

REFERENCES CITED

AMINO Yoshihiko 網野善彦

1993 *Nihon tsūshi* 日本通史 [Complete history of Japan], 1. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

OHNUKI-TIERNEY, Emiko

1987 *The monkey as mirror*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

KUWAYAMA Takami
Soka University
Tokyo

SŌGAWA TSUNEO 寒川恒夫 editor. *Sumō no uchūron—Juryoku wo hanatsu rikishitachi* 相撲の宇宙論——呪力をはなつ力士たち [The cosmology of sumō: Wrestlers that radiate magical power]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1993. 255 pages. Plates. Hardcover Yen 2,200; ISBN 4-582-48405-0. (In Japanese)

In *Sumō no uchūron* Sōgawa Tsuneko of Waseda University has brought together six articles on the ever-popular subject of sumō wrestling. Taken together they illuminate a number of different aspects of this fascinating sport.

Two articles in particular deserve mention. Tanigawa Akio's "Edo no sumō to gangu" [Edo sumō and toys] deals with the relation between the growth of Edo and the popularity of sumō dolls and toys. The growing population and increasing commercial importance of Edo was crucial in the formation of an "Edo-ite" spectator mentality that made possible the definitive establishment of sumō in the city. This growing popularization, in turn, influenced the world of children's games in many ways. The author makes a number of interesting observations on the role played by sumō toys (specially *sumō-ningyō* 相撲人形 and *doro-menko* 泥面子) in Edo children's life.

Kaneda Eiko's contribution concerns a topic that has never received monographic treatment: "Onna-zumō—Mō hitotsu no ōzumō" [Women's sumō: The other sumō]. Though in existence until the middle of this century, *onna-zumō* has always been neglected in discussions of sumō in Japan. This irreverent but important part of popular sumō culture was relegated to obscurity by efforts to make sumō a national and respectable sport.

Kaneda later raises the question of the classification of the different types of sumō in her discussion of *kōgyō-zumō* 興行相撲 (spectacle sumō), *chihō-zumō* 地方相撲 (regional sumō), and *amagoi-zumō* 雨乞い相撲 (sumō as a petition for rain). The problem of classification, arising from the scarcity and ambiguity of the historical records, crops up repeatedly throughout the book.

One example is Sōgawa's article "Sumō no kigen to tennō [The emperor and the origins of sumō], which proceeds through a domain of dangerously shifting sands, multiple possible interpretations, and enormous historiological difficulties in an attempt to trace the genealogy of sumō. A concern with the origins of sumō is not recent. In the late Edo period, for example, sumō—at the time a popular but clandestine sport—tried to reconstruct its past in order to make itself acceptable to the bakufu's political elite. One offspring of this attempt was a fictitious bridge with the court sumō (*sechie-zumō* 節会相撲) practiced centuries ago. Dodging the question of whether different types of sumō can also have different roots, Sōgawa claims a

“consanguineous” connection, not only between Edo sumō and *sechie-zumō*, but between all the various types of sumō practice.

Another quest for pedigree is presented by Yamada Tomoko in her “Dohyō matsuri to Shugendō” [The ring-opening ceremony and Shugendō]. Yamada tries to persuade us of a close affinity between sumō and Shugendō, using the *dohyō matsuri* as evidence. She sees in sumō the mimicry of certain purification rituals, and emphasizes the role played by *sechie-zumō* as a nation-purging ritual.

Surprisingly, Takioto Yoshiyuki, in his contribution “Kodai no sumō to ratai” [Ancient sumō and the naked body], makes an effort to demonstrate just the opposite: that sumō is of a profane character. Although the wrestler’s naked body has always been considered the symbol of sacred innocence and genuine purity, Takioto, examining the range of evidence from ancient haniwa sculpture to modern ethnography, contends that throughout history sumō has been practiced more as a recreation and amusement than as a religious event. Nor do written records on sumō reveal any connection with religion. The nakedness of the wrestlers (demonstrating their weaponlessness) emphasizes more the ideal relation between human beings (justice and equality) than an association with the kami.

The concern with origins that pervades all of the papers seems to send the authors off on speculative peregrinations to the sources of sumō, as if sumō were a meteor or an archeological artifact. This treatment brings to mind attempts to explain cultural phenomena not in terms of their social significance but in terms of their historical continuity with the past. Perhaps to offset this bias, Setoguchi Teruo in “Enjirareru sumō” [Sumō performed] calls the attention of ethnographers to the fabulous diversity of sumō in contemporary Japan.

The selection of articles presented in Sōgawa’s book pretty much guarantees its originality, given the dearth of academic literature on sumō. In terms of theory, however, the book does not move far from the symbolistic treatment of MIYAMOTO Tokuzō (1985) or the anthropologist YAMAGUCHI Masao (1987a and b); neither does it straighten the convoluted historic streams of past studies. According to the preface, the book attempts to demonstrate the *bunkasei* 文化性 (culturality) of the sumō cosmology. Although he never precisely defines *bunkasei*, Sōgawa attributes to it a universal, transcultural character. In spite of the various modern inventions present in sumō symbology, they refer—according to Sōgawa—only to the form; the meaning (i.e., the *bunkasei*) latent in all sumō formulations is remote, and lost in a ubiquitous cosmology inherited from time immemorial. Altogether this is a labored attempt to give coherence to the phenomenological variety that has been questionably labeled “sumō.”

REFERENCES CITED:

MIYAMOTO Tokuzō 宮本徳蔵

- 1985 *Rikishi hyōhaku: Sumō no arukeorojii* 力士漂白——相撲のアルケオロジ—— [Wrestlers’ wanderings: The archeology of sumō]. Tokyo: Ozawa Shoten.

YAMAGUCHI Masao 山口昌男

- 1987a Sumō ni okeru girei to uchūkan 相撲における儀礼と宇宙観 [Ritual and cosmology in sumō]. *Kokuritsu rekishi minzoku hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku* 国立歴史民俗博物館研究報告 15: 99–130.
- 1987b Minzoku geinō toshite no sumō—pafomansu to cosumorojī 民俗芸能として

の相撲—パフォーマンスとコスモロジー [Sumō as popular performing art: Performance and cosmology]. *Minzoku geinō kenkyū* 民族芸能研究 5: 1–13.

Francisco J. TABLERO
Tokyo University
Tokyo

CHINA

GUAN JIAN. *The Indigenous Religion and Theravada Buddhism in Ban Da Tiu: A Dai Lue Village in Yunnan (China)*. *The South East Asian Review* 17, nos. 1–2. Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies, 1992. ii+60 pages. Paper; n.p.

It is still relatively rare to find modern anthropological studies, based on fieldwork and written in English, by scholars from the People's Republic of China. The present study is one of them. Guan Jian has given us an extraordinarily valuable account of the religious institutions of a Dai (Tai) Lue village, Ban Da Tiu, in Mengla county, Xishuangbanna Dai Autonomous Prefecture, Yunnan Province. The topic on which Guan has focused—the concomitance of folk religion and Theravada Buddhism in a Tai-speaking community—is, of course, not new to Southeast Asian anthropology; we have a shelf of fine studies on the subject from Burma and Thailand (e.g., BROHM 1963; KIRSCH 1977; PFANNER 1962; SPIRO 1967; TAMBIAH 1970; TERWIEL 1975). The great value of Guan's work is that it is from China, and postdates the Cultural Revolution.

Guan's "Background of Dai Lue Society" (chapter 2) is an excellent adumbration of the traditional politico-administrative structure of Xishuangbanna, from the ruling prince, the *zhao pienling*, through the chiefs of the twelve *panna* (*zhao panna*), the lords of the thirty-four *muang* (*zhao muang*), down to the village headmen (*zhao ban*) and, finally, the household (*hen*) heads. Interestingly, though the former principedom and its twelve *panna* were abolished by the Communist regime when it assumed power in 1950, the old divisions of *muang* (traditionally, the irrigation units) and *ban* (natural villages) have been retained as the "township" and "village" units in the present administrative structure of Xishuangbanna Dai Autonomous Prefecture.

Chapter 3 is Guan's introduction to her study community, Ban Da Tiu, located close to the Lao border and sixty kilometers from the prefectural capital of Jinhong. The description gives the impression, at one level, of a fairly typical seventy-six-household Tai rice-farming village, such as one would expect to find all over these Sino-Southeast Asian borderlands, from North Thailand through the Burmese Shan State, northern Laos, and into Yunnan. But of special interest is Guan's portrait of a vibrant on-going religious tradition, in both its Buddhist and its folk dimensions. It is difficult to remember how close we still are to that frenzied decade (1966–76) of political turmoil and antireligiosity that marked Chairman Mao Zedong's Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. (Incidentally, I experienced something of the same sense of surprise when, in Xishuangbanna and in neighboring Lancang County of Simao Prefecture, I attended Lahu Shi and Lahu Na temple rituals and soul-recall rites with Lahu friends who are card-carrying CCP members—and proud of it!)

Ban Da Tiu is an exclusively Dai Lue community, with the exception of a few unmarried Han carpenters. It is not, however, a particularly isolated settlement. The