Co-Traditions in Japanese Archaeology

Author(s): Fumiko Ikawa-Smith

Source: *World Archaeology*, Feb., 1982, Vol. 13, No. 3, Regional Traditions of Archaeological Research II (Feb., 1982), pp. 296-309

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/124385

Co-traditions in Japanese archaeology

Fumiko Ikawa-Smith

Authors of recent reviews of archaeological work in Japan are impressed by the astonishing number of excavations (about 11,000 in the 1980–1 fiscal year alone), the correspondingly large number of publications, the enthusiastic interest shown by the general public, the many museums and exhibitions of archaeological materials and the high standards of skills in excavations and technical analyses (Ikawa-Smith 1980; Loewe 1980; Pearson 1976). Those trained in the anthropological archaeology of North America remark, however, that Japanese archaeologists are primarily interested in the history of the Japanese people and nation (Ikawa-Smith 1975; Pearson 1976) and note that 'culture history and chronology are the overriding goals of Japanese archaeology' (Crawford 1979: 16). Chard (1974: 109), speaking of the Jomon Period (*ca.* 10,000–300 BC), commented: 'It also reflects a tremendous overemphasis on pottery typology: the bulk of the published or available evidence relates to this aspect, with relatively little information on other branches of technology or on ecology, settlement patterns, and so forth.' Similarly, Hitchins (1977: 14), speaking of the Yayoi Period (300 BC–AD 300), has stated:

> the most appropriate comment would appear to be that, by comparison with archaeological research in certain other parts of the world such as North America and Europe, the research on Yayoi culture, while characterized by very fine relative chronologies based on typology, has shown to date relatively poorly developed theoretical orientations despite comparatively rich data.

The factors that have shaped this Western perception of Japanese archaeology are of course numerous. A major one is the long tradition of antiquarianism and amateur interests in archaeology that has flourished since the eighteenth century. This tradition has provided the basis for the public understanding of archaeological research and the reservoir of archaeological expertise that is necessary for the large number of salvage operations carried out at the present time. Exposure to the goals and methods of Western archaeology as a result of contacts with the technical experts who were welcomed to Japan in the nineteenth century and the establishment of a centre of prehistoric research in the Department of Anthropology within the Science Faculty of Tokyo University initiated the tradition of studying prehistoric archaeology as part of the natural history of mankind. This tradition laid strong emphasis on scientific methods and technical analysis. A parallel tradition of archaeology as historical research has a closer link with the indigenous antiquarian tradition. It was reaffirmed as an academic discipline around the

World Archaeology *Volume 13 No. 3* *Regional traditions II*

 0043-8243/82/1303-296 $1.50/1

turn of the century by historians affiliated with the Imperial Museum. This tradition has been carried on by those archaeologists who work in history departments within the Arts Faculties of universities.

Throughout this time, the political ideology of the regime sometimes encouraged, but more often restricted, the development of archaeological research. As a result of severe restrictions during the 1930s and early 1940s, an increasing number of archaeologists devoted their attention to the refinement of typological definitions and chronological sequences, without reference to studying the causative factors that bring about sociocultural changes. As a result of the loss of contacts with colleagues abroad that began during World War II and continued for some time thereafter, Japanese archaeologists pursued their research in the direction set in the 1930s. The structure of Japanese academic institutions tended to perpetuate the research orientations that were familiar to those in positions of authority. Thus what we see today results from the archaeological involution that began with the repressive regime of the 1930s. Although the situation is changing, I believe that Miller (1976: 298) is correct in saying that 'Japanese archaeology is still in its post-World War beginnings.'

Legacies of Tokugawa antiquarianism

In the political stability under the Tokugawa shogunate (AD 1603–1868), which involved the policy of exclusion of (and, later, controlled access by) encroaching Europeans, arts (such as *bunraku*, *kabuki* and *ukiyoe*) and scholarship flourished in the urban centres of Edo (today's Tokyo), Kyoto and Osaka. Some of the gentleman-scholars of the *samurai* and merchant classes collected and described archaeological objects for their own sake, while others recorded archaeological features, such as burial mounds, as supplemental data relating to local and national history. '*Zempo-koen*', a term coined by Gamo Kumpei (1708–1813) to describe the keyhole-shaped burial mounds of the Kofun Period (AD 300–600), has survived to the present and become part of archaeological terminology.

Hoffman (1974) compared the rise of antiquarianism in Tokugawa Japan and in contemporary England, where 'educated squires interested in local history set the stage for a large number of amateur excavations and discoveries before the end of the 18th century'. He has suggested that transmission of European ideas through the designated Dutch trading port at Nagasaki may have stimulated antiquarian interest within Japan. It is true that Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725), the author of *A Report on the Occident*, based on interviews with an Italian priest, is generally regarded as being the first person in Japan to state that stone arrowheads did not fall from the sky but were made by the ancient inhabitants of the country. Nevertheless, it is difficult to determine the extent to which European ideas about archaeological specimens actually led Arai Hakuseki to make such a novel statement. If there was European influence on the emerging antiquarianism of the Tokugawa Period, it may have been through the rational approach of Western science. Arai Hakuseki so frankly admired this approach that he successfully advised the Shogun Yoshimune to relax the ban on the import and study of European books.

By the time the Tokugawa shogunate fell in 1868, scholars were engaged in careful field surveys of sites and artifacts, even in areas far from the centres of learning in Kyoto, Osaka and Edo (Saito 1956, 1980). A decade later, in a preface to the report on the excavation of the

Omori Shellmound, Edward S. Morse, whose contribution to Japanese archaeology will be discussed in the next section, noted that there were probably more people interested in archaeology in Japan than anywhere else in the world (Morse 1879a). The number of people interested in archaeology has remained high. I believe that Japan now has the largest number of archaeologists, both 'professional' and 'amateur', per square kilometre in the world.

The distinction between the professional and amateur is difficult to make in Japan. Amateurs may be defined as those who did not receive formal training in archaeology at the post-secondary level. Prior to World War II, when archaeology courses were offered at only a small number of universities many practising archaeologists did not have formal training in this sense. In any event, even today real learning takes place, Japanese archaeologists affirm, not in university classrooms but at excavations and in mentors' homes in an apprentice-like relationship. The term amateur may also apply to those who do not make their living from teaching and research in archaeology. Again, in pre-War days, paid positions were scarce and many important scholarly contributions were made by school-teachers, government officials and businessmen who did archaeological research in their spare time. Just as Kinouchi Sekitei (1724–1808) and his associates organized a national rock-lovers' club which promoted interest in collecting stone artifacts, the amateurs of the twentieth century formed clubs and associations, and published their work in their own journals. Perhaps the most noteworthy club is the Tokyo Archaeological Association, a national organization of archaeologists working outside academia, which was instrumental in the development of the Yayoi Period research from the late 1930s into the 1940s. A distinguished amateur, Fujimori Eiichi (1911–73), in his autobiographical essays (1965, 1967a, 1967b), vividly describes the extremely trying circumstances under which he and his colleagues worked, as well as the self-perpetuating process by which children became the next generation of amateur archaeologists through exposure to relatives, family friends and school-teachers. Some of these children later joined the ranks of the professionals.

The large number of non-professional archaeologists could present a threat to the protection of archaeological remains. Some of the literary figures of the early twentieth century, who dug sites to find aesthetically pleasing objects and as a fashionable pastime (Esaka 1957: 13), must have done considerable damage. Yet most of the amateur archaeologists aspired to be scholars and emulated the latest techniques. Kanaizuka (1977) believes that the excavation of the Kuroiwa burial site by Negishi Bunko (1839–1902), a wealthy farmer, local politician and antiquarian of the Tokugawa tradition, must have been inspired by Morse's excavation of the Omori Shellmound two months earlier. Negishi received Heinrich von Siebold at his home in 1877 and Edward Morse in 1879 and joined the newly formed Anthropological Society of Tokyo in order 'to gain new knowledge from young students'. He also lent his hands to an excavation later conducted by one of these students. Negishi's efforts to keep up with the new academic developments were typical of many of the so-called amateurs in later years. Countless archaeological sites have been destroyed, but the damage resulted from the lack of government policy to protect them from industrial development and clandestine excavations for commercial gain far more than from the activities of amateurs. In fact, public opinion has been ahead of government policy in its appreciation of archaeological remains as sources of valuable information (Saito 1977).

Without such broadly-based interests in antiquities, the current policy of mandatory investigation of archaeological sites threatened by development would not have been accepted by the

public. Nor would it have been practical to implement it for lack of expertise. The reservoir of archaeological talents that existed over the years in the form of amateur archaeologists also had the effect of preserving diversity in approach and maintaining a kind of data bank. When the possibility of plant cultivation during the Jomon Period was dismissed out of hand by archaeologists within academia, Morimoto Rokuji (1903–36) and Fujimori Eiichi persisted in producing relevant data (Morimoto 1933; Fujimori 1963). It was Aizawa Tadahiro (1926–) who, in 1947, discovered a Palaeolithic site at Iwajuku, although established scholars held that Japan had not been inhabited by human beings during the Pleistocene. Once the Iwajuku artifacts were verified by excavation, an outline of Palaeolithic chronology was presented in a matter of a few years, using data that had patiently been accumulated by amateurs in various parts of Japan (Tozawa 1977a). Interests in ecology, settlement patterns and social change were also kept alive outside academia, before being taken up by a large number of professionals in recent years.

Prehistoric archaeology as natural science

Even while the isolationist policy was officially in effect, the Tokugawa shogunate, which saw the practical benefits of Western sciences and technology, was willing to support schools devoted to these studies. The Meiji Period (1868–1912) began with the Charter of Oath of Five Principles, the last principle of which states that 'wisdom and ability should be sought after in all quarters of the world for the purpose of firmly establishing the foundation of the Empire' (translation by Yoshida and Kaigo 1937). The new government was determined to catch up with the advances in Western sciences, technology and medicine. The first introduction of archaeology, as practised in nineteenth-century Europe and America, was the by-product of the arrival in Japan of natural scientists and physicians whose special skills were deemed useful by the Tokugawa and Meiji governments. These specialists included Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866), a German physician who taught at Nagasaki between 1923 and 1829; John Milne (1850–1913), an English seismologist who came in 1876 to be Professor of Geology at Tokyo University, where he remained until 1894; William Gowland (1843–1922), an English chemist who served as a consultant to the Mint from 1872 to 1888; and Edward S. Morse (1838–1925), whose research trip to Japan in 1877 to study marine fauna turned into a two-year appointment as Professor of Zoology at Tokyo University.

With the exception of the Japanese version of Morse's excavation report (Yatabe 1879), their studies on Japanese archaeology, most of which were published abroad in foreign languages, were read by very few Japanese. Hence their impact on late Tokugawa and early Meiji antiquarians was not immediately visible. Even Morse, who is often credited as being the father of modern archaeology in Japan, did not leave students who would follow in his footsteps. The students who helped him in the excavation of the Omori Shellmound, and even those who later excavated another shellmound by themselves (Iisima and Sasaki 1883), pursued their careers in biology, which, after all, was Morse's field of specialization. Nevertheless, it is significant that leading Japanese prehistorians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were those who entered the field after an initial training in zoology, geology and medicine. They also shared their interests in the ethnic and biological identity of the people who had left the prehistoric remains with the American and European visitors to Japan in the mid-nineteenth century.

The first generation of Japanese professionals was led by Tsuboi Shogoro (1863–1913), who, with several other science students of the time, formed the Anthropological Society of Tokyo in 1884. He is said to have emphasized the fact that he had not studied anthropology under Morse and made disparaging remarks about him (Goto 1977; Kudo 1977). Yet the direct historical approach that he followed to identify the makers of prehistoric pottery from Hokkaido (Tsuboi 1887) was the same as that used by Morse (1879b). Moreover, the main idea Tsuboi championed was one Milne (1882) had adopted from the 1808 records of Ainu oral traditions. Since it attributed this pottery to inhabitants who had lived in Hokkaido before the Ainu, it amounts to the same argument as that of Morse (Kiyono 1944; Serizawa 1960).

Tsuboi, who apparently had read books by Tylor (1865, 1871, 1881) and Lubbock (1865) before going to England in 1889, became the first Professor of Anthropology at Tokyo University in 1893. During his three years in England, he attended Tylor's lectures only once and remained critical of his anthropology (Kudo 1977). To Tsuboi, anthropology was to be considered part of zoology, and archaeological remains and ethnological examples were clues to be used to study racial groups. At the same time, he eschewed the use of anthropometric data, which were employed by such scholars as Koganei Yoshikiyo (1859–1944). The latter, his principal opponent in the ethnic identity controversy, had studied anatomy in Germany.

Edward Morse was in correspondence with Charles Darwin (Barrett 1977: 222–3; Wayman 1940). His major contribution to the sciences in nineteenth-century Japan was the fact that he exposed his students to evolutionism (Watanabe 1977). This aspect of Morse's approach, as well as Tylor's evolutionary orientation, is absent from the interpretation of archaeological data by Tsuboi and his followers. Interestingly, the one who entered into a debate over the interpretation of variations within Jomon pottery with Tsuboi's protégé was another science graduate of Tokyo University. The former, Torii Ryuzo (1870–1953) maintained that the differences signified various tribal groups (Torii 1920). The latter, Matsumoto Hikoshichiro (1887–1975), argued in favour of chronological succession by applying the stratigraphic principles of palaeontology (Matsumoto 1919). By the 1930s, refinement of chronology, based on stratigraphic relationships among an increasing number of ceramic types, became the major concern of Jomon archaeologists. Among them, Kono Isamu (1901–67) used prehistoric beach lines as temporal indicators and even discussed evolutionary changes of tools, subsistence practices and social organization (Kono 1935). The space–time relationships of ceramic types for all of Japan developed by Yamanouchi Sugao (1902–70) constitute the general framework for Jomon archaeology today (Yamanouchi 1937).

Both Kono and Yamanouchi studied archaeology in the Anthropology Department founded by Tsuboi at Tokyo University in 1893. This department had been established in the College (later the Faculty) of Science. The successive heads of the department since 1925 have been scholars whose research interests were in biological anthropology. Yet this prestigious unit continued to be one of the major centres for prehistoric research, even when a number of other institutions began offering opportunities for teaching and research in this field. Its strong natural science orientation sets the tone for one of the important trends in Japanese archaeology. Although technical analyses are only part of this scientific approach, a recent compendium of scientific analyses with 140 contributors (Kobunkazai Editorial Committee 1980) demonstrates the impressive level of achievements in this direction.

Archaeology as history

The Archaeological Society was formed in 1895 'for the study of archaeology of our country, with the view to throwing light on customs, institutions, culture and technologies in the successive periods of our national history' (Sakazume 1974). In contrast to the Anthropological Society of Tokyo, whose founding members were science students of Tokyo University, the core members of this organization were historians who were working at the Imperial Museum, which was to become the present Tokyo National Museum. The government policy at that time was to deposit there remains pertaining to the protohistoric and historic periods, while those from the shellmounds were placed in the Anthropology Department of Tokyo University (Yoshida 1974).

Since the museum at that time employed scholars who continued the tradition of Tokugawa antiquarianism, the Archaeological Society had closer links with pre-Meiji scholarship than did the Anthropological Society. Terada (1980) cites a source which states that there were two schools of archaeology then: the one led by Tsuboi, which was nicknamed the 'university school', 'race archaeology school' or 'ethnic archaeology school', and the other known as the 'museum school', 'fine art archaeology' or 'antiquarian school'. Yet some of the founding members of the Archaeological Society were also prominent members of the Anthropological Society. Tsuboi himself sometimes excavated protohistoric and historic remains. In such instances, he treated these materials as supplements to the official history, in much the same way as pre-Meiji scholars had done.

The emphasis of the historically-oriented archaeologists was on detailed study of isolated remains such as ornaments, bronze mirrors and weapons. Comparison of these materials with similar objects from Korea and China led to the increasing involvement of Japanese archaeologists with the archaeology of continental Asia that continued until World War II. This approach also developed into the highly specialized scholarship on bronze artifacts and other items of continental derivation that forms the important part of the archaeology of the Yayoi and Kofun Periods today. It was on the basis of stylistic details of continental imports that archaeologists and historians in the 1920s hotly debated the probable location of the 'Yamato state', mentioned in Chinese chronicles, in relation to the development of burial mounds and the origin and growth of the state in Japan.

Historically-oriented archaeologists played an increasingly important role in the development of archaeology. By coincidence, Tsuboi, the founder of the Anthropology Department of Tokyo University, died in 1913, when specialization in archaeology was formally recognized within the History Department of Kyoto University. Hamada Kosaku (1881–1938) was appointed Professor of Archaeology at Kyoto on his return from Europe in 1916. Most of his time in Europe (1913–16) had been spent in England, where he studied with W. M. F. Petrie. Hamada's *Tsuron Kokogaku* (1922) is considered to be the first systematic statement in Japanese on the methods and theory of archaeology. A series of excavation reports which appeared as the publications of the History Department of the Faculty of Arts, Kyoto University, had profound influence not only on protohistoric and historic, but also on prehistoric, archaeology (Esaka 1957; Fujisawa 1966; Wajima 1966b; Yoshida 1974). Even though Umehara (1973: 139) states that Hamada was more of an art historian than an archaeologist, Hamada and his co-workers emphasized the importance of stratigraphic excavation and attempted to define ceramic types explicitly and to use them consistently (e.g., Hamada 1918, 1919).

Interests in causative factors that had produced changes in material remains developed among archaeologists who regarded their discipline as an extension of national history. This is seen in Kobayashi's discussion of Yayoi ceramic types (1933), and more explicitly in the materialist interpretation of the ancient history of Japan written by Wajima Seiichi (1909–71) in 1936 (Watanabe 1973). After a period of enforced silence on the subject, since 1945 many archaeologists have presented developmental interpretations of archaeological data (e.g. Kondo and Fujisawa 1966; Kondo and Harunari 1967; Kobayashi 1955; Wajima 1966a).

When Japanese archaeologists speak of archaeology as history, the term 'history' is not used in the derogatory sense that some American archaeologists used it in the 1960s. To present a historical interpretation also implies the strength of conviction to defy the political pressures that have driven most Japanese archaeologists into a devotion to details of types and styles and away from the discussion of human behaviour and societal relations. Miyake Yonekichi (1860–1929), one of the founding members of the Archaeological Society, believed that the purpose of historical research was to 'discover the outline of human development and regularities of social transformations' (Yajima 1977). 'History' for Japanese archaeologists includes the 'process' of American archaeologists.

Ideological pendulum

The sociopolitical climate of the 1930s is succinctly and candidly expressed in a contemporary pamphlet written for foreign tourists (Yoshida and Kaigo 1937: 99–100):

> In view of the present condition of our country it seems quite necessary to effect reform in, and a furtherance of, national training through educational organization. In order to clarify the fundamental spirit of the Empire, and lead the minds of students into proper channels, the Department of Education began co-operation with similar agencies in the prefectural governments about ten years ago . . . Some of the provisions, mentioned above, for the guidance of thought, were originally planned to offset such radical theories as were being disseminated throughout the schools of the country about 1929 . . .

The effects of 'the guidance of thought' were most keenly felt by archaeologists working on the protohistoric and historic periods during the 1930s and the first half of the 1940s, but political pressures were present at all times to varying degrees and all archaeologists, consciously or unconsciously, responded to them.

The balance between nationalism and liberalism has shifted several times within the last hundred years: 'the strong pro-Western sentiment of the early Meiji period was followed by a wide-spread reaction; this, in turn, gave way to another wave of pro-Western feeling, particularly a "pro-democratic" one around the time of the First World War and into the early 1920s; the reaction against this was severe and led into ultra-nationalist military control and war' (Passin 1965: 474). The passage quoted at the beginning of this section represents the start of the last phase. At the conclusion of the war, democracy again became the catchword, but after a few decades of enthusiasm to catch up with the West, the mood of the country turned again towards a mild form of nationalism, with 'national heritage' as a new slogan.

Edward Morse and other Westerners were the manifestation of the first pro-Western phase. By the time Morse published the report on the Omori excavation, however, there were sufficient political pressures, Tozawa (1977b) claims, to cause the author of the Japanese

version of the report to modify one of its passages. Morse's observation that cannibalism was indicated by the human bones from the shellmounds created a stir, and, in order to make it clear that the practice was not attributed to the Japanese but to the 'pre-Ainu' inhabitants of Japan, Morse (1879a) wrote that cannibalism had not been known for the last 1,500 years, for which the historical record was well documented. In the Japanese version (Yatabe 1879), the length of the historic period appeared as '2,500 years', which fitted the official history better. Sahara (1977) believes that this was a simple error in translation; Tozawa (1977b) suggests that the discrepancy was deliberate.

The growing tide of nationalism is reflected in the founding of the Archaeological Society, with the express purpose of studying the nation's past, and in the repudiation of Morse, Milne and other Europeans by Tsuboi and his contemporaries. It is plausible, as Wajima (1966b) suggests, that their preoccupation with the ethnic identities of the makers of Jomon and Yayoi ceramics was a response to the growing nationalism that was necessary for the developing capitalism of Meiji Japan. It is also possible, however, that this was the result of the diffusion of archaeological ideas from abroad. Trigger (1980: 666) notes that a similar preoccupation among European archaeologists after 1880 'reflected the growing political importance of nationalism in Europe at that time'. Tsuboi was in England between 1889 and 1892 and Koganei in Germany between 1880 and 1885. Hence they may have absorbed the archaeological ideas that then prevailed in Europe. It is also possible that global links between capitalist countries may have produced a similar intellectual response.

The question of independent development or diffusion has not been satisfactorily resolved for the rise of antiquarianism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The same question can be asked for each swing of the pendulum in the direction of archaeological research in Japan without a clear answer. For example, commenting on the image of the Ainu as an inferior race with little cultural initiative presented by Koganei and Torii in their discussion of ethnic relationships in prehistoric Japan, Kudo (1977) speculates that this attitude may have been brought into Japan by Koganei from Germany. Similarly, Fujisawa (1966) observed that the archaeology of the protohistoric Kofun Period was influenced by the methodology which Japanese archaeologists learned from Europe, where methods and techniques had been developed in the course of research in Egypt and Mesopotamia under colonial rule.

In any event, the notion that ethnic groups are static and can attain a higher level of development only through contacts with culturally advanced groups tended to justify the imperialism of the regime (Hayashi 1977). Indeed, many of the archaeological investigations abroad were closely linked with military expeditions. For example, Torii went to Liaotung in 1895, right after the Sino-Japanese War, to Taiwan in 1896 when it was brought under Japanese control, and to Manchuria in 1905, when the Russo-Japanese War had just ended (Terada 1980).

The government regulations of 1874 and 1880 made it extremely difficult to excavate large burial mounds (*kofun*), especially those which were suspected of being Imperial tombs. As a result, archaeologists relied mainly on artifacts accidentally recovered from such sites. It is ironic that the first systematic investigation of *kofun* was conducted at Saitobaru in southern Kyushu between 1912 and 1917, at the initiative of the Governor of Miyazaki Prefecture. The latter wished to have the *kofun* group corroborate the mythological account of Imperial origins. The results of the excavations did not support the myth, but provided the basis for the development of research on burial mounds and their relationship to the rise of the ancient state in Japan that took place in the relaxed atmosphere of the 1920s. Archaeologists themselves freely

engaged in a debate concerning the location of 'the Yamato state' described in Chinese chronicles for the third century, even though their interpretations implied a much more recent origin for the Imperial Family than was attributed in the officially sanctioned history. Increasing interest in house remains during the 1920s may also have resulted from growing concern with social reconstruction. It was also during the 1920s that several historians presented Marxist interpretations of the ancient history of Japan, into which archaeological data were incorporated. These were part of the 'radical theories' to which the quotation at the beginning of this section referred.

The pendulum swung back in the late 1920s, with the mass arrests of radical thinkers. A socially prominent archaeologist was prompted to remark: 'even when the research is purely academic in nature, one should be very careful, if that research, particularly prehistoric and protohistoric research, touches on our "Ages of Gods" ' (Prince Kashiwa Ohyama in 1933, as quoted by Tozawa 1977b). In the 1930s, increasing attention was paid to the refinement of ceramic typology and chronology for the Jomon and Yayoi Periods. For the Kofun Period, restrictions on excavations encouraged detailed studies of burial goods, particularly bronze mirrors, that had been recovered from the mounds. Concern with typology and chronology may again be a reflection of archaeological trends in the West during the 1930s and 1940s. In the case of Japan, discussion over fine points of typology and chronology, without reference to the processes of sociocultural transformation and the relationship between archaeological finds and the events described in the official version of history, was one kind of activity that was relatively immune to political pressures.

During the early phase of the war, Japanese archaeologists were actively engaged in archaeological investigations in newly-occupied areas such as Manchuria, China, Indochina and the Pacific islands. As the war progressed, however, they became increasingly isolated. This isolation continued into the early post-war decades when foreign travel and the importation of foreign books were severely limited by economic conditions. In the meantime, a whole new generation of archaeologists grew up without the kinds of contacts with foreign colleagues that were described by Umehara (1973) for the 1920s and 1930s and without the foreign language skills of their predecessors. The research goals that were established in the 1930s and 1940s were pursued with increasing refinements in techniques, reinforced by the characteristic teamwork approach where deference is made to the opinions of elders.

Conclusion

Most historical reviews of Japanese archaeology present its course of development in terms of several periods: one of naïve interest before the eighteenth century, followed by late Tokugawa antiquarian scholarship (*ca.* 1700–1868), contact with the West in the early Meiji era (*ca.* 1868–80), the establishment of archaeology as an academic discipline in the later Meiji Period (*ca.* 1880–1912), a period of methodological refinement in the Taisho Period (1913–25), the development of chronological frameworks in the first two decades of the Showa Period (1925–45), and the post-War period (1945–). Taking the Western perception of Japanese archaeology, as presented by foreign archaeologists in the 1970s, as the baseline, I have attempted to explain the situation in terms of parallel, but interacting, traditions. I was unable to spare space for the discussion of the on-going development, which will be taken up on another occasion.

Anthropology in Japan began in the Anglo-Saxon tradition of general anthropology in the 1880s. The articles that appeared in the early issues of the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Tokyo* embraced the full range of archaeology, ethnology, linguistics and physical anthropology. Linguistics, however, was established as a separate discipline about the same time as the Anthropological Society of Tokyo was formed, and historically-oriented archaeology branched out of anthropology about a decade later. Increasingly, anthropology in Japan, as in continental Europe, meant physical anthropology, while ethnology remained without an organizational base until the Japanese Society of Ethnology was formed in 1934. Although ethnologists have been active in field work and taught courses as part of the disciplines of anthropology, sociology, political science and comparative religion, ethnology was not recognized as a discipline in academic institutions until cultural anthropology of the Ruth Benedict–Margaret Mead variety became a popular general education subject after World War II.

The relatively limited effect that anthropological theory has had on the interpretation of archaeological data in Japan may be attributed to the following factors: (1) archaeology became separated from general anthropology some eighty years ago; (2) archaeology, since then, has developed as a separate branch of historical research relating to Japan and has had little in common with ethnology as a comparative study of diverse 'primitive' peoples; and (3) ethnology in Japan has not had a strong organizational base until recently.

Today, there are some anthropologists who combine archaeological and ethnological interests. These include those who have been trained at, or affiliated with, the Department of Cultural Anthropology of the Faculty of General Education at Tokyo University (institutionally separated from the Department of Anthropology in the Faculty of Science, as well as from the archaeologists in the History Department of the Faculty of Arts). Their efforts, however, are often directed towards prehistoric remains abroad, such as in Peru, Alaska and the Middle East. They also constitute a small minority among archaeologists, most of whom are interested in the material remains within Japan from the perspective of national history.

International contacts have increased dramatically since about 1970. There are large contingents of Japanese archaeologists at international meetings, many young scholars studying abroad, and a number of senior archaeologists visiting foreign institutions. Despite these contacts, the Japanese ambivalence about internationalism, which Reischauer (1977) speaks about, probably applies to archaeologists as well. Japanese archaeologists are proud of the technical excellence of their work as judged by international standards. At the same time they take pride in the uniqueness of their approach. They are particularly pleased with the extremely fine typological chronology and satisfied with their own version of the developmental framework based on historical materialism. The unique archaeological co-traditions, that developed over the last century, will flourish for some time to come and continue to baffle Western observers.

Acknowledgments

I am indebted to Professors Hideji Harunari, Tatsuo Kobayashi and Chosuke Serizawa, who gave me biographical and bibliographical assistance. Responsibility for all the errors contained in this paper, of course, is mine.

2.vii.1981

Department of Anthropology
McGill University

References

Barrett, Paul H. 1977. *The Collected Papers of Charles Darwin.* University of Chicago Press.

Chard, Chester S. 1974. *Northeast Asia in Prehistory.* University of Wisconsin Press.

Crawford, Gary W. 1979. Palaeobotany of the Kameda Peninsula Jomon. PhD. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Esaka, Teruya. 1957. *Senshi Jidai II: Jomon Jidai* (*Kokogaku Noto No. 2*). Tokyo: Nippon Hyoron Shinsha.

Fujimori, Eiichi. 1963. Jomon Jidai nokoron to sono tenkai. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 10 (2): 21–33.

Fujimori, Eiichi. 1965. *Kyusekki no Kariudo.* Tokyo: Gakuseisha.

Fujimori, Eiichi. 1967a. *Kamoshikamichi.* Tokyo: Gakuseisha.

Fujimori, Eiichi. 1967b. *Kamoshikamichi Igo.* Tokyo: Gakuseisha.

Fujisawa, Choji. 1966. Kofun Jidai kenkyu no ayumi. In *Nippon no Kokogaku IV: Kofun Jidai (1)* (ed. Y. Kondo and C. Fujisawa). Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha, pp. 26–38.

Goto, Kazutami. 1977. Morse to kaizuka kenkyu. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 114–21.

Hamada, Kosaku. 1918. Kawachi Kou sekkijidai iseki hakkutsu hokoku. *Kyoto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku Kokogaku Kenkyūshitsu Hokoku*, no. 2.

Hamada, Kosaku. 1919. Yayoi-shiki doki keishiki bunrui zuroku. *Kyoto Teikoku Daigaku Bungakubu Kokogaku Kenkyushitsu Hokoku*, no. 3.

Hamada, Kosaku. 1922. *Tsuron Kokogaku.* Tokyo: Daitokaku.

Hayashi, Kensaku. 1977. 'Shokujinsetsu' to shakai shinkaron. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 107–13.

Hitchins, Patricia A. 1977. A Cultural Synthesis of the Yayoi Period of Japan. PhD. thesis, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto.

Hoffman, Michael A. 1974. The rise of antiquarianism in Japan and Western Europe. *Arctic Anthropology.* 9 (supplement): 182–8.

Iisima, I. and C. Sasaki. 1883. *Shellmound at Hitachi, being an appendix to Memoir Vol. I, Part I, of the Science Department, Tokio Daigaku.*

Ikawa-Smith, Fumiko. 1975. Japanese ancestors and Palaeolithic archaeology. *Asian Perspectives.* 18 (1): 15–25.

Ikawa-Smith, Fumiko. 1980. Current issues in Japanese archaeology. *American Scientist.* 68 (2): 134–45.

Ikeda, Jiro and Susumu Ono (eds). 1973. *Ronshu Nippon Bunka no Kigen 5: Nipponjinshu-ron, Gengogaku.* Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Kanaizuka, Ryoichi. 1977. Mo hitotsu no hyakunen-me. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 226–36.

Kiyono, Kenji. 1944. *Nipponjinshu-ron Hensenski.* Tokyo: Koyama Shoten (reprinted in part in Ikeda and Ono, eds, 1973, pp. 33–51).

Kobayashi, Yukio. 1933. Senshi kokogaku ni okeru yoshiki mondai. *Kokogaku.* 4 (8): 223–38.

Kobayashi, Yukio. 1955. Kofun no hassei no rekishi-teki igi. *Shirin.* 38 (1): 1–20.

Kobayashi, Yukio (ed.). 1971. *Ronshu Nippon Bunka no Kigen 1: Kokogaku.* Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Kobunkazai Editorial Committee (ed.). 1980. *Kokogaku Bijutsushi no Shizenkagaku-teki Kenkyu.* Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

Koganei, Yoshikiyo. 1903. Nippon sekki jidai no jumin. *Toyo Gakugei Zasshi*, 256 and 260 (reprinted in Ikeda and Ono, eds, 1973, pp. 66–88).

Kondo, Yoshiro and Choji Fujisawa (eds). 1966. *Nippon no Kokogaku IV: Kofun Jidai (1).* Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha.

Kondo, Yoshiro and Hideji Harunari. 1967. Haniwa no kigen. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 13 (3): 13–35.

Kono, Isamu. 1935. Kanto chiho ni okeru Jomon-shiki sekki jidai bunka no hensen. *Shizengaku Zasshi.* 7 (3): 1–63 (reprinted in Kobayashi, ed., 1971, pp. 226–47).

Kudo, Masaki. 1977. Tsuboi Shogoro to sono shuhen. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 190–208.

Loewe, Michael. 1980. Archaeological work and the growth of museums in Japan. *Antiquity.* 58 (209): 228–31.

Lubbock, John. 1865. *Pre-Historic Times, as Illustrated by Ancient Remains and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages.* London: Williams & Norgate.

Matsumoto, Hikoshichiro. 1919. Miyatojima Satohama oyobi Kesen-gun Osozawa kaizuka no doki. *Gendai no Kagaku.* 7 (5–6) (reprinted in Kobayashi, ed., 1971, pp. 119–216).

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1976. Introduction to Symposium: Japanese origins. *Journal of Japanese Studies.* 2 (2): 295–303.

Milne, John. 1882. Notes on the Koro-pok-guru or pit-dwellers of Yezo and the Kuril Islands. *Transactions, Asiatic Society of Japan.* 10.

Morimoto, Rokuji (ed.). 1933. *Nihon Genshi Nogyo.* Tokyo: Tokyo Kokogakkai.

Morse, Edward S. 1879a. *Shell Mounds of Omori.* Memoirs of the Science Department, University of Tokio, Japan, vol. I, pt 1.

Morse, Edward S. 1879b. Traces of an early race in Japan. *Popular Science Monthly.* 14 (reprinted in translation, in Ikeda and Ono, eds, 1973, pp. 54–60).

Passin, Herbert. 1965. Modernization and the Japanese intellectual: some comparative observations. In *Changing Japanese Attitudes towards Modernization* (ed. M. B. Jansen). Princeton University Press, pp. 447–87.

Pearson, Richard J. 1976. The contribution of archaeology to Japanese studies. *Journal of Japanese Studies.* 2 (2): 305–27.

Reischauer, Edwin O. 1977. *The Japanese.* Harvard University Press.

Sahara, Makoto. 1977. Omori kaizuka hyaku-nen. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 19–48.

Saito, Tadashi. 1956. Kenkyushi. *Zusetsu Nippon Bunkashi Taikei I: Jomon, Yayoi, Kofun Jidai.* Tokyo: Shogakukan, pp. 49–62.

Saito, Tadashi. 1974. Soron. *Kokogaku Janaru.* 100: 2–7.

Saito, Tadashi. 1977. Iseki hozon no rekishi. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 237–48.

Saito, Tadashi. 1980. *Nippon no Hakkutsu Hakken Shi I: Nara-jidai Taisho Hen.* NHK Books, no. 370. Tokyo: Nippon Hoso Shuppan Kyokai.

Sakazume, Hideichi. 1974. Rekishi jidai: gakushi tembo. *Kokogaku Janaru.* 100: 90–4.

Serizawa, Chosuke. 1960. *Sekki Jidai no Nippon.* Tokyo: Tsukiji Shokan.

Serizawa, Chosuke. 1979. Gaikokujin ni yoru Jomon jidai no kenkyu: John Milne no baai. *Rekishi Koron.* 5 (2): 116–23.

Terada, Kazuo. 1980. *Nippon no Jinruigaku.* Tokyo: Shisakusha.

Torii, Ryuzo. 1920. Musashi no yushi izen. *Musashino.* 3 (3) (reprinted in Kobayashi, ed., 1971, pp. 217–25).

Tozawa, Mitsunori. 1977a. Iwajuku e no nagai michi. *Dorumen.* 15: 16–31.

Tozawa, Mitsunori. 1977b. Nippon kokogaku gannen o ootta kuroi kage. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 97–102.

Trigger, Bruce G. 1980. Archaeology and the image of the American Indian. *American Antiquity.* 45 (3): 662–76.

Tsuboi, Shogoro. 1887. Korobokkuru Hokkaido ni sumishi narubeshi. *Tokyo Jinruigakkai Hokoku.* 2 (2) (reprinted in Ikeda and Ono, eds, 1973, pp. 61–5).

Tylor, E. B. 1865. *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization.* London: J. Murray.

Tylor, E. B. 1871. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom.* London: J. Murray.

Tylor, E. B. 1881. *Anthropology: an Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization.* New York: D. Appleton.

Umehara, Sueji. 1973. *Kokogaku Rokuju-nen.* Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Wajima, Seiichi (ed.). 1966a. *Nippon no Kokogaku III: Yayoi Jidai.* Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha.

Wajima, Seiichi. 1966b. Yayoi jidai shakai no kozo. In *Nippon no Kokogaku III: Yayoi Jidai* (ed. S. Wajima). Tokyo: Kawade Shobo Shinsha, pp. 1–30.

Watanabe, Naotsune. 1977. Seibutsugakusha Morse to kokogaku. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 10–18.

Watanabe, Yoshimichi. 1973. *Nippon Rekishi Kyotei* zengo no Wajima Seiichi. *Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 19 (4): 4–9.

Wayman, Dorothy G. 1940. (trans. Nakao Sakazume). Edward S. Morse. *Zinruigaku Zasshi.* 55 (633): 339–49.

Yajima, Toshio. 1977. Miyake Yonekichi to *Nihonshigaku Teiyo. Kokogaku Kenkyu.* 24 (3–4): 177–82.

Yamanouchi, Sugao. 1937. Jomon doki keishiki no saibetsu to taibetsu. *Senshi Kokogaku.* 1 (1): 28–32.

Yatabe, Ryokichi. 1879. *Omori Kaikyo Kobutsu Hen.* University of Tokyo.

Yoshida, K. and T. Kaigo. 1937. *Japanese Education.* Tokyo: Board of Tourist Industry, Japanese Government Railways.

Yoshida, Shoichiro. 1974. Kofun jidai: gakushi tembo. *Kokogaku Janaru.* 100: 67–70.

Abstract

Ikawa-Smith, Fumiko

Co-traditions in Japanese archaeology

The archaeology practised in Japan, which sometimes puzzles Western observers with its highly-advanced technical expertise and apparent absence of social science theory, is a product of several parallel and often conflicting, but interacting traditions. These include a broadly-based antiquarianism that can be traced as far back as the seventeenth century, the interest in pre-historic research as a natural history of mankind that began in the nineteenth century, and the equally long tradition of archaeology as a historical and humanistic discipline. The socio-political climate, which repeatedly oscillated between pro-Western liberalism and repressive nationalism, has fostered the involution of Japanese archaeology since the 1940s.