Comparative Mythology Synchronic and Diachronic: Structure and History for Taryo Obayashi and Claude Lévi-Strauss

HITOSHI YAMADA
Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan

Abstract: Taryo Obayashi (1929–2001) [1] was a prominent ethnologist whose wide range of interests covered kinship and family, subsistence and economy, and myth and history, among other things. Training in Frankfurt a.M. with Adolf E. Jensen, and in Vienna seeing the collapse of the so-called Culture History School, the way Obayashi studied myths appears — at least superficially — to be historically oriented. However, scrutinizing his writings carefully, it turns out that he employed structural analyses of myths more often than one would expect.

In contrast, the alleged protagonist of structural mythology, Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009), had a profound interest in history and diffusion especially earlier in his career. His opus magnum, *Mythologiques* (4 vols., 1964–71), presupposed also historically formed commonalities of American Indian mythologies as a basis for his structural exploration.

In this paper, I will
1) briefly describe Obayashi's biography and the role he played in the academics of Japan in the 1960s–90s, a period that is less known outside the country;
2) focus on the historical background of Lévi-Strauss' studies of myths;
3) shed light on the "structural-genealogical" methodologies of Obayashi, in particular in his *Structure of Japanese Mythology* (1975); and finally
4) suggest that synchronic and diachronic viewpoints will enrich our understanding of myths when employed complementarily.

Keywords: Taryo Obayashi, Claude Lévi-Strauss, mythology, structuralism.

1. Taryo Obayashi: A Brief Biography

Obayashi was born in Tokyo on May 10, 1929 as son of Professor Ryoichi Obayashi, who studied and taught insurance science at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo. From childhood he was interested in prehistory, ancient history, and especially in Japanese mythology. During his study of national economy at Tokyo

---

[1] Cf. Paproth, Hans-Joachim & Hitoshi Yamada, 2002 [with a bibliography of 67 publications by Obayashi in English, German, French and other Western languages].

University, he became acquainted with ethnologists and folklorists like Masao Oka, Eiichiro Ishida and Kunio Yanagita. In 1952 the newly graduated Obayashi became Assistant Professor at the Institute for Oriental Cultures, one of the humanities institutes of his alma mater, and wrote several articles on Southeast Asian cultures and societies. The main result of his studies at this time was his first monograph, entitled *Kinship System of the Peoples in the Mainland of Southeast Asia* (1955).

From the 1955/56 winter semester to the 1956 summer semester, Obayashi studied in Frankfurt a.M., mainly with Adolf E. Jensen and Wolfram Eberhard. Jensen's *Myth and Cult among Primitive Peoples* (1951) had had a deep influence on the young Japanese scholar even before his trip to Europe, while Eberhard, the German-born and USA-based sinologist, then Guest Professor at University Frankfurt, orientated Obayashi's later methodologies. Between 1956 and 1959, he studied ethnology and prehistory at Vienna University, with a one-year interruption as Visiting Scholar at Harvard University with the anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn. Obayashi's teachers at Vienna were Wilhelm Koppers, Robert Heine-Geldern and Josef Haekel, all of whom were more or less distanced from the so-called Culture History School (*Kulturhistorische Schule*), particularly after the death of its leader, Pater Wilhelm Schmidt, in 1954. Obayashi's Vienna days ended with his acquisition of the title *Doktor der Philosophie* with his dissertation, *The Swine in China and Southeast Asia* (1959)[2].

Between 1962 and 1990, Obayashi taught Cultural Anthropology at the University of Tokyo, then from 1990 to 1997 at Tokyo Woman's Christian University. He was president of the Japanese Society of Ethnology from 1982 to 1984, and director of the Hokkaido Museum of Northern Peoples from 1990 to 1996. On April 12, 2001, he passed away in Tokyo.

Obayashi's range of studies was very wide: he wrote about Amerindian cultures (especially in his earlier years), material culture, kinship and social organizations, economy and prehistory. The basis of his long activities lay in his two previously mentioned monographies on the kinship systems (1955) and subsistence economy (1959) of Southeast Asian peoples. I am of the opinion that these essays on the foundation of societies served as a solid foothold for his later works on myths, religions and worldviews.

Though sometimes misunderstood, he was not an armchair anthropologist. His fieldwork took place among the Lawa and the Sgaw Karen in North Thailand (1963), in Sarawak (1979), Yunnan and Sichuan (1985, 89, 90), Myanmar (1987), Hainan (1990), Indonesia (1991), Guangxi (1992), and Fujian (1992 and 95), in addition to fieldwork at many times and places in Japan.

Besides his fieldwork experience, his works were always based on voluminous literary research, an attitude which distinguished him from his contemporary colleagues in Japan during the 1960s to 90s. He read, in addition to his mother tongue, English, German, French, Dutch and Chinese, and wrote in Japanese, English and German. When you learn how many articles and books Obayashi published, edited or translated, in how many conferences and symposia he participated, and how often he traveled, it is hardly believable that he had time

---

[2] Due to this, Obayashi was called "Doctor Swine," a friendly nickname, at Vienna University (according to Prof. Josef Kreiner).

for his hobby, detective novels. Finally, in his private life, Obayashi was a good husband and the father of one daughter.

2. Encounters with Brazil

Here is a rather minor episode. In May 1937, a young French ethnologist went on a field trip, organized by the National Museum of Brazil, in the suburbs of Rio de Janeiro, with "a Japanese scholar" (Lévi-Strauss 2012: 84). The French man was Claude Lévi-Strauss, about to turn 29, then Professor at the newly established São Paulo University. The Japanese scholar, whose name is not mentioned in *Tristes Tropiques*, was the anthropologist and archaeologist, Ryuzo Torii, then aged 67, sent there as cultural ambassador for the Japanese government. The only known fact is that on this occasion they examined a burial urn of the Tupi, and conducted an excavation (Asano 2010).

Coincidentally, nearly 20 years later, in October 1958, a 29-year-old Japanese man visited São Paulo. This was Taryo Obayashi, who finished his visiting scholarship at Harvard and was going back to Vienna by way of Costa Rica, Peru, Bolivia, and Brazil. Despite his short stay in São Paulo, Obayashi managed to survey a digging stick of the Chavante, housed in Paulista Museum, the result of which was published in 1964. It is interesting that Obayashi, who later developed Torii's theories on the ethnogenesis of Japanese, also left his footprints in Brazil.

That both mythologists, Lévi-Strauss and Obayashi, encountered Brazil in their younger years is surely a mere coincidence. However, they have several points in common: they both started their careers with kinship systems and proceeded to myth comparisons; both read a vast amount of ethnographies and had wide perspectives, although one was an expert in the Americas, the other in Southeast Asia.

In the following sentences, I would like to focus more on their hidden sides, i.e. not the usually recognized views of Lévi-Strauss as a structuralist and Obayashi as a historical ethnologist.

3. Lévi-Strauss, a Diffusionist

In the Journal *Renaissance*, issued 1944/45, we find an interesting article with the title "Split Representation in the Art of Asia and America" (Le dédoublement de la représentation dans les arts de l'Asie et de l'Amérique), written by Lévi-Strauss. This text, later included in his *Structural Anthropology* (1958), reveals the author's view on history and structure.

At the outset, he criticizes past diffusionists:

Contemporary anthropologists seem to be somewhat reluctant to undertake comparative studies of primitive art. We can easily understand their reasons. Until now, studies of this nature have tended almost exclusively to demonstrate cultural contacts, diffusion phenomena, and borrowings. The discovery of a decorative detail or an unusual pattern in two different parts of the world, regardless of the geographical distance between them and an often considerable historical gap, brought enthusiastic proclamations about

common origin and the unquestionable existence of prehistoric relationships between cultures which could not be compared in other respects. Leaving aside some fruitful discoveries, we know to what abuses this hurried search for analogies "at any cost" has led.
(Lévi-Strauss 1963: 245, tr. by Claire Jacobson (= CJ))

This passage appears to be a criticism against diffusionism. Still, the renderings of Lévi-Strauss in the overall article are quite ambiguous. Why? Because, I think, the fact that he addressed similar art representations among the Northeast Coast, China, Siberia, New Zealand etc. reveals sufficiently that he had some historical background in mind. The following is another citation from the same article:

Do we rest, then, on the horns of a dilemma which condemns us either to deny history or to remain blind to similarities so often confirmed? Anthropologists of the diffusionist school did not hesitate to force the hand of historical criticism. I do not intend to defend their adventurous hypotheses, but it must be admitted that the negative attitude of their cautious opponents is no more satisfactory than the fabulous pretensions which the latter merely reject.
(Lévi-Strauss 1963: 247–248, tr. CJ)

Thus, Lévi-Strauss does not defend diffusionists, while he is not entirely satisfied with their opponents. Then, what is it that he attempts to pursue?

Even if the most ambitious reconstructions of the diffusionist school were to be confirmed, we should still be faced with an essential problem which has nothing to do with history. Why should a cultural trait that has been borrowed or diffused through a long historical period remain intact? ... External connections can explain transmission, but only internal connections can account for persistence. Two entirely different kinds of problems are involved here, and the attempt to explain one in no way prejudges the solution that must be given to the other.
(Lévi-Strauss 1963: 258, tr. CJ)

In this declaration, while affirming the diffusion and borrowing of cultural traits, he tries to address another dimension to explain their persistence. In order to do so, he paid attention to what was "in men's minds" (Lévi-Strauss 1963: 266), and proclaimed, "let us appeal to psychology, or the structural analysis of forms" (Lévi-Strauss 1963: 248).

According to Junzo Kawada (1972), a Japanese pupil of Lévi-Strauss, the latter had a strong interest in extreme diffusionists like Elliot Smith in his student days. In his first academic year in São Paulo, Lévi-Strauss held lectures on cultural diffusionism in a quite convincing way. The above article presupposes also cultural diffusion and borrowing in the Circumpacific area over its long history. Lévi-Strauss' "structure" had, so to speak, "history" as its basis or presupposition.

4. The Americas in the Circumpacific

In 1948 Lévi-Strauss returned to France, and subsequently published his dissertation, *Elementary Structures of Kinship* (1949), which had a large impact on different fields. Obayashi was one of the Japanese scholars who esteemed the book very highly, as I will discuss shortly.

In 1955, when Obayashi set forth on a trip to Frankfurt, our French ethnologist published the prolegomena of his myth studies, "The Structural Study of Myth," then in 1959 "The Story of Asdiwal." Lévi-Strauss' opus magnum, *Mythologiques*, appeared finally in four volumes, in 1964, 1966, 1968 and 1971 respectively. Now, let us examine how the author viewed history in this work. I would like to refer to three relevant places in it.

The first is the only Japanese myth, rather unexpectedly appearing in the midst of 813 myths Lévi-Strauss cited in the quartet. It is "M_{311}, Japan, 'The crying baby'" (Lévi-Strauss 1973: 378–379), in which the deity Susanowo is said to have been crying all the time longing for his dead mother. The myth is compared with its Amazonian (M_{86a}) and Cashinawa (M_{313}) parallels, with the same title 'The crying baby.' According to Lévi-Strauss, "[w]hether Japanese or American, all these myths closely follow an identical pattern. The crying child is a baby who has been abandoned by his mother, or has been born posthumously." And "[t]his excessive longing for conjunction with the family, which the myths usually situate on a horizontal plane … involves in every case a vertical disjunction of the cosmic type" (Lévi-Strauss 1973: 380, 381).

This is not the place to evaluate this analysis. The point is that Lévi-Strauss did compare the myths on both sides of the Pacific. For this "rapid excursion into a more remote region of mythology," the author made the following apology:

> I shall not try to justify my action, and I admit that it is irreconcilable with a sound use of structural method. I will even refrain from using as an argument, in this very special case, my deep conviction that Japanese mythology and American mythology, each in its own way, are using sources which go right back to paleolithic times and which were once the common heritage of Asiatic groups later disseminated throughout the Far East and the New World.
> (Lévi-Strauss 1973: 378, tr. by John & Doreen Weightman (= JDW))

Clearly, Lévi-Strauss mentioned here the possible existence of common myths before the migration from Asia to the Americas took place in the Paleolithic. This is again a comparison based on the Circumpacific human history, as was the case in the art motifs.

The second interesting set of remarks that Lévi-Strauss made in his work refer to the Finnish School. He summarized the methodology of this school as: carefully listing all extant versions of any given story transmitted by the oral tradition; dividing up the story into the shortest themes or episodes; calculating the frequency with which these themes occur; drawing up a distribution chart; comparing the numerical values and their geographical distribution; picking out

those types which are relatively older; and finally establishing the source from which they originated.

Lévi-Strauss accepts the validity of this method: "In so far as it sets out to ascertain facts, this method is not open to criticism," but does not fail to point out the shortcomings of this school that "[l]ittle or no attempt is made to effect a reduction that would show how two or more themes, superficially different from each other, stand in a transformational relationship to each other" (Lévi-Strauss 1978: 227, 228).

What does this mean? The best explanation is given, as I see it, in the last volume, *The Naked Man*, where the author lets a skeptical reader ask:

> ...agreed, a group of myths belonging to tropical America reappears unchanged in North America. But what does that prove, apart from the fact that America was populated by successive waves of immigrants from Asia, who brought with them myths, some of which still remain recognizable in several of their North American and South American versions? This has been known for a long time and there is no lack of myths with parallel versions in the North and the South.
> (Lévi-Strauss 1981: 37, tr. JDW)

This criticism stems, according to Lévi-Strauss, from a misunderstanding of his intention. Because he is "not trying to discover why these resemblances occur, but how." The myths he compares may appear different from each other. In this case, they had been treated as different myths. But Lévi-Strauss held them as transformations. He argued:

> This method does not always need to appeal to history, but neither does it completely disregard history. Since it brings out unsuspected links between the myths and classifies the variants in an order which at least indicates the necessary sequence of certain transformations, it raises historical problems suggesting hypotheses that history, left to itself, might otherwise not have thought of and, in so doing, provides more effective help than could be given by any prosaic inventory of the already available findings of history.
> (Lévi-Strauss 1981: 38, tr. JDW)

Now it seems quite clear. Lévi-Strauss did not disregard the history of the Americas. Rather, one of the reasons why the structural analyses in *Mythologiques* was successful to a certain extent is that the migration history of early Americans resulted in more or less common myths and cultural traits that enable a mass comparison. Thus, the Americas in the Circumpacific and the migration history therein supported — albeit implicitly — the named works of Lévi-Strauss.

5. Obayashi as Introducer of Lévi-Strauss to Japanese Academia

Taryo Obayashi was one of the first introducers of Lévi-Strauss in Japan. The former's mentioned work, *Kinship System of the Peoples in the Mainland of*

Southeast Asia (1955) praised the latter's *Elementary Structures of Kinship* (1949) as "an epoch-maker," and summarized its contents critically.

Interestingly, both scholars thus began their career with kinship studies, then proceeded to mythology almost simultaneously: as mentioned above, "The Structural Study of Myth" by Lévi-Strauss appeared in 1955, while the first article on mythology by Obayashi, "Solar Eclipse Myths in Southeast Asia," was published one year later (Obayashi 1956).

However, Obayashi distanced himself from his French colleague's myth studies. For instance, in his *Introduction to Mythology* (1966a), Obayashi referred to "The Story of Asdiwal" and, after providing an overview of Lévi-Strauss' analytical method, tried to locate it in a larger academic context:

> This idea of Lévi-Strauss is, in a sense, a development of the theories on mind categories, a tradition of the French sociological school since Durkheim. Besides, such structural analyses of myths as those of Lévi-Strauss had been attempted by G. W. Locher and W. H. Rassers, both of whom belonged to the Dutch Leiden school.
> (Obayashi 1966a: 42, tr. is mine – H. Ya.).

Thus, the myth studies of Lévi-Strauss were surely "refreshing" (Obayashi 1966b) for Obayashi, but no "epoch-maker" like the former's kinship studies. In any case, there is no doubt that Obayashi was one of the first to introduce Lévi-Strauss' kinship and myth studies into Japanese academia.

6. Obayashi's Structural Analyses of Japanese Mythology

Lévi-Strauss' is not the only structural analysis of myths. Obayashi recognized more value in Georges Dumézil's geographically more restricted analyses of mythology, and he applied the latter's classification of pantheon to Japanese mythology. The result was "The Logic of Classification in Ancient Japan," which was first published in 1971 and included in the book *The Structure of Japanese Mythology* (1975).

Why did Obayashi prefer Dumézil to Lévi-Strauss? Let us listen to the apology by Obayashi himself:

> Surely, the structural analysis of Japanese mythology attempted in this book stems from direct or indirect influences and stimulus of South and North American Indian mythology analyzed by Lévi-Strauss.
> (Obayashi 1975: 7, tr. is mine – H. Ya.)

However, there is a difference in the nature of myths of "South American primitive [sic] peoples" Lévi-Strauss analyzed on the one hand, and those of Ancient Japanese mythology on the other. In the former case, namely, each myth seldom forms a larger system as a whole, with single myths existing next to others. Japanese mythology, to the contrary, is systematized in a temporal sequence.

Therefore, in contrast to Lévi-Strauss, who in the first volume of his *Mythologiques* chose a myth of the Bororo as a starting point, then compared and analyzed its variants among different South American peoples, I myself wish to consider the importance of Japanese mythology as a system, and would like to compare and analyze similar plots or structures within the same system. ... Furthermore, what I want to clarify here is not the Lévi-Straussian panhuman logic of myth, but the logic of ancient Japanese mythology.
(Obayashi 1975: 7, tr. is mine – H. Ya.)

Thus, there were differences not only between the sources both our scholars employed, but between the levels of structure and logic they were investigating as well. Obayashi's analyses of Japanese mythology lead to the result that the structure of Japanese and Indo-European mythology resembles each other. The reason for this Obayashi saw in the historical connection of both peoples mediated by Inner Asian Altaic herders, an approach, which Obayashi called "structural-genealogical" theory.

7. Lévi-Strauss Relativized

In the 1970s, Obayashi tried to relativize Lévi-Strauss by comparing the latter's method with other structural analyses of myths, such as those of Dumézil, Vladimir Propp, and the Romanian folklorist Mihai Pop. Nevertheless, the structural mythology of Lévi-Strauss enjoyed a tremendous vogue during that decade in Japan. Obayashi never ceased to warn against such trends:

The method of Lévi-Strauss is just one of many methods to study mythology. That the former can solve some fields does not disprove the importance of other inherited methods and the significance of the fields they can solve.
(Obayashi 1973: 269, tr. is mine – H. Ya.)

Despite these efforts, the dominant picture of Japanese academia came more and more under the influence of Lévi-Strauss. Although I myself can only imagine what it was like at that time, I cannot help recalling the passage of *Tristes Tropiques*, where the atmosphere of São Paulo University in the 1930s is described:

Our students wanted to know everything but, whatever the field of interest, only the most recent theory seemed to them to be worthy of being memorized. They were indifferent to all the intellectual feasts of the past, which in any case they only knew of by hearsay since they did not read the original works, and were always ready to enthuse over new dishes. But in their case fashion is a more appropriate metaphor than cooking: ideas and theories held no intrinsic interest for them; they were merely instruments of prestige and the important thing was to be the first to know about them. To share a theory with other people already acquainted with it was like

appearing in a dress that had already been worn; it entailed a loss of face. (Lévi-Strauss 2012: 103, tr. JDW)

8. Structure and History

From a worldwide perspective, after the intellectual movement called structuralism prospered in the 1950s and 60s, it was playing a "swan song" in the 1980s (Dosse 1992).

Obayashi also stopped introducing and applying Lévi-Strauss' theory, and crystallized his estimation of it. For Obayashi, the merit of structural mythology was the idea of transformation, with which apparently different myths can now be compared with each other. In short, the mythology of Lévi-Strauss was, for Obayashi, just one of many methods, probably because the latter believed that human cultures are so complex that an anthropologist should be eclectic, employing many theories.

Lévi-Strauss, too, albeit in a quite different context, pointed out the fallacy of seeing myths from a single point of view:

Max Müller and his school must be given great credit for having discovered, and to some extent deciphered, the astronomical code so often used by the myths. Their mistake, like that of all mythologists of the period and more recent ones too, was to try to understand the myths by means of a single and exclusive code, when in fact several codes are always in operation simultaneously.
(Lévi-Strauss 1981: 44, tr. JDW)

Thus, for him too, "[i]t is impossible to reduce the myth to any one code" (Lévi-Strauss 1981: 44).

What can we learn now from both scholars? We have seen that their works in fact contained both synchronic structure and diachronic history. In the end, however, their mythologies appear to be extremely different, partly because of their different academic backgrounds, or perhaps because of their different personalities. Ultimately, though, I would like to propose that they followed opposite tracks: Lévi-Strauss presupposed history to seek after structure, while Obayashi employed structure in order to explore history.

References

Asano, Takuo. 2010. San Pauro, toki no madobe de: Rebi-Sutorosu to "wasurerareta Nihonjin." [São Paolo, by the window of the time: Lévi-Strauss and the "forgotten Japanese"]. *Lebi-Sutorosu: Nyumon no tame ni — shinwa no kanata e*: 114–125. Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha (in Japanese).

Dosse, François. 1992. *Histoire du structuralisme*, 2 tomes. Paris: Éditions La Découverte.

Jensen, Adolf E. 1951. *Mythos und Kult bei Naturvölkern*, 2. Aufl. (Studien zur Kulturkunde; 10). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Kawada, Junzo. 1972. Jinruigaku no shiten to kozo bunseki [Anthropological perspective and structural analysis]. *In*: Lévi-Strauss, *Kozo jinruigaku*, tr. by Ikuo Arakawa et al.: 427–451. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobo (in Japanese).

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1949. *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

_____. 1955. The Structural Study of Myth. *Journal of American Folklore*, 68(270): 428–444.

_____. 1959. La geste d'Asdiwal. *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études (Science religieuse)*: 1958–1959: 3–43.

_____. 1963 [1944–45]. Split Representation in the Art of Asia and America. Translated by Claire Jacobson. *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Basic Books: 245–273

_____. 1964. *Le Cru et le Cuit*. (Mythologiques; I). Paris: Plon.

_____. 1966. *Du miel aux cendres*. (Mythologiques; II). Paris: Plon.

_____. 1968. *L'Origine des manières de table*. (Mythologiques; III). Paris: Plon.

_____. 1971. *L'Homme nu*. (Mythologiques; IV). Paris: Plon.

_____. 1973 [1966]. *From Honey to Ashes: Introduction to a Science of Mythology*, Vol. 2. Translated by John & Doreen Weightman. London: Jonathan Cape.

_____. 1978 [1968]. *The Origin of Table Manners*. Translated by John & Doreen Weightman. (Mythologiques; Vol. 3). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1981 [1971]. *The Naked Man*. Translated by John & Doreen Weightman. (Mythologiques; Vol. 4). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____. 2012 [1955]. *Tristes Tropiques*. Translated by John Weightman & Doreen Weightman. (Penguin Classics). New York: Penguin Books.

Obayashi, Taryo. 1955. *Tonan Ajia tairiku shominzoku no shinzoku soshiki [Kinship System of the Peoples in the Mainland Southeast Asia]*. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkokai / Tokyo Daigaku Toyo Bunka Kenkyujo (in Japanese).

_____. 1957. Tonan Ajia no nisshoku shinwa no ichi kosatsu [A consideration on solar eclipse myths in Southeast Asia]. *Toyo Bunka Kenkyujo Kiyo*, 9: 217–287 (in Japanese).

_____. 1959. *Das Schwein in China und Südostasien. Beiträge zur Urgeschichte, Linguistik, Sinologie und Völkerkunde*. Dissertation Wien.

_____. 1966a. *Shinwagaku nyumon [An Introduction to Mythology]*. Tokyo: Chuo Koronsha (in Japanese).

_____. 1966b. Gaisetsu: Shinwa to shinwagaku [Introduction: myth and mythology]. *In*: *Gendai no Esupuri*, 22 (Shinwa). Tokyo: Shibundo: 5–9 (in Japanese).

_____. 1973. Shinwa kenkyu no ayumi [History of myth studies]. *In*: Dento to Gendai sha (ed.), *Nihon shinwa no kanosei*. Tokyo: Dento to Gendai sha: 259–275 (in Japanese).

_____. 1975. *Nihon shinwa no kozo [Structure of Japanese Mythology]*. Tokyo: Kobundo (in Japanese).

Paproth, Hans-Joachim & Hitoshi Yamada. 2002. [Obituary of] Taryo Obayashi 1929–2001. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 127: 139–146.