

Editors' Introduction: Towards an Archaeology of Japanese Ritual and Religion

Mark J. HUDSON & Simon KANER

The Neo-Babylonian king Nabonidus (d. 538 BC) is often said to have been the world's first archaeologist. Nabonidus's interest in the ruins and inscriptions of ancient Babylon was motivated by a pious desire to better serve the gods. Right from the very beginning of archaeology, therefore, there has been a profound interest in ancient religion. Since then archaeology and religion have had an intimate if occasionally stormy relationship. Archaeology is largely concerned with the study of material items that have been preserved from the past, and that demand explanation within specific cultural contexts, while the study of the history of religion (particularly in Japan) can teeter on the brink of teleology, in which the differences between past and present and the diversity of past religious structures are sacrificed at the altar of progressive evolution. The aims of this special issue on "Archaeological approaches to ritual and religion in Japan" are threefold:

- 1) to show what the historical study of Japanese religion can gain from incorporating an archaeological approach;
- 2) to demonstrate that the material evidence for past Japanese religious activity is a rich repository for exploring the way in which archaeological material operates;
- 3) to show that it is not possible to fully understand the processes that constitute the history of Japan without considering religion.

In this introduction we would like to set these aims in the context of recent advances in archaeological thought. We will begin by considering the general relationship between archaeology and religion, dealing in particular with the identification of ritual practices in archaeological remains and the interpretation of those remains in terms of reconstructed religious systems. This necessitates a discussion of how ritual operates to reproduce and transform those religious systems, often through the

use of symbolically meaningful material culture. Our pilgrimage will deliver us from the temptations and confusions that lurk in the vales of esoteric empiricism into the light of explicit theory, past the negotiation and manipulation of ideologies towards a realization of the need for critical self-awareness concerning our interpretation of the past and its relationship with the present. In this way we will reach a clearer understanding of the nature of the history of religious behavior in Japan and the significance of religion in the elucidation of Japanese archaeology.

The relationship between archaeology and religion in Japan is of particular interest because of the tremendous potential it offers for investigating two important approaches to ritual in archaeology and anthropology in general. One is the exploration of the historical specificity of ritual practices and their meaning with regard to individual religious structures. The other is the illumination of general cross-cultural materialist definitions of ritual. The papers in this special issue deal much more with the first issue, and herein lies their strength for contributing to the second.

This potential is great for a number of reasons. First, the amount of archaeology done in Japan, in terms of numbers of excavations and their scale, is enormous in comparison with other areas in the world. There are now some 400,000 known archaeological sites in Japan, many of which are under threat of destruction due to the massive development Japan has undergone since World War II (TSUBOI in press). Second, as the papers in this issue demonstrate, a large amount of the archaeological material recovered is considered to be ritual in nature. Indeed, this is true to such a degree that to offer general interpretations of the periods in question without incorporating ritual and religion would be negligent at best and meaningless at worst. How, then, can we identify religious and ritual remains in archaeology?

The Identification of Ritual in Archaeology

Religious behavior is manifested in religiously motivated ritual practices which often leave traces in the archaeological record. The papers in this issue show to what degree ancient Japanese ritual practices fit into cross-cultural generalizations about ritual (GARWOOD et al. 1991). The first of these generalizations is that rituals are perceived as being significant to the reproduction of society. The second is that the rituals include many references to the past, which may involve the use of apparently archaic symbolic arrangements. The third is that ritual provides a forum for the projection of ideal conceptions of social life. These three are important to the way in which ritual is ascribed a certain kind of meaning. BARRETT (1991) sees this ascription as taking on a kind of textuality, in which an act of interpretation is required to give the ritual "text" some meaning

at the time of its enactment. This interpretation is validated by referring back to what the people who first conducted the ritual are supposed to have meant by it. In other words, the meaning of ritual is seen as originating beyond the ordinary experience of everyday life. Such readings are also open to various forms of manipulation by those in authority.

Two classes of ritual may be identified. First are public-institutional rituals, which are important in the legitimation of the social order, and second, non-institutional ritual practices (TILLEY 1984, p. 115). Most of the papers in this issue deal with the former, with only Ishino making much mention of household rituals. In the pre- and protohistoric studies, these include rites of passage, from tooth ablation to the sending back of animal spirits to the other world, and calendrical rites, such as agricultural festivals. There may have been an underlying tension between these two types of ritual that served to mediate between different levels of the social group and different strata of society, such as households and communities. Of central importance to understanding the historical processes in the development of Japanese religions is the apparent emphasis on one of these types of ritual, or the transformations in the relationships between them.

Four specific identifiers of ritual in the archaeological record have been proposed that are considered to add up to an archaeology of cult (RENFREW and BAHN 1991, pp. 358–63). These identifiers are: evidence for the focusing of attention through the demarcation of special spaces and times; the presence of a boundary zone between this world and the next; some indication of the presence of the divine; some evidence of participation and offering. Most if not all of these are reflected in the following papers.

While these identifiers seem straightforward, there are problems with assuming that we will always find evidence of the distinction between the sacred and the profane or that they will all be visible in the archaeological remains of any particular rite. Notions of sacredness, purity, and pollution are very important in later Japanese religion, but to what extent can they be extended back into Japanese prehistory? Further, how can this distinction be seen as providing a dynamic force in the reproduction and transformation of Japanese religious culture?

Interpretation in the Archaeology of Religion

Once ritual is identified, where can the archaeologist turn in search of interpretation? HAWKES (1954) was of the opinion that the reconstruction of systems of belief was the most difficult goal of archaeological inference, much harder than technological, economic, or social systems, and largely beyond reach. With the rise of the so-called new or processual archaeology in the 1960s, it was suggested that since all

aspects of behavior were related in a systematic fashion, ideology could be directly linked to changes in the technological and social realms (see BINFORD 1962). Building on current trends in American anthropology, culture was defined as conferring adaptive advantage. Processual archaeology was thus explicitly materialist in KOHL'S sense that it "accords greater weight to a society's behavior than to its thoughts, reflections, or justifications for its behavior (1981, p. 89). Since behavior was seen as an interrelated system, the New Archaeology was initially confident of its ability to understand ideology, and critical of traditional approaches exemplified by Hawkes's ladder of inference, where religion was at the very top and more or less out of reach. In reality, however, problems of ritual and ideology have found little place in processual archaeology. The few studies that were performed have been criticized on theoretical grounds for their tendency to "see style, symbolism, ideology, and cultural meaning as conferring adaptive advantage. If pushed, all will *re-duce* culture to survival" (HODDER 1991, p. 20; emphasis in original)

Since then we have come a long way in archaeological epistemology. Dissatisfaction with the American processual school was particularly strong in British archaeology in the late seventies and early eighties. A number of scholars began to move away from materialism to a more idealist approach to prehistory. In other words, they believed that "there is some component of human action which is not predictable from a material base, but which comes from the human mind or from culture in some sense" (HODDER 1991, p. 18). The application of such ideas to archaeology was influenced by European traditions of structuralism and Marxism, where they had already been used by prehistorians to some extent. The French prehistorian LEROI-GOURHAN, for example, had presented a structuralist interpretation of Palaeolithic cave art as early as 1965. In this process, ritual and ideology have been set firmly on the archaeological agenda, and there is now a range of interpretive approaches from which to choose (see GARWOOD et al. 1991).

Although Hawkes realized the importance of religion in understanding the past, its role in cultural and historical processes was viewed as epiphenomenal by cultural materialists, for whom the demographic and economic infrastructure govern the superstructure of which religion is a part. This approach is anathema to an archaeology of religion. The implication that religion is not important in explaining cultural change has allowed items and features put in the ritual category to be overlooked except as curiosities. This approach ignores how religion actually operates in cultural contexts, something that has been remedied to some extent by studies that have seen religion as ideology, motivating and being used in the reproduction and transformation of the social order (CONRAD and DEMAREST 1984; MILLER and TILLEY 1984).

The question of interpretation is a contentious one in contemporary

archaeological thought. The problem involves the verification of ideas about how material culture operated in the past. It is particularly acute where religion and ritual are concerned because on one side lies the study of religion as a proper concern of the archaeological discipline, while on the other lies the lunatic fringe of archaeological speculation, in which Jōmon figurines are representations of aliens from outer space (GREENE 1978). The rules of engagement in archaeological discourse are all important here, and of particular relevance is the form of interpretive device used. The analogical reasoning that underlies much archaeological reconstruction needs to be made explicit. Thus in the papers that follow, analogies are drawn from historical accounts, ethnology, and ethnography.

The use of these analogies provides some of the context within which archaeological material designated as ritual is interpreted. A further step is to examine the relationships within the material itself, in terms of location, decoration, form, and so forth. This is the staple fare of everyday archaeology. The spatial and temporal dimensions of archaeological material are of the utmost importance, and although we have tried to keep discussions of typologies of material culture and the associated nomenclature to a minimum, the use of typology is inherent in archaeology and is a crucial aspect of the material through which religion is being approached in this special issue. The importance of these relationships, which can be used to build up some notion of how the material record of religion is structured, has been stressed recently, and there is tremendous potential for following this up in Japanese archaeology.

These approaches form the basis of a contextual archaeology of ritual, in which its social role, the form of particular practices and the interpretation of the belief systems to which ritual practices referred and from which they took their meaning can be understood.

How can we get at the social role of religion through the archaeological record? A religious system is partly constituted through the ritual practices performed by its believers and these are often social in nature. Thus ritual has often been portrayed as an instrument of social solidarity or as a method of ideological control, in both functionalist and structural-Marxist accounts. Many studies, however, have stopped there and not gone on to explore what is specific to ritual practices that distinguishes them from the purely social. Many of the papers in this special issue demonstrate the contribution to this debate made by the study of Japanese religious archaeology.

That material culture, namely objects and parts of the physical world, plays an active role in structuring social relations is an important precept of much recent archaeological theorizing (MILLER and TILLEY 1984). The way in which the natural world is brought to bear on early Japanese religions is also very important. The settings in which rituals

take place and the way in which material and natural entities are imbued with religious spirit offer a way to investigate not only the nature/culture divide (an opposition often denied in the world view of contemporary Japan, cf. MORRIS-SUZUKI 1991), but also to see how the natural world comes to play a very active role in the perception of early Japanese cosmologies. These points are amplified in the studies of in this issue. The main way in which this idea has been put into practice is through the interpretation of symbolism.

The study of symbolism in archaeology has been closely linked with the use of the methods of structuralist thinking in archaeology. The adoption of structuralism was made partly in reaction to what was seen as the hegemony of functionalist interpretations, and partly out of a concern over classificatory systems and their role in culture (HODDER 1982). That material culture is used symbolically in ritual to express meaning is well established, but it is equally clear that meaning is not necessarily expressed in a straightforward way. In the first place the relationship between the form of the expression and its meaning is often vague. In addition, symbolism may be deliberately ambiguous, inverted or subverted. It may mean different things to different people, or at different times and places.

The use of that favored structuralist device, the structural opposition, is worthy of note here. Designed to show how classificatory systems work, they are problematic in that they do not express the full range of meanings that each element expressed. Moreover, they were not intended to show how change comes about, and we must be careful of imposing normative, unchanging classifications on cultural systems that would have been continuously renewed and renegotiated partly through the religious systems and ritual practices that an archaeology of religion seeks to educe. Structural opposition does, however, provide a useful way of identifying dualisms, such as sacred and profane, purity and pollution, private and public, nature and culture – areas of potential tension relating to classificatory systems that crop up throughout the papers.

Material culture may have a multiplicity of symbolic meanings that will change as the artifacts pass through a series of cultural contexts, from being manufactured with particular purposes in mind (Chiyonobu, in this issue), to being carefully buried or ritually deposited (Kidder, Ishino), to being deliberately broken and discarded (Yamagata). Rubbish itself often takes on particular significance and the act of deposition may be votive in nature. Symbolic systems are likely to incorporate many aspects of the world within which people live. Not only is material culture imbued with meanings, but so are the animals people deal with (see especially Hudson and Utagawa), and the landscapes, the milieu in which lives are led (see Ishino).

One of the main areas in which ritual symbolism has been explored has been that of death and burial (CHAPMAN et al., eds. 1982; MORRIS 1987). It has also been the focus of much debate concerning social organization. Rituals surrounding death and burial in Japanese archaeology are covered in the papers by Hudson, Ishino and in particular Tanigawa. However, the way that meaning is symbolically expressed through material culture is not necessarily straightforward, as discussed above, and so in interpreting the archaeological remains of funerary ritual we need to bear in mind that there is not always a direct relation between apparent mortuary customs and the social role of the deceased in life.

Archaeology and the History of Japanese Religion

It must be stressed that the theoretical developments just discussed have mainly been the products of universities in Britain and North America, and have had little or no effect on Japanese archaeology. The aim of processual archaeology was not to get at the person behind the artifact, but the system behind both the person and the artifact. Such an objective could hope for little support in Japan, where archaeology is still seen primarily as national history and most textbooks take the “becoming of the Japanese people” as their basic theme (e.g. SAHARA 1987, SASAKI 1991). Although the approach espoused by British post-processualism would seem more acceptable to Japanese archaeologists, this has also had minimal influence in Japan, something that can be partly explained by the extreme materialism of much of Japanese archaeology. Despite this, a number of types of religious systems are reconstructed by the authors in the following pages, and archaeology is used to suggest the ways in which these systems were formed and maintained. There is a special relationship between material culture and belief systems that shows the latter in a different light from other classes of evidence, for example written sources, demonstrating the importance of archaeology to the study of early Japanese religions.

While several books provide guides and overviews to important sites for the archaeology of religion in Japan (e.g. ONO 1982a and 1982b), one of the most substantial syntheses of Japanese religious archaeology is the multi-volume *Shintō kōkōgaku kōza*, which deals with all periods in the development of Shinto archaeology. While this is a convenient overview, it is also a good example of how archaeology has been seen as national history in Japan. The general editor, ŌBA Iwao (1899–1975) attempted to interpret prehistoric Japanese religion as research on “primitive Shinto.” Ōba described Shinto archaeology as “the origins of our country’s unique beliefs and the religious phenomena that grew from them through the study of sites and artifacts” (1981, p. 3). This ap-

proach, whereby ancient Japan is explained a priori by its relation to the modern nation, is common to many fields of Japanese scholarship. "The *nihonjinron*, (and here we may include a specific genre, that vast number of academic works on Japanese origins) simply assume the existence of a 'Japanese tribe' for the prehistoric period, and read back into its culture those features of outlook which later generations have come to consider as unique to their country" (DALE 1986, p. 50).

Central to such a view of the past is the assumption that if one travels far enough back in time, an original or pristine Japanese culture is to be found. This expression reaches its extreme in the work of Umehara Takeshi. Umehara argues that successive waves of foreign influence have fundamentally changed Japanese culture since the Yayoi period, and that it is only when one goes further back into the Jōmon period that one can find an original "Japanese" culture. He further argues that this original culture has remained in part amongst the Ainu in Hokkaido and the Okinawans in the Ryūkyū Islands, and that it is thus possible to gain some understanding of pre-Buddhist Japanese religion through studying these remnant peoples (UMEHARA 1992, pp. 24-36).

While we applaud Umehara's call to study the relationship between the Ainu, the Okinawans, and the mainland "Wajin" Japanese, we see a number of major faults in the approach typified by his work. In subsuming the Ainu and Okinawans into a "Japanese" past, he denies these people the possibility of their own separate pasts. As the paper by Utagawa demonstrates so ably, Ainu archaeology needs to be assessed on its own terms rather than being seen as part of a progressive evolution towards a homogeneous modern Japan. More importantly for our own present purposes, Umehara seriously undermines the role of interaction between the mainland Japanese and the people of the north and south in forcing changes within these latter populations.

The idea that the "purest" Japanese culture is to be found the furthest back is a *reductio ad absurdum* well illustrated in Joan STANLEY-BAKER'S statement that at the earliest Shinto sacred precincts "worship took its purest form, in total silence *with no ritual*" (1984, p. 27; emphasis added). This returns us to our first aim for this special issue, by which we would like to stress that ancient Japanese religion and culture should be studied in their own right rather than as primitive forms of later, in many ways quite different, cultures. This is not to deny that there may be unifying strands that run through Japanese religious history, but the existence of such long-term structures is a beginning rather than an end in the understanding of prehistoric religion. We believe that archaeology is uniquely positioned to understand very long term cultural sequences, as well as the detailed historical characteristics of each particular period (e.g. BINTLIFF 1991; HODDER 1987; KNAPP 1992).

The papers by Yamagata, Hudson and Ishino demonstrate some of the

tremendous regional and chronological variation in religiously motivated behavior within the different phases of Japanese pre- and proto-history. These papers show how effective use can be made of myth and early historical sources to elucidate prehistoric behavior. The main key is the interpretation of material culture, and this forms the link with later papers.

Yamagata Mariko's discussion of the remarkable numbers of broken clay figurines from the Middle Jōmon Shakadō site in Yamanashi shows the importance of patterning in interpreting the archaeological record. Such patterning includes the spatial distribution of artifacts across a particular site, differences in the numbers of artifacts between sites and archaeological regions, and the patterning observed in the ways the artifacts were broken, leading to the idea that certain artifacts were designed to be deliberately broken as part of a ritual practice.

Mark Hudson's detailed review of Yayoi ritual sets out to demonstrate how cultural change in the period following the introduction of rice agriculture was negotiated through a series of ritual structures that were distinctively different from what had gone before in the preceding Jōmon period, when cultural change was much less pronounced (though see NISHIDA 1989). Hudson raises the question of the relationship between economy, society and religion, showing how rituals are important and anything but epiphenomenal. Some of the problems involved in addressing regional and temporal diversity in archaeology are also considered, providing the basis for a discussion of the Yayoi religious revolution.

The notion of religious revolution forms the core of Ishino Hiro-nobu's introduction to Kofun-period ritual. In the third century AD there appear to have been deliberate attempts to separate the new religious order from what went before. This involved the deliberate breaking of a large amount of material culture, a practice that although similar in form to the breaking of Jōmon figurines in Yamagata's paper is clearly to be interpreted as having a different motivation.

The importance of material culture in the study of religion continues into the historical period. There are many more written sources for this period, of course, but these often need to be reevaluated (rather than merely filled out) on the basis of archaeological evidence. The papers by Chiyonobu Yoshimasa and J. Edward Kidder deal with the early Buddhist period. Introduced from Korea in the middle of the sixth century, Buddhism has had an immeasurable impact on the religious life of the Japanese. At first, however, its role was as much political as religious. Buddhism was adopted along with other elements of continental high culture in order to further centralize the early Japanese state. With its sophisticated artistic images, its appeal was above all visual, and the

artifacts of early Buddhism have long been studied by both archaeologists and art historians.

Chiyonobu's paper on Tōdai-ji shows how the techniques of careful archaeological excavation can be used to understand the history of such religious monuments. Tōdai-ji is one of the great monuments to state Buddhism in Asia. Begun by the Emperor Shōmu in 745, it was a massive undertaking which severely tested the resources of the nation. Building the temple involved hollowing out the side of Mt Wakakusa to depths of from 10 to 30 m, and in total some 1.6 million laborers were used (COALDRAKE 1986). Shōmu encouraged each citizen to contribute to the project even if it was no more than a twig or a handful of dirt. The data presented by Chiyonobu give us detailed archaeological support for the scale and complexity of the organization behind the erection of what was perhaps the most impressive artifact of state religion in Japan.

While the Daibutsu is one of the most obviously visible monuments of Japanese Buddhism, the *fukuzō* of Kidder's paper, are among the least visible (although also among the most elaborate). Kidder's discussion demonstrates the complex interplay between historical text and archaeological material called for in Buddhist and historical archaeology. It is, however, the artifacts themselves that stand out in this analysis, as being assigned a very important role in the protection of the holy relics. Material culture is considered to mediate between the worlds of the sacred and the profane, warding off the danger from angry kami, frequent fires, and prophecies of disasters that come true.

Utagawa Hiroshi's careful consideration of the Ainu *iomante* rituals, based on the sending off of bear spirits to the other world, tackles the problem of how we can define cultures on the basis of the rituals and beliefs that are thought to lie at their heart. This is interesting not only in relation to the comparable problems in the prehistoric studies in trying to define what ritual regionalization means, but also in that cultural identity is often so closely associated with "central rituals." In addition, it is significant that the resurrection of the *iomante* ritual is part of the revival of Ainu culture going on at present, showing how rituals are actively used and are very important in the process of reproducing culture. This paper also shows how the specificity of the ritual associations are important, indicating that caution needs to be exercised in assuming that similar rituals occurred in earlier periods. Once again, similarity of ritual form does not necessarily mean the ritual factors had the same social significance.

The papers by Tanigawa Akio and Uchiyama Junzō both deal with the Edo period. During the 1980's the archaeology of the medieval and modern periods came into its own with a massive increase in excavation and debate. A whole new field of Japanese scholarship is now being opened up (see BLEED 1991). This interest in more recent archaeology

is by no means surprising when one considers the role the past plays in the formation of current Japanese identities (cf. ROBERTSON 1991). "Edo archaeology" still remains in its infancy, however, with its full agenda yet to be realized. As far as we are aware, Tanigawa's and Uchiyama's papers are the first full articles to be published in English on Edo archaeology. We hope they indicate some of the potential contributions of archaeology to Edo studies in general, as they both force reassessments of fundamental aspects of life in the Edo period.

Tanigawa's paper (appropriately on the subject of burials, since the first excavation of an Edo period site [in 1958–1969] was carried out on the shoguns' graves at Zōjō-ji in Minato-ku, Tokyo), deals a blow to those who would extend the emphasis on the *ie* (extended family) back into early history and prehistory by suggesting that this social principle really only came about at the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century. Meanwhile Uchiyama's article on the animal remains at San'ei-chō dispels the myth that there was a strictly observed taboo on meat eating in the Edo period. What is particularly worthy of note concerning these papers in the general context of this introduction is that we see here approaches developed to deal with the archaeology of prehistoric religions and cultures being used to enlighten more recent historical periods, resulting in often startling mismatches between historical assumptions and the testimony of the spade. They demonstrate our contention that ancient Japanese religious practices need to be dealt with in their own context rather than as simple precursors to their modern counterparts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very grateful to Edmund Skrzypczak for his translation of Ishino Hironobu's paper, Tom Kirchner for his translation of Utagawa Hiroshi's article, and Paul Swanson for his translation of the paper by Tanigawa Akio. The papers by Yamagata Mariko and Chiyonobu Yoshimasa were translated by Mark Hudson, and the paper by Uchiyama Junzō by Simon Kaner. We would like to thank Paul Swanson in particular for his enthusiasm and encouragement for this project and for seeing it through so smoothly with an efficiency many site directors can but aspire to. We would like in addition to thank the staff of the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture for their assistance and hospitality during the preparation of this issue.

REFERENCES

BARRETT, John

1991 Towards an archaeology of ritual. In GARWOOD et al., 1-9.

BINFORD, Lewis R.

1962 Archaeology as anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28: 217-25.

BINTLIFF, John, ed.

1991 *The Annales School and Archaeology*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

BLEED, Peter

1991 Historic archaeology in Japan. *The Japan Foundation Newsletter* 19/1:13-17.

CHAPMAN, Robert, Ian KINNES, and Klaus RANDSBORG, eds.

1982 *The Archaeology of Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COALDRAKE, William H.

1986 The architecture of Todai-ji. In *The Great Eastern Temple: Treasures of Japanese Buddhist Art from Todai-ji*, organized by Mino Yutaka, 33-47. Chicago and Bloomington, Indiana: The Art Institute of Chicago and Indiana University Press.

CONRAD, Geoffrey W. and Arthur A. DEMAREST

1984 *Religion and Empire. The Dynamics of Aztec and Inca Expansionism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

DALE, Peter N.

1986 *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

GARWOOD, Paul, David JENNINGS, Robin SKEATES, and Judith TOMS, eds.

1991 *Sacred and Profane. Proceedings of a Conference on Archaeology, Ritual and Religion Oxford 1989*. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 32.

GREENE, Vaughn M.

1978 *Astronauts of Ancient Japan*. Millbrae, Ca.: Merlin Engine Works.

HAWKES, Christopher

1954 Archaeological theory and method: some suggestions from the old world. *American Anthropologist* 56: 155-68.

HODDER, Ian

1982 *Structural and Symbolic Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

1991 *Reading the Past*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HODDER, Ian, ed.

1987 *The Archaeology of the Long Term*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KNAPP, A. Bernard

1992 *Archeology, Annales, and Ethnohistory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KOHL, P.

1981 Materialist approaches in prehistory. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 10: 89–118.

LEROI-GOURGAN, A.

1965 *Prehistoire de l'Art Oriental*. Paris: Mazenod.

MILLER, Daniel and Christopher TILLEY

1984 *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MORRIS, Ian

1987 *Burial in Ancient Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MORRIS-SUZUKI, Tessa

1991 Concepts of nature and technology in pre-industrial Japan. *East Asian History* 1: 81–97.

NISHIDA Masaki 西田正規

1989 *Jōmon no seitaishikan 縄文の生態史観* [The historical ecology of the Jōmon period]. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

ŌBA Iwao 大場磐雄, ed.

1981 *Shintō kōkogaku no taikai 神道考古学の体系* [Outline of Shinto archaeology]. *Shintō kōkogaku kōza 神道考古学講座* [A course in Shinto archaeology], vol. 1, 1–28. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.

ONO Shin'ichi 小野眞一

1982a *Matsuri iseki 祭祀遺跡* [Festival sites]. Tokyo: Nyū Saiensu-sha.

1982b *Matsuri iseki chimei sōran 祭祀遺跡地名総覧* [Gazeteer of festival sites]. Tokyo: Nyū Saiensu-sha.

RENFREW, Colin and Paul BAHN

1991 *Archaeology*. London: Thames and Hudson.

ROBERTSON, Jennifer

1991 *Native and Newcomer: Making and Remaking a Japanese City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

SAHARA Makoto 左原 眞

1987 *Nihonjin no tanjō – Taikei Nihon no rekishi 1 日本人の誕生 – 大系日本の歴史 1* [The birth of the Japanese people: Outline history of Japan, vol. 1]. Tokyo: Shōgakkan.

SASAKI Kōmei 佐々木高明

1991 *Nihonshi tanjō – Nihon no rekishi 1 日本史誕生 – 日本の歴史 1* [The birth of Japanese history: History of Japan, vol. 1]. Tokyo: Shūeisha.

STANLEY-BAKER, Joan

1984 *Japanese Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.

TILLEY, Christopher

1984 Ideology and the legitimation of power in the Middle Neolithic of Southern Sweden. In MILLER and TILLEY, eds., 111-46

TSUBOI, Kiyotari

in press Issues in Japanese archaeology. *Acta Asiatica* 63.

UMEHARA Takeshi 梅原 猛

1992 *Nihonjin no tamashii* 日本人の魂 [The soul of the Japanese]. Tokyo: Kōbunsha.

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART
OF TOPICS MENTIONED IN THIS ISSUE

- 12,000 BC First pottery; Jōmon period begins
- 7000 BC First clay figurines
- 3,500–2,000 BC Middle Jōmon phase; Shakadō site
- 1000 BC Final Jōmon begins
- 300 BC Early Yayoi begins in western Japan
- 200 BC Final occupation of the Kinsei site
- 100 BC Middle Yayoi begins;
first use of mirror-sword-jewel combination
- 1st c. AD Epi-Jōmon culture begins in Hokkaido
- 100 AD Late Yayoi begins
- c. 150–190 “Wa Unrest”
 - 180 Tatetsuki burial mound
 - c. 190 Himiko [Pimiko] assumes leadership of Yamatai
Keyhole-shape tombs appear; Kofun period begins
 - 230 Makimuku Ishizuka tomb mound*
 - 239 Himiko establishes relations with Wei court in China
- 260/270 Hashihaka tomb mound*
- 3rd c. Aqueduct systems developed
 - 552 Official introduction of Buddhism
 - 596 Completion of Asuka-dera
 - 607 Prince Shōtoku orders construction of Hōryū-ji
- 646–710 Hakuho period
 - 663 Direct trade with China; mirrors appear among relics
 - 668 Sūfuku-ji founded
 - c. 700 Last *kofun* constructed
- 7–13th c. Satsumon and Okhotsk cultures in Hokkaido
- 710–794 Nara period
 - 741 Emperor Shōmu orders construction of Kokubun-ji
 - 745 Construction of Tōdai-ji begun
 - 752 Casting of Nara Tārō bell
- 794–1185 Heian period
 - 925 Great fire at Hōryū-ji
 - 1052 *Mappō* (End of Law period) thought to begin
- 1185–1333 Kamakura period
 - 1196 Fire at Asuka-dera
 - 1590 Tokugawa Ieyasu arrives in Edo
- c. 1600–1868 Edo (Tokugawa) period
 - 1640 Cemetery established at Jishō-in
- early 1700s Major change in shogunal graves
Hatchōbori Sanchōme site (Rōsei-ji cemetery)
- late 1700s “New” Ainu culture begins
Strict laws against meat-eating
San’ei-chō meat market developed
- 1868 Meiji Restoration
- 1877 First archaeological excavation in Japan by E. S. Morse

* denotes dates over which there is much debate

PREFECTURES AND REGIONS OF JAPAN

- | | |
|--------------|--------------|
| 1 Hokkaidō | 25 Shiga |
| 2 Aomori | 26 Kyoto |
| 3 Akita | 27 Osaka |
| 4 Iwate | 28 Hyōgo |
| 5 Yamagata | 29 Nara |
| 6 Miyagi | 30 Wakayama |
| 7 Fukushima | 31 Tottori |
| 8 Gunma | 32 Shimane |
| 9 Tochigi | 33 Okayama |
| 10 Ibaraki | 34 Hiroshima |
| 11 Saitama | 35 Yamaguchi |
| 12 Chiba | 36 Kagawa |
| 13 Tokyo | 37 Ehime |
| 14 Kanagawa | 38 Tokushima |
| 15 Niigata | 39 Kōchi |
| 16 Toyama | 40 Fukuoka |
| 17 Ishikawa | 41 Saga |
| 18 Fukui | 42 Nagasaki |
| 19 Nagano | 43 Oita |
| 20 Yamanashi | 44 Kumamoto |
| 21 Shizuoka | 45 Miyazaki |
| 22 Gifu | 46 Kagoshima |
| 23 Aichi | 47 Okinawa |
| 24 Mie | |



- Chūgoku: Hiroshima, Okayama, Shimane, Tottori, and Yamaguchi
- Hokuriku: Fukui, Ishikawa, Niigata, and Toyama
- Izumo: present-day eastern Shimane Prefecture
- Kansai: the Kyoto-Osaka-Kobe area
- Kantō: Chiba, Gunma, Ibaragi, Kanagawa, Saitama, Tochigi, and Tokyo
- Kibi: present-day Okayama Prefecture
- Kinai: present-day Osaka, Nara, and southern Kyoto
- Kinki: Hyōgo, Kyoto, Nara, Osaka, Shiga, Wakayama, portions of Mie
- Tōkai: Aichi, Shizuoka, and portions of Gifu and Mie