. This cultural difference stems from ecological and historical conditions.

These various cultures of northern regions have changed up to today. Comparative studies
of the current northern regions are as important as studies of prehistoric cultures and
ethnographies. For example, Hokkaido has a natural environment similar to Scandinavian
nations, Russia, Canada, the United States and other northern nations. These regions have a
common goal; that is, to live comfortably during the long winter. Furthermore, changes in the
environment greatly influence the northern ecosystem. Such changes should not be viewed as
the problem of one nation, but should be seen as an international problem common to all
northern regions.

Therefore, research on northern culture is wide-ranging and also considered to be
anthropological research. It is possible to proceed with research by considering northern
regions as cultural domains, and constantly performing comparative reviews of whether the
cultural characteristics are indeed northern characteristics or characteristics universal to all
human beings regardless of geographical location. By doing so, we can consider northern
culture in the context of overall human culture and approach a more universal issue; i.e. "What
are human beings?"

This manifesto of northern studies by IRIMOTO is characterized first by the broad definition of the research subject as northern regions including Northern Eurasia, Japan and North America; second, by application of shizenshi, which is — anthropology of nature and culture — to the research theory and method; and third, by the fact that the final goal of research is the clarification of a universal issue in anthropology — "What are human beings?" This differs greatly from conventional northern studies in Japan, which were limited to Hokkaido or adjoining northern regions in Japan, with the Ainu as the main focus, applied folklore/ethnology as methodology. Also, it differs in that the purpose was to clarify the origin of the Japanese people and culture. This change, however, was a natural consequence of changes in northern studies in Japan, rather than something that occurred suddenly. I therefore explain these changes in the subsequent sections.

Age of Exploration

In the following three sections, I explain the characteristics and results of northern studies by dividing them into three ages. The first is the Age of Exploration, starting in the 4th century, when the Yamato Imperial Court was formed, then the unified government of Japan, to the Chusei (medieval period) and the Kinsei (modern times) in the mid-nineteenth century, when the Edo period ended. The second is the Age of Academics in the Kindai (modern period) from the Meiji Restoration to the end of Pacific War. The third is the Age of the World up to the end of the twentieth century, when the bipolar Cold-War structure after the war collapsed. These divisions are of course not mutually exclusive. It just means that characteristics of northern studies can be observed more clearly by looking at northern studies objectively by age. It is because researchers engaged in northern studies seem to have proceeded with their studies with intellectual challenge to the north as their driving force regardless of the ages, although there are differences among individuals, and their observations may have been affected by the times in some cases. Based on the above conditions, next I explain northern studies during the Age of Exploration.

Interest in the north could be found in Japan since old times. The north was an object of exploration from the formation of the Yamato Imperial Court up to the end of the Edo period in 1867. Needless to say, the interest in the north was for acquisition of knowledge on ethnic groups in surrounding areas, such as the Emishi in the north and Hayato in the south, which were subdued and integrated during the process of Japan's political unification, rather than for academic purposes. For example, Nihon Shoki or Chronicles of Japan (TONERI-SHINNO et al. ed. 720/1669), compiled in 720 as Japan's oldest anthology of official history by Imperial Command, states that the Mishihase, currently regarded by ethnologists as a Tungus-speaking ethnic group, came to the northern Sado Island of Etsu Province (present-day eastern Fukui, Toyama and Niigata) in 544, but islanders did not approach them, calling them ogres and monsters rather than people (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 5).
It also states the following events: chiefs of the ancient Emishi including Ayakasu, who lived in the present-day Aomori, Akita and northern Miyagi Prefectures in northern Japan and are believed by many Japanese specialists to be related with ancestors of the Ainu both physically and linguistically, came to the Imperial Court in Yamato (present-day Nara) in 581 and took an oath pledging their obedience. Abe no Omi went on an expedition leading 180 warships in 658 and 659 and forced the Emishi in Wanita, Aita and Nushiro (present-day Akita) to pledge their loyalty to the Imperial Court. He also led 200 warships in 660 and conquered the Mishihase with the support of the Mutsu (now known as Aomori and a part of Iwate) Emishi and Oshima (now Hokkaido) Emishi (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 5; OBAYASHI 1994: 125, 127-8). *Nihon Shoki* also states that, in 659, there were three groups of Emishi — those in Tsukaru (modern Aomori), Shishi Emishi and Niki Emishi — from the far side, and the Niki Emishi visited the Imperial Court to offer a tribute (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 5). It can be seen that Niki Emishi lived closest to Yamato and were the most obedient to the Imperial Court out of the ancient Emishi groups.

In *Jussai Kofuku Ezoshō, or Emishi Surrendering to the 10 years old Prince Shotoku*, (Unknown author 1323/1959: 25; 1323/1968: no. 159: 186-7; 1323/1973: 11-3) in the pictorial biography of Prince Shotoku written around 1323, there is a legendary scene in which Prince Shotoku, ten years old at the time, suggested to the Emperor Bidatsu to invite the Emishi chief Ayakasu and his men to the bank of the Hatsuse River and then persuaded them to obey the Imperial Court. While this is said to be the oldest genre picture of the Ainu (i.e., a picture that depicts Ainu customs) remaining to this day, it is obvious from the description in *Nihon Shoki* that this was a picture of Emishi in Honshu and not the Ainu in Hokkaido. It is naturally not known to what degree this picture, painted at the end of the Kamakura era, was based on the knowledge on the Ainu in Hokkaido or the Emishi in Honshu. As indicated by many descriptions in *Nihon Shoki*, however, it is true that knowledge on the Emishi had already been collected in those days. Considering such a background, it was presumed that people appearing in the picture were the Emishi. While the people in the picture depicted bows and quivers, also found in Ainu culture, they wore feather and fur shawls, hoods and headbands, and had spears decorated with cloth slightly different from those of the Ainu. They also wore shoes that looked like long boots, which did not exist in Ainu culture. This picture had been evaluated negatively as an imaginary painting depicting the Ainu incorrectly. As mentioned before, however, this can be interpreted as a picture of the Emishi and is likely the oldest and only genre picture of the Emishi. If this is true, the abovementioned differences from the Ainu in the modern times have important meaning as the characteristics of the Emishi in Honshu, rather than just being the products of imagination.

In fact, analysis of the description of Emishi in *Nihon Shoki* revealed some facts concerning their mode of living and view of the world. They sustained themselves by hunting, gathering, fishing, as well as cultivating wet rice, and breeding horses. They divided a year into two seasons — summer and winter, and the times of their revolts against the Imperial Court were related to the transition of these two seasons; i.e., the breaks between subsistence
activities, being concentrated at the end of winter or the end of summer (OBAIYASHI 1994: 131, 136). Based on such information, it can be presumed that the Emishi in Honshu were engaged in subsistence activities different from those of the Ainu in Hokkaido, were directly influenced by the continent concerning the use of horses, and were a culturally different group from the Ainu, although they had the same ancestors.

Description of the Ainu in Hokkaido can be seen in documents dating back to approximately the same time as the pictorial biography of Prince Shotoku. While archaeologists believe that Ainu culture formed around the twelfth century, the *Suwa Daimyojin Ekotoba* (SUWA DAISHINBO 1356/1925: 53-4; Hokkaido ed. 1989: 9) states that Ezogashima Island was situated in the middle of the ocean in the northeast of Japan, and that three groups called the Hinomoto, Karako and Watarito lived on 333 islands. It also states that the Watarito shared one island with other groups and did trades on the coast outside of Oshu Tsugaru. KINDAICHI Kyosuke (1925: 54-5, 357-401) concluded that the Hinomoto were the group in the eastern province (East Ezo) that later came to be called the Chishima (Kuril) Ainu, the Karako were the Ainu influenced by Manchurian culture via the Tatar Straits who were later called the Karafuto (Sakhalin) Ainu, and the Watarito were the group that fled from Ou, or the Ainu enjoying Japanese culture at the gateway to Hokkaido.

*Suwa Daimyojin Ekotoba* (SUWA DAISHINBO 1356/1925: 55-6) also states that the territories of the Hinomoto and Karako were connected to foreign countries, and that they were engaged in hunting and fishing, they did not conduct farming (such as cultivating five grains as staple foods — including rice, wheat, foxtail millet, bean, millet or barnyard grass — although there are varied opinions) and had different languages. In contrast to this, the Watarito were similar to the Japanese and shared the same language. Some of them knew how to hide themselves by creating a smoky fog. On the battlefield, armored men advanced, armed with bows and arrows, and women remained at the back uttering incantations to the sky while grasping strips of wood. Both men and women moved freely without the aid of horses and used arrows with poisoned heads made from fish bones. Ainu in Edo period shared these characteristics. In the medieval period, Japan had already expanded its outlook to Ezo-ga-Chishima (now known as Hokkaido and neighboring areas), and people living there, and had recognition that there was foreign land beyond.

It was, however, not until the Edo period in the modern times — 265 years from the opening of the shogunate in Edo (modern Tokyo) by TOKUGAWA Ieyasu in 1603 to the Restoration of the Imperial Rule by TOKUGAWA Yoshinobu in 1867 — that correct and detailed descriptions of the Ainu were reliably discovered. Looking at the general survey of the history of Hokkaido in the *Shin Hokkaidoshi Nenpyo* or *New chronological table of the history of Hokkaido* (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 688-96), which is a reproduction of the chronological table part of the Historical Record No. 3, Vol. 9 of the New History of Hokkaido (Hokkaido ed. 1980), the number of documents on the Edo period was approximately 440, while only 50 regarding the period from ancient to medieval times were quoted. Although these documents are only a part of ancient writings about the history of Hokkaido, it can be seen from the number of documents
that interest in the northern regions, including Hokkaido and its adjoining areas, was very high during the Edo period. For example, ARAI Hakuseki wrote Ezoshi (ARAI, 1720/1979: 39-54), the first geography book of Hokkaido in 1720. Matsumaekoku Chuki (Unknown author c. 1720) was also written by an unknown author at roughly the same time. Also, KUDO Heisuke published Aka Ezo Husetsuko (KUDO 1783/1972: 209-45) in 1783, which described a district called Kamusasuka (present-day Kamchatka), also known as Aka Ezo (Red Ezo or "Russianized" Ezo Country), along the northern island of the Chishima (Kuril) Islands, and that people living there brought dried salmon and salmon oil to trade for salt, rice, rolls of cloth and textiles. There was also mention that a large country called Oroshiya (now Russia), which had its capital in Musukobeya (modern Moscow), expanded its power gradually starting from the Kanbun era (1661-1672) and took control of Kamusasuka by the Shotoku era (1711-1715), indicating that the necessity of national defense was promoted in Japan.

Because of this, the shogunate sent an investigating party to Ezo in 1785 and 1786, and they traveled to Karafuto (Sakhalin) in the north and Kunashiri Island of Southern Chishima (Kuril) Archipelago in the east. At that time, MOGAMI Tokunai went not only to Etorofu Island of the southern Kurils, but also to Urup Island of the northern Kurils. SATO Genrokuro, a participant in this party, compiled the results of the survey of Ezo into Ezo Shui (SATO 1786/1972: 248-309) in 1786. Mogami also published Ezo Soshi (MOGAMI 1790/1972: 310-410) in 1790, with descriptions of geography, products, Ainu society, rituals, songs and dances. Karafuto and the Kurils in those days served as the northern border of Japan with Russia. For example, the Ainu of Etorofu Island went to Urup Island of the northern Kurils to find work and presented sea otter skin and eagle feathers to the shogunate. Because some of them were plundered of their cargoes and shot to death by Russians in 1770, they took revenge (Hokkaidocho 1901: 36-7; IRIMOTO 1995a: 128). After that, a mission to Japan led by Adam LARSMAN came to Nemuro and Hakodate on the Ekaterina in 1792, with a request for amity from the Governor-General of Siberia under the pretext of extradition of DAIKOKUYA Kodayu of Ise Province among other drifters. Their proposal for trade was, however, rejected according to the closed-door policy of the shogunate. The Providence, a British expedition ship led by BROUGHTON, also came to Abuta and Etomo in 1796 and 1797, and demanded of the shogunate the opening of the country. The shogunate sent another investigating party to eastern and western Ezo immediately after, in 1798. At that time, another party including KONDO Juzo and MAMIYA Rinzo went to Etorofu Island of the southern Kurils, and MURAKAMI Shimanojo (a.k.a. HATA Awakimaru) published Ezhosima Kikan in 1799 (MURAKAMI 1799/1953: 27, 29; 1799/1973: no. 41-77), which contained pictures and text depicting the lives of the Ainu. Also, INO Tadataka conducted a survey of Ezo in 1800 by permission of the shogunate, and MAMIYA Rinzo made inspections of northern Sakhalin in 1808 and 1809, and confirmed that Sakhalin was an island through exploration of the Mamiya (Tatar) Strait (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 89, 91-2; YAMADA 2002a: 362-363).

There is mention of Sakhalin in those days in Hokuidan (MATSUDA 1822/1972: 117-276), a record on Ezo written by MATSUDA Denjuro between 1799 and 1822. For example, it says that
the Orotsuko-jin (Uilta) raised animals called *tonakai* (reindeer) to ride and carry loads, and the Sumeren-guru (Nivkh) kept dogs to pull boats from the sea onto the shore in summer and sleighs on the snow in winter. It also states that the Santan-jin (Tungus-speaking people in the coastal area) visited this island every year to trade with the Ainu in Karafuto and Soya in Hokkaido, the Ainu in Karafuto and visiting Santan-jin who hunted in the mountain went by boat to Derei (Deren) by the Amur River, where the Manchurian temporary government was situated, to trade otter, fox and sea otter furs for foxtail millet, rice, sake and tobacco. They also took pieces of brocades, blue glass balls for neck ornaments, bowls of tobacco pipes and other goods to Soya to trade them for otter, fox and raccoon dog furs (MATSUDA 1882/1972: 171-2, 175-8; MAMIYA 1855/1972: 286). These descriptions revealed not only the status of fur trading in the coastal area of the Asian continent and Karafuto with the Qing Dynasty in the background, but also the fact that the Santan-jin and Ainu in Karafuto played the roles of middlemen by trading with the Ainu in Hokkaido. Furthermore, MAMIYA Rinzo went to the continent by sea from Karafuto in 1809, crossed a mountain pass carrying the boat and reached Deren via Lake Kizhi, observed the state of trading by Manchurian public servants, and traveled down the main stream of the Amur River on his journey home. It is said that MAMIYA made a fair copy of the record of this trip called the *Todatsu Chiho Kiko* (MAMIYA, 1811a/1969: 180-99), and presented it to the shogunate in 1811 (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 101-2; TAKAKURA 1969: 178). In this report, MAMIYA mentioned the state of trading at the Manchurian temporary government by the Amur River, and the recorded the names of various ethnic groups living in the area extending from northern Karafuto to the lower reaches of the Amur River, including Orotsuko (Tungus-speaking Orok, or Uilta), Sumeren-guru (Nivkh), Shirun-aino (Ainu in the hinterland of Karafuto), Kimun-aino (mountain Ainu), Santan (probably the Tungus-speaking Ulchi in the lower reaches of the Amur River), Korutetsuke (likely the Tungus-speaking Goldy in the lower reaches of Ussurii River), Kyatsukara (probably Tungus-speaking Negidal in the lower reaches of the Amur River), Ida (Tungus-speaking Udegey east of the Sikhote Alin mountains) and Kiren (a group of Goldy called Samagir). Also, *Hokui Bunkai Yowa* (MAMIYA 1811b/1973: 76-80; 1811c/1973: no. 78-143) that was written together with *Todatsu Chiho Kiko* was published in wood-block print as *Kita Ezo Zusetsu* (MAMIYA, 1855/1972: 283-380) in 1855. The book contains detailed descriptions and ethnography of the Ainu in Karafuto, Orotsuko (Uilta) and Sumeren-guru (Nivkh), including food, housing, skills, livelihood, trading and ceremonies.

Records on the Ainu are characterized by many genre pictures, in addition to written descriptions. Those pictures shown in the form of picture scrolls or figures inserted in old chronicles present valuable information that cannot be expressed with words alone, just like photos in ethnography. *Ezoshi Fuzu* (ARAI 1720/1945: 9; TAKAKURA 1959: 9; 1720/1973: 14) of ARAI Hakuseki attached to the above-mentioned *Ezoshi* is known as the first realistic genre picture of the Ainu. It is a simple picture of Ainu men and women wearing characteristic costumes and accessories, accompanied by the description of sizes, materials and usage, as well as pictures related to material culture of the Ainu, including those of bows and arrows, containers and clubs (ARAI, 1720/1953: 5; TAKAKURA, 1953: 4-7). Also, *Ezokoku Fue* (KODAMA
1756/1945: no. 4; 1756/1953: 10; 1756/1973: no. 27-40), which is said to be the work of painter KODAMA Sadayoshi of Matsumae, created in 1756, also includes vivid pictures of the Bear Festival, kelp gathering, shut (corporal punishment), audiences with the baron of Matsumae and other scenes of the Ainu’s lives and festivals.

Furthermore, portraits of twelve imposing men from the Kunashiri and Menashi areas wearing Ezo brocade from Santan with decorated swords or spears under their arms were painted by KAKIZAKI Hakyo in Ishu Retsuzo in 1790 (KAKIZAKI 1790/1953: 17; 1790/1968: no. 1-4; 1790/1973: 1-14). As mentioned before, the eighteenth century was the time when the shogunate sent an investigating party to Ezo to deal with Russians expanding southward, and was when the first era of direct control of Ezo by the shogunate began. Many books and genre pictures of the Ainu were produced in those days. TANI Gentan’s Ezo Kiko Zufu (TANI 1799/1953: 21; 1799/1973: no. 170-91) contains realistic pictures of the lives of the Ainu, including a woman weaving atsushi (bank-cloth), a hunting scene, children at play, a drinking scene, corporal punishment, sailing, kindling of fire, praying and passing around a pipe. The abovementioned Ezushima Kikan (MURAKAMI 1799/1953: 27, 29; 1799/1973: no. 41-77), which was developed based on the shogunate’s second survey of Ezo, contains detailed description and pictures of Ainu myths, ceremonial occasions and daily activities, including the earth-creating deity (Goddess in the Cave), Ainu men and women, an audience with Baron Matsumae, sitting in attendance, greetings and salutations, taking care of the sick, funerals, saimon (trial by boiling water), machikoru (wedding), the burning of the houses of the deceased, ukari (beating with a club), dances at a feast, drinking, exorcism of evil spirits, niyoen (homecoming ritual), dogs pulling a boat, the harvesting of kelp, the castration of dogs, the harpooning of salmon, the stripping of tree bark, the gathering medical plants and the trapping of an eagle, as well as bows and arrows, quivers, women’s tattoos, shitoki (necklaces), and dwellings and their interior. It contains many records on modern Ainu culture that had been lost since the Meiji era. It was because MURAKAMI Shimanojo had clear intentions of producing a picture scroll to record the Ainu customs (TAKAKURA 1953: 26), as can be seen in his remark, “I hope to avoid losing the past descriptions of the Ainu and show them to those who have never seen them.” The illustrations of MURAKAMI were later sorted by his adopted son Teisuke and MAMIYA Rinzo, and have been kept as Ezo Seikei Zusetsu contained in the Department of ethnology class of the University of Tokyo and Ezushima Zusetsu contained in Hakodate Library (the original is Ezo Gacho contained in the Cabinet Library) (TAKAKURA 1953: 31; 1968: 157; 1973: 26). Ezo Seikei Zusetsu or Ezo Gacho (MURAKAMI 1804-1823/1945: no. 20; 1804-23/1953: 27; 1804-23/1968: no. 44-6, 50, 53-6, 64-9, 72, 76, 78, 85, 87, 90, 149) includes pictures of various activities related to subsistence of the Ainu and material aspects related their food, clothing and shelter. They include pictures of the cultivation process of miscellaneous grains from seed to harvest, bleaching of tree bark to make clothing, twisting of

\[\text{1 The comparison with the current names of ethnic groups is based on TAKAKURA (1969: 199), who wrote explanatory and supplementary notes for Todatsu Chiho Kiko.}\]
tree-bark fibers, clothes made of fur, feathers, grass and various other materials, construction of houses, houses covered with miscanthus, birch bark and bamboo leaves, the eating meals, *inau* (wooden sticks) state of inau-making, and boats on the sea with sails made of straw mats.

After the Golovnin incident in 1811, PERRY's fleet came to Uraga in 1853 and the shogunate opened the ports of Shimoda and Hakodate the following year. In the same year, PUTYATIN's fleet visited Nagasaki and Hakodate and signed a memorandum setting the national boundary between Japan and Russia at the Etorofu Channel in the northern part of Etorofu Island of the Kurils, and designating Karafuto as a mixed-residence area. The instruments of ratification were then exchanged in 1856 (Hokkaido ed. 1989: 103, 131-3). With the dramatic changes of the domestic and international situations in the transition from the closed-door policy to opening of the country, Ezo entered the second period of direct control by the shogunate (1855-1867) (IRIMOTO 1987: 3). Genre pictures of the Ainu were created in addition to many reports in those days. Among them were the masterpieces of HIRASAWA Byozan – *Ezo-jin Shuto-no-zu* (HIRASAWA 1857/1945: no. 32; 1857/1968: no. 109) that depicted a scene of smallpox vaccination for the Ainu at the Hakodate Magistrate's Office under the instruction of the shogunate in 1857 and 1858 and *Ezo Fuzoku Juni-kagetsu Byobu* (folding screen of twelve months of the Ainu customs) (HIRASAWA late 1800s/1945: no. 38-43; late 1800s/1973: no. 15-26). The folding screen contains pictures of visiting a shrine on New Year's day (January), hunting deer (February), gathering seaweed (March), twisting *atsushi* bark (April), drying fish-oil cakes (May), harvesting kelp (June), catching trout (July), catching salmon (August), harpooning salmon using *marek* (September), departing for a hunting trip (October) and the Bear Festival (December). Pictures 130 cm in height and 52 cm in width are on a pair of six-panel screens. It is not only highly artistic, but also accurately depicts the yearly cycle of the Ainu. *Ainu Fuzoku Emaki* (scroll painting of Ainu customs) produced by NISHIKAWA Hokuyo (end of 1800s/1973: no. 149-69) also contains realistic and detailed pictures of condolence, the playing of mouth harps, subsistence activities of hunting, fishing and gathering, the rearing of bear cubs, the Bear Festival, plays, the reciting of *shakorobe* epics and a trial.

These genre pictures of the Ainu also have titles in the Ainu language and serve as valuable records of the language. In fact, the *Ezo Hogen Moshiogusa*, a bilingual dictionary of the Ainu language and Japanese, was written by interpreter UEHARA Kumajiro and Governor ABE Chozaburo in 1792, and published by MOGAMI Tokunai in 1804 (UEHARA and ABE 1792, 1804/1972; Hokkaido ed. 1989: 84). Many more publications were issued in the late Edo period. KANSENDO-YUKI then published a map called *Ezokoku Chiri-no-zu* from the Edo Asakusa Gyokuryuken Kyokuhogata in 1853, which included a supplemental booklet that introduced the Ainu language called *Ezo Hin'i Yakugen* (KANSENDO-YUKI 1853/1872; TAKAKURA 1973: 31).

Later, MATSUURA Takeshiro, who went on four exploratory trips in Ezo starting in 1845, and who was employed by the shogunate in 1856 to investigate the geography of Ezo mountains and rivers, introduced Ezo to a wide range of people through wood-printed books featuring genre pictures of the Ainu. He also collected and disseminated past genre pictures of
the Ainu (Matsuura 1859/1945: no. 49(1); 1859/1968: no. 125; Takakura 1973: 31-2). Matsuura explored extensive areas of Hokkaido and Karafuto in the late Edo period. He not only kept valuable investigation records on geography, place names in the Ainu language and censuses of the Ainu population, but also earned the trust of the Ainu with his universal and objective outlook (Yamada 2002a: 361, 368-9; 2003: 77). Based mainly on the journals and geographical survey maps of Matsuura Takeshiro (1856/1978, 1858/1985, 1859/1983, 1863/1962), a series of pioneering studies of Irimoto were later conducted (Irimoto 1987, 1988, 1992b), which included anthropological and historic — ecological analyses of the Ainu in the Saru River basin.

This anthropological study of historical materials on the Ainu in the Saru River basin was the analysis on the Ainu society and culture in this area from around 1300 to 1867. The significance of this study was described as follows: The first point is the extremely steady collection and analysis of data using literature and archeological materials systematically while referring to ethnographical reports of the modern period. The second point is the division into three major periods — the first from around 1300 to 1603, the second from 1604 to 1669 and the third from 1670 to 1867 — and the establishment of three sub-periods during the third period. The third point is that the study revealed the transition of weight on activities to gather food in the wild, such as hunting animals, gathering plants and fishing, to trade, plant-cultivation and employment activities throughout these periods. The fourth point is that analysis was conducted based on full understanding of the standard of studies in modern-day cultural anthropology. While the ecological point of view was especially characteristic to this study, a balanced interpretation was made by also taking the importance of political history factors into account. It also revealed that the social and political system of the Ainu was formed through a political and economic relationship with the Matsumae clan and shogunate, including trade and employment activities, while it was supported by the ecological basis and subsistence activities, population and settlement patterns of the area.

As mentioned above, it could be said that northern studies in Japan began in the Age of Exploration. It is possible to clarify the mode of life, society and culture in the northern regions in modern times based especially on the records created in the Edo period for the following reasons: First, interest in the northern regions, including Hokkaido and its adjoining areas, was high, and many materials were left from the era. This was probably because the Matsumae Clan under the Tokugawa shogunate obtained the management rights to Ezoichi (present-day Hokkaido and Chishima [Kuril] Archipelago) and Karafuto (Sakhalin) from Tokugawa Ieyasu in 1604 and executed them, and the shogunate positioned the northern regions of Japan as Hokumon no Mamori (the guardian of the northern gate) and the front line of the nation against Russia. There was also the fact that people’s curiosity was extended to external things during the prosperity of culture in the Kyoto and Osaka area and popular culture of Edo.

Second, an objective and comprehensive description method was established based on

---

2 This study received the sixteenth Dr. Kindaichi Kyosuke Memorial Award in 1988, which is given for important contributions concerning languages and ethnic cultures in Japan and surrounding areas.
natural observation, which is a traditional culture of Japan. It is entirely the result of establishment of scientific method based on the natural view unique to Japanese culture. Such method was established in the history of Japan through experience of compilation of *Fudoki* (geographical description of the origin of the name, topography, products, legends and other conditions of a certain area) that began in the eighth century, and tradition of painters who worked as artisans to produce paintings under direct control of the Court or shogunate after introduction of the laws and ordinance system in the seventh century. This tradition has been handed down to folklore and ethnology of Japan in the Age of Academics, while introducing Western science in the modern period, as mentioned below, and has now evolved into *shizenshi* (anthropology of nature and culture) by integrating Western anthropology (physical anthropology and cultural anthropology) in the Age of the World.

**Age of Academics**

The seventy-eight years from the establishment of the new Meiji government in 1868, through the Taisho era (1912-1926), to the end of Pacific War in 1945 was the age of the evolution of Japan into a modern nation. In academic fields, Western science was introduced to Japan’s existing traditional science, which resulted in the creation of a variety of new fields of study and organizations. In anthropological studies, on the other hand, issues concerning the origin of the Japanese people and culture became the major focus. *Tsuboi* Shogoro and his associates founded the “Friends of Anthropology” in 1884, the predecessor of the Anthropological Society of Nippon, the Japanese Society of Ethnology and other organizations. It was renamed the Anthropological Research Society, the Anthropological Society, then the Anthropological Society of Tokyo in 1886 and to the present name the Anthropological Society of Nippon in 1941. In 1886, the first issue of the society’s journal *Jinruigaku Hokoku, Bulletin of the Anthropological Society* was published (Terada 1975: 31-3), where the foundation of anthropology in Japan was laid.

It is understandable that study was limited to setting up various hypotheses concerning the origins of the Japanese, since there was almost no accumulation of concrete data in those days. Shirai Mitsutaro (M.S. 1887: 70-5) and Koganei Yoshikiyo (1889a: 2-7; 1889b: 34-9; 1904) considered the Ainu to be Japan’s Stone Age people. *Tsuboi* Shogoro (1886:11-4; 1887a: 93-7; 1887b: 167-72; 1971-72), on the other hand, believed the Stone Age people in Japan were the Korobokkuru, who were mentioned in Ainu folk tales and thought to have lived before the Ainu. Furthermore, the explorer Torii Ryuzo conducted ethnological research over a broad area of northern Asia, including Liaodong, Manchuria, Mongolia, the northern Chishima (Kuril) Islands, Sakhalin and Siberia, since the latter half of the Meiji era until around 1940,
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*The journal was later known as *Tokyo Jinruigaku Hokoku*, *Bulletin of the Tokyo Anthropological Society*, *Tokyo Jinruigaku Zasshi*, *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Tokyo*, and then *Jinruigaku Zasshi, the Journal of the Anthropological Society of Nippon* in 1911.*
and set up a unique “Theory of Japanese-proper,” a hypothesis that first the Ainu migrated to the Japanese islands, then the Mongolian-Yamato people came from the north over to Kyushu and lived mixed with locals, followed by Indonesians coming to coastal areas, and finally a Mongolian closely related to the Tungus came from the north and became an emperor by annexing and assimilating the various ethnic groups to form a dynasty, which became the Yamato, or Japanese race (TORII 1975-77; TERADA 1975: 83-4).

The existence of Yayoi earthenware became known in 1896, and efforts were made to organize prehistoric data, including a chronological arrangement of Jomon-period history, during the Taisho era. KIYONO Kenji and KANAZKEI Takeo of Kyoto University and archaeologist HAMADA Seiryo believed that the culture during the Stone Age was neither the Ainu nor the present Japanese, but the proto-Japanese (KANAZKEI 1976; KIYONO 1925, 1982; KIYONO and KANAZKEI 1928; FUJOKA 1979: 47, 139-40). During the same period, HASEBE Kotondo of Tohoku University, who later founded the Department of Anthropology at the University of Tokyo, reached the conclusion that the people during that time were ancestors of the modern Japanese people, and those who migrated from the continent played an elemental role (HASEBE 1949, 1975; TERADA 1975: 150, 163-4). The theory that the people during the Stone Age were the proto-Japanese was based on the new idea that anthropological characteristics could change enough during a period of approximately 10,000 years to be observed, which is relatively short in human evolution history, when compared with various theories previously proposed in which they presumed that the present-Japanese came later to the Japanese Islands. The theory supported by HASEBE and other researchers formed the foundation for further development of the view that the Jomon, the people from Japan’s Stone Age, might have acquired modern Japanese characteristics by micro-evolution through changes in lifestyles (SUZUKI 1963, 1971, 1992), as well as formed the basis to arrive at the results of present research on the origin and formation of the Japanese, which assert the Jomon were the proto-Japanese, although the genetic influences of the Yayoi were significant, and there was a genetic gradient for Yayoi characteristics; that is, they peaked at western Japan where the Yayoi arrived and spread toward the north and south of the Japanese islands (HANIHARA 1996; IKEBA 1987; OMOTO 1995, 1996; YAMAGUCHI 1990). Accordingly, it was concluded that in addition to the Japanese, the ancestors of the Ainu, who have continuously held an important position in regard to the origin of the Japanese, were the Jomon.

Anthropological studies in this period covered not only what we today call physical anthropology, but also folklore, ethnology and prehistory. For this reason, materials and data on culture, in addition to characteristics of people in Japan and its peripheral areas, were exhaustively collected. In 1913, YANAGITA Kunio et al. (YANAGITA 1989-91) published Kyodo Kenkyu or Folk Studies (four volumes, ending in 1917) and Minzoku or Ethnos in 1925 (four volumes up to 1929). A meeting for Ainu studies was held in 1926 under the leadership of YANAGITA, in which KOGANEI Yoshikiyo, a physical anthropologist, and John BACHTELOR, a missionary and linguist as well as an ethnologist, participated (TERADA 1975: 190), and thus researchers exchanged their views on common subjects. In 1929, a society of ethnology was
organized, and its journal, *Minzokugaku* or *Folklore*, was published (publication ended in 1933). Then, a new society, the Japanese Society of Ethnology, was founded by some of the coteries in 1934, with the publication of its journal *Minzokugaku Kenkyu* or *The Japanese Journal of Ethnology* starting in 1935. During the same year, Yanagita Kunio played a central role in the establishment of the Society of Folklore (renamed the Folklore Society of Japan after World War II), and the journal *Minkan-densho* or *Folklore* was first published. Thus, ethnology, the comparative study of different ethnic groups, and folklore, the study of one's own ethnic group, were separated (Itoh 2002: 26-7; Terada 1975: 240). During the same period, anthropology and archaeology were divided, and special fields of study were established: physical anthropology, folklore, ethnology and archaeology. There was, of course, an approach to anthropology from a broad perspective, as that of Hasebe Kotondo, founder or the University of Tokyo's Anthropology Course in 1938, which was succeeded by the Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Science, the University of Tokyo after World War II. This was also the start of ecological anthropology in Japan as described in the section below.

The fields of folklore and ethnology were different; however, they used the same methodology, which is the traditional Japanese methodology to comprehensively describe the lives, cultures and traditions of humans. With the use of this methodology, the collection of the folklore and ethnological materials and data began. In 1869, the Hokkaido Development Commission was established, and the Sapporo Agricultural College in 1876, with W. S. Clark of the President of the Massachusetts Agricultural College serving as the Vice President, was founded. The college was then reorganized as Agricultural College, Tohoku Imperial University in 1907, and in accordance with the foundation of Hokkaido Imperial University, it was reorganized as Agricultural College of the university. The development of Hokkaido further increased after Japan gained the entire area of the Kuril Islands and the southern half of Sakhalin in accordance with the terms of Treaty of St. Petersburg in 1875 and the Treaty of Portsmouth in 1905 after the Russo-Japanese War. Along with this development, anthropological, archaeological, and ethnological materials and data in Hokkaido, Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands (Torii 1975-77; Suda 1939; Kono Tsunekichi 1974-75; Kono Hiromichi 1971-72), in particular those related to Ainu culture, were accumulated by many researchers including Kindaichi Kyosuke (1992) and Chiri Mashiho (1973-76) (Irimoto 1992; Yamada 2003: 77-87).

In 1910, as a result of the annexation of Korea, the Governor-General's Office of Korea was established in Keijo (present-day Seoul), and Keijo Imperial University was opened in 1926. After the Manchurian Incident in 1931, the establishment of Manchukuo was declared in 1932 (Hokkaido 1989: 387, 487, 489). Ethnological materials and data on the rituals, shamanism and family system of various northern people such as the Manchu and the Mongolian collected in these areas were published on *Tokyo Jinruigaku Zasshi*, *Jinruigakkai Zasshi*, *Minzokugaku Kenkyu*, *Manmo* and other journals by aforementioned Torii Ryuzo
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4 The journal was renamed *Nihon Minzokugaku* or *Folklore of Japan* after World War II.
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(TORII 1909a, 1909b), and other researchers (AKAMATSU 1936; KOBAYASHI 1932; KOBORI 1949; OYAMA 1941; TAKIZAWA 1937). In the end of this period, anthropological studies in northern areas from a socio-ecological perspective appeared; for example, socio-ecological studies on nomads in Da Hinggan Ling and Inner Mongolia by IMANISHI Kinji (IMANISHI 1974-75; 1995; 1974-75; IMANISHI and BAN 1948a, 1948b), UMESAO Tadao (1976, 1989-94) and other researchers, studies on the social structure and livelihood domain of the Orochon in Da Hinggan Ling by IZUMI Seiichi (1937), and studies on the social structure of the Orok (Uilta) in Sakhalin by ISHIDA Eiichiro (1941). In addition, institutions related to ethnological studies were established: the Institute of Ethnos in the second year of the Pacific War in 1943 and the Institute for the Study of Northwest (of China) in Zhangjiakou in 1944 (TERADA 1975; 257-9). However, in the following year, the war ended. UMESAO Tadao, who conducted research on dog sleds in Sakhalin as a student, as well as nomads in Da Hinggan Ling and Inner Mongolia, reported that research had been very difficult due to strict restrictions set by the Japanese military, so when the war ended, he thought that from now on he could carry out research freely (UMESAO 2003-04: personal communication).

As described above, it could be said that the issues surrounding the origin of the Japanese in the time of the creation of a modern nation in Japan were associated with the formation of an ethnic-national identity. Along with the movement of “One Nation’s Folklore,” folklore — the study of one’s own ethnic group — traced the identity of the Japanese inward through the country’s history. In contrast, ethnology — the comparative study of different ethnic groups — explored outwards to seek the identity of the Japanese. After the war, such explorers extended their studies as far as to Africa, Himalaya and Andes.

Age of the World

The period of fifty-five years from 1945, when the Pacific War ended, to 2000, when the twentieth century ended after the collapse of the post-war structure of bipolar confrontation, was the age of social and economic reconstruction for Japan under a new democratic system. In the field of anthropology, with the introduction of cultural anthropology from the United State, a universal issue of anthropology — “What are human beings” — became the central focus, rather than issues surrounding the origin of the Japanese, which was associated with the conventional ethnic-national identity. This period is the Age of the World, so to speak, in which the area of academic interests is expanded to the world.

The broad view of HASEBE Kotondo — “Physical anthropology is the study of the natural history of man of all times and regions” (HASEBE 1927: 3) — was inherited by the Department of Anthropology in the University of Tokyo. It engaged in studies aiming to clarify the relationship between human physics and technology based on the idea of viewing anthropology as a comprehensive science focusing on the “works” of men (SUGIURA 1951: 2). After the War, the Department of Cultural Anthropology was separated from the Department of Anthropology, but maintaining its stance of viewing anthropology as “one comprehensive

As northern studies, the Department of Anthropology dealt with northern hunter-gatherers using evolutionary-ecological and functional approaches; for example, life of the Ainu during the last half of the nineteenth century was rebuilt and described by WATANABE Hitoshi from ecological and structural-functional viewpoints (WATANABE 1964/1972), and he further argued that the Jomon society in Japan was a stratified one (WATANABE 1990). As part of the International Biological Program, research on the adaptability to northern climates and genetics of the Ainu were carried out (Seibutsuken 1970). In respect to northern studies at the Department of Cultural Anthropology, characteristics of Japanese culture with multi-ethnic origins were revealed based on the comparison of cultural elements, especially the myths, between the north and south, by OBAYASHI Taryo (OBAYASHI 1961, 1999). SUE (HARA) Hiroko, a student of cultural anthropology at Bryn Mawr College, U.S.A., conducted research on the Hare, the northern Athapaskan people as a part of work on her doctoral dissertation (SUE 1965). Concerning studies on the Alaskan Eskimos, OKA Masao of Meiji University carried out three field surveys (WATANABE et al. ed. 1961; GAMO 1964). SOFUE Takao (1972) engaged in psychological anthropological research on Eskimos, and MIYAOKA Osahito developed linguistic anthropology, discussing not only linguistics, but also the relationship between culture and language of Yup'ik Eskimos, and encouraged the Project on the Endangered Languages by actually teaching the Eskimo language to Eskimos in cooperation with the University of Alaska (MIYAOKA 1979, 1987, 1994).

The ecological anthropological studies focusing on human activities were developed in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Tokyo. Activities, also referred to as works, were considered as the subject of scientific research, which could be recorded and analyzed according to time and space through fieldwork (IRIMOTO 1973, 1977a, 1977b, 1977c, 1977d; WATANABE ed. 1977a, 1977b). Based on this methodology, I conducted an ecological anthropological research on the Athapaskan (Dene) in the Canadian subarctic (IRIMOTO 1979, 1981). The relationship between the ecology and worldview of caribou-hunters was further discussed, and published along with the records showing the process of the fieldwork (IRIMOTO 1983/2002). These studies formed the foundation of the theory and methodology for shizenshi — anthropology of nature and culture (IRIMOTO 1996), which was presented in a later year.

5 From 1970 to 1977, I studied anthropology at the Department of Anthropology, Graduate School of Science at the University of Tokyo under the guidance of WATANABE Hitoshi. In addition, I received instruction in northern ethnology from OBAYASHI Taryo through personal guidance and seminars offered by the Department of Cultural Anthropology. To further pursue northern studies, I traveled to Canada to study at the Graduate School of the University of Manitoba and later at the Graduate School of Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. During my stay, I conducted ecological-anthropological fieldwork on the Chipewyan caribou-hunters, the Athapaskan language family, in the Canadian subarctic for 15 months in 1973 and between 1975 and 1976. Then I worked on my doctoral dissertation at Simon Fraser University between 1978 and 1979 and received my Ph.D. This dissertation was later published by the National Museum of Ethnology in 1981, for which I worked, and it was selected to be included in Yale University's Human Relations Area Files in 1989.
As the National Museum of Ethnology was established in 1974 and opened 1977, through the endorsement of IZUMI Seiichi and UMEASO Tadao, who had been involved in northern studies before World War II, I was employed to develop joint studies on comparative research of northern hunter-gatherers with support from Director-General UMEASO Tadao, Director of Research Department SOFUE Takao, a psychological anthropologist; Director of Research Department KATO Kyuzo, a researcher of documents in Siberia and Central Asia (KATO 1974); and KOTANI Yoshinobu, a researcher of the cultural history of Alaskan Eskimos (KOTANI ed. 1980). In Japan, northern culture was conventionally framed in a relatively narrow sense as culture in the peripheral areas of Japan, such as Ainu culture. Having lively conversations with such scholars as WATANABE Hitoshi and OBAYASHI Taryo, who have a broad anthropological view over several years in these joint studies, in which researchers of northern studies throughout Japan gathered, I came to believe that it was necessary to compare and verify cultures commonly seen in the broad area of Northern Eurasia and North America. This broad view toward northern culture was in accordance with the internationally-accepted view of circumpolar — the North Pole and its periphery, and formed the foundation of my idea to study Eurasia, Japan and North America as a continuous and unified northern region as I described in the beginning of this paper regarding the definition of northern culture.

Meanwhile, the Institute for the Study of North Eurasian Cultures at Hokkaido University was considered as the unique Institute for northern cultural studies in Japan.⁶ Its predecessor was the Research Institute for Northern and Arctic Culture, established by the Hokkaido Imperial University in 1937 as a research institute within the university. It developed unique fields of study in anthropology, folklore, ethnology and archaeology of northern areas, particularly those concerning the Ainu, and its achievements resulted in a twenty-volume Studies from the Research Institute for Northern and Arctic Culture (1939-1965). During this period, anthropological and ethnological materials and documents and data on Hokkaido history were gathered together. They are currently stored in Northern Studies Collection, Hokkaido University Library, School of Medicine, and Museum Faculty of Agriculture. In 1947, Hokkaido Imperial University was renamed Hokkaido University. In 1966, the Research Institute for Northern and Arctic Culture was merged with the Institute of Eurasian Cultural Studies, which was established in 1964 in the Faculty of Letters, and newly established as a government facility, the Institute for the Study of Northern Eurasian Cultures, Faculty of Letters, Hokkaido University. Taking over Studies from the Research Institute for Northern and Arctic Culture (1939-1965) and Bulletin of the Institute of Eurasian Cultural Studies (1965), the institute published its research results on cultural anthropology and archaeology of northern areas in Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of North Eurasian Cultures Hokkaido University, twenty-one volumes (vols. 2-22, 1967-1995). However, since the
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⁶ After working at the National Museum of Ethnology from 1977 to 1984, I moved to the Hokkaido University in 1984 and worked there up to the present (2005). From 1996 to 2003, I also served for the National Museum of Ethnology as a Visiting Professor.
institute accomplished a certain level of success and fulfilled its immediate role, it was closed in accordance with the reorganization of Faculty of Letters in 1995. Then, the Institute for the Study of Northern Cultures was newly established in Faculty of Letters and Graduate School of Letters to engage in research and education with the purposes of promoting research of northern areas including Eurasia, Japan and North America (IRIMOTO 1993; 2003: 362-3).

At the former Institute for the Study of North Eurasian Cultures, I started research on northern cultures, focusing on that of the Ainu, in addition to the research of North America and Tibet that I had worked on at the National Museum of Ethnology. In respect to Ainu studies, as described in the Section of “Age of Exploration” in this paper, I started with a historical and cultural anthropological analysis of the Ainu in the Saru River region. Then, a bibliographical database on the Ainu was created, and a series of research on ecology, shamanism, ethnicity, identity, cultural revitalization, cultural creation and others were published during the twenty years up to the present day (YAMADA 2003: 87-8). Meanwhile, various northern cultures were comprehensively compared. With the goal of clarifying the characteristics of various northern cultures, Hoppo Gakkai, or the Northern Studies Association (NSA), was established, and its journal *Hoppo Gakkai Ho or Northern Studies Association Bulletin* (ten volumes, nos. 1-10, 1992-2004) was published. In addition, international collaborative research was promoted. The first international symposium, the “International Conference on Religion and Ecology in Northern Eurasia and North America,” was held at Hokkaido University in 1991, in which, in addition to WATANABE Hitoshi, OBARASHI Taryo and other researchers, internationally eminent pioneers in northern studies, including Frederica de LAGUNA from Bryn Mawr College, U.S.A. and Åke HULTKRANZ from the University of Stockholm, Sweden, presented papers (IRIMOTO and YAMADA eds. 1994). Subsequently, the second international symposium of the Northern Studies Association “Animism and Shamanism in the North” was held in 1995 (YAMADA and IIMOTO eds. 1997) and the third international symposium of the Northern Studies Association “Ethnicity and Identity in the North” in 2000 (IRIMOTO and YAMADA eds. 2004), which culminated in three volumes of research results consisting of 77 anthropological and ethnological papers on northern cultures by researchers who participated in these symposiums from twelve countries: Japan, the United States, Canada, France, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Russia, Hungary, China, Mongol and the U.K.

The first significance of the series of northern studies was that they were international collaborative studies. As a result, northern cultures, which had been approached with the focus on Japan, were able to be characterized from an international viewpoint. The second significance was that those who had been researched, such as the Ainu, indigenous American people, the Sami and the Mongols, participated in the symposiums on an equal footing with

---

researchers, and presented papers on common subjects. The third significance was that the most recent anthropological issues were chosen and discussed, and thereby new paradigms for anthropology were acquired and distributed. Finally, the fourth significance was that a variety of unique studies were promoted and developed through the exchange of knowledge at the international symposiums.

For example, YAMADA Takako (1994, 2001a) discovered that the worldview of the Ainu was complimentary dualism. Based on this, she pioneered fieldwork in post-Soviet Siberia to research shamanism and the view of nature in Sakha (Yakut), and unveiled that the philosophy of symbiosis with nature worked as a message for the restoration of ethnicity and identity (YAMADA 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2002b, 2004). Additionally, she conducted studies on environmental conservation and religion in association with oil development in Siberia based on the fieldwork, targeting Khanty (YAMADA 2001b; YAMADA and GLAVATSKAYA 2002).


Then, as an area study of northeast Asia including northern regions, SEGAWA Masahisa at the Center for Northeast Asian Studies, Tohoku University, conducted the cultural anthropological researches on the ethnicity of Han in South China (SEGAWA 1993; TSUKADA et al. ed. 2001), and TAKAKURA Hiroki (2000) analyzed socio-economic aspect of contemporary reindeer herders of east Siberia. SUGA Yutaka (2002) at the Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, analyzed the subsistence strategies of Sho in China from the viewpoint of folklore and ecological anthropology, WATANABE Hibi (2003), discussed the politics and culture of the post-Soviet Buryat. Henry STUART at Hoso University and OMURA Keiichi at Osaka
University discussed the cultural change and reproduction among the contemporary Inuit (STUART 1996; OMURA 1998).

Meanwhile, I clarified characteristics of northern cultures, including the "original oneness" and the recognition of reciprocity between humans and deities, based on the comparison between the Ainu in Japan and the Athapaskan in North America (IRIMOTO 1983/2002, 1994, 1996). Furthermore, I started new fieldwork for the first time as a foreigner in the post-Soviet Kamchatka region in 1993, 1995 and 1997 to conduct anthropological research on the ecology, worldview and rituals of reindeer-herding Koryak, and clarified the origin of and changes in nomadism and their idea of cosmic cycles based on the comparison between hunting and herding (IRIMOTO 2004b). In addition, I analyzed the worldview of and changes in shamanism in Inner Mongolia, China and Mongolia (IRIMOTO 2002), thus developing my research on the cultural dynamics of various ethnic groups, primarily in Northeast Asia (IRIMOTO ed. 2002).

In northern areas, including Eurasia, Japan and North America, socio-economic changes, restoration of ethnicity and identity, and cultural dynamics after the collapse of the bipolar post-war confrontation have become common anthropological issues. Thus, northern studies have developed into the studies on the Age of the World.

Conclusion

Northern studies in Japan have gone through unique changes and developments during the long history before modern times. Research subjects have changed from Ainu culture to a variety of cultures in broad northern circumpolar areas including Northern Eurasia, Japan and North America. Study methodology also has changed from folklore and ethnology to *shizenshi* — anthropology of nature and culture, and study objectives have shifted from the clarification of the origin of the Japanese and their culture to the clarification of universal issues in anthropological studies, i.e., "What are human beings?"

*Shizenshi* (spontaneous/natural record) referred here is a new anthropological theory and methodology, which could be called anthropology of nature and culture. The literal interpretation of *shizen* is "nature" in English; however, it also includes meanings "as it is, or whole truth" in Japanese, and -*shi* means "record." Here, human beings are considered as nature as well as culture, and human lives, which is the common field for both physical anthropology and cultural anthropology, becomes to be a study subject. Also, human lives are considered as systems of activities. *Shizenshi* is accordingly the systemic description of human activities, in which culture and nature overlap each other. Empirical observational method is methodology that observers identify themselves with subjects and experience their world from inside (IRIMOTO 1996: 9-21; IRIMOTO 2004b: 291).

I characterize *shizenshi* as the integration of Japanese and Western sciences. Its framework as a whole is consisted of objective descriptions based on the traditional Japanese view of nature, and Western analytic thinking — "how" and "why" — are part of it. Traditional
Japanese thinking — in which nature and culture are not regarded as two conflicting concepts, but considered essentially the same — can be recognized in Ainu pictures and archives depicting human surrounded by nature. Furthermore, it has been descended to the tradition of anthropology by HASEBE Kotondo, SUGIURA Kenichi and WATANABE Hitoshi, members of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Tokyo, all consistently placing greater importance on the “works” and “activities” of human beings, while adapting Western scientific anthropology since the Meiji era; Japanese folklore tradition by YANAGITA Kunio, whose academic goal and methodology was comprehensive description avoiding analysis; and anthropology tradition in Japan by ISHIDA Eiichiro of Department of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tokyo, who stressed that anthropology was “one comprehensive science,” even when cultural anthropology was introduced after World War II, and focused on the understanding of human beings in general. While I succeeded to these traditions, I have also added a bit of the liberal spirit for human studies in socio-cultural anthropology I learned in Canada to them. I believe that if we can broadly present Japanese thought through shizenshi, a new perspective in the field of anthropology, it may beneficially contribute to the field of anthropology in the world.

Through shizenshi, “original oneness” based on the idea that humans and animals are essentially the same, the recognition of the relationship between human and the supernatural has reciprocity, and the recognition of nature as a whole, including human from a perspective of cycle and symbiosis, were extracted as characteristics of northern cultures. It was then unveiled that these ideas were closely connected with ecology, society and worldview in hunting-based northern areas. However, I believe these characteristics might be some universal ideas of human beings not limited to northern cultures alone. To clarify why such ideas were born and how they now function in the framework of human evolution history is to understand the human mind and also to answer the anthropological thesis, “What are human beings?” Northern studies developed from the exploration of northern cultures to the search for the universality of human beings.

Studies on the ethnicity and identity in northern cultures have revealed that the idea of symbiosis played the role of resolving ethnical conflicts. The importance of the functions of the symbiotic idea and agency in the creation and restoration of Ainu culture was accordingly pointed out (IRIMOTO 1995b, 2001, 2004c). The first half of the twenty-first century is said to be the age of ethnic conflicts. As seen in the collapse of socialistic states and other events, this is because the relationship between states and ethnic groups and that among ethnic groups have changed, and ethnic groups who had been oppressed started to assert themselves. A number of people were killed or became refugees during large conflicts involving such violations. It is therefore thought that various mechanisms for conflict resolution, once integrated into culture, must be illuminated using an anthropological approach.

If northern studies are able to contribute to the resolution of these problems, answers to not only the question “What are human beings?” but also the thesis “How should human beings live?” will be surely provided. Through northern studies, we encounter issues common
to human beings in addition to those unique to northern cultures. To talk about northern cultures is no longer to talk about issues of the limited areas. It is to discuss current anthropological issues, which can be seen beyond such limits, such as ecology, religion, nations, language, states, ethnicity, identity, society, activities, the mind, evolution, conflicts and conflict resolutions, and roles of studies. If this is the case, as an outlook for the future, we may be able to call the twenty-first century the “Age of the Humanity” for anthropology.
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