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Introduction and Background


Junko Habu, who is an Associate Professor at the University of California at Berkeley, is a very rare Japanese archaeologist in two respects: she is one of the few female Japanese professional archaeologists and is one of the even fewer Japanese archaeologists who researches and teaches Japanese archaeology outside of Japan. I admire her endeavors and her success in securing a faculty position at an American university. With this background, it is not surprising that Habu has made it one of her missions to bridge the gap between Japanese and Anglo-American archaeologies. Ancient Jomon of Japan is the first book in the English language that focuses solely on Jomon culture. As a matter of course, this book contains more new information on the Jomon than any of the introductory books on Japanese archaeology written in English. The huge settlement site at Sannai Maruyama and the extraordinarily large shell midden at Nakazato could not be covered comprehensively when I wrote a book in English on Japanese prehistory ten years ago (Imamura, 1996).

In this review, I will concentrate on the distinctive aspects of Habu’s book, skipping discussion of the conventional topics normally written about in Japanese books. The distinctive aspects covered in this book include the chapters in which Habu presents her original reconstruction of Jomon society based on Anglo-American theories, particularly in relation to the hunter-gatherer models created by Lewis Binford. These chapters make this book a rarity in Japanese archaeology, with the exception of an earlier monograph written by Habu (2001) herself, and Habu’s arguments are important in delineating new hypotheses in Jomon research.

Ancient Jomon of Japan, if likened to a culinary dish, cooks Japanese archaeological material in an Anglo-American manner to serve to Anglo-Americans. If this book proves to be popular with the latter readers, it may be because Habu’s method suits their tastes. Any critical review of this book must consider Habu’s approach and take into account the differences and exchanges between the two archaeological spheres.

The concepts and theories concerning hunter-gatherers developed by Binford and others, which are used repeatedly by Habu, were originally derived from cases of modern hunter-gatherers for synchronic explanations. However, Habu declares that they are also applicable to diachronic explanations for long-term changes and can actually be applied to the Jomon period, which occurred in a very distant time and in a quite different environment from those of the original cases. Although this extrapolation is crucial and fundamental, Habu expands the applicable sphere of the theory without sufficient explanation. Since theories of human behavior, which is extremely diversified, are not equivalent to theories of mathematics or chemistry, the limits of applicability of such theories are open to question and require careful consideration and clarification. Habu seems to assume that the previously developed hunter-gatherer theories, which she uses, are applicable to all types of hunter-gatherer. However, the original theories were derived for modern hunter-gatherers, who were excluded from fertile lands by farmers or who adapted to barren lands in special ways. So, are these theories applicable to all hunter-gatherers who ever existed on earth? In this respect, archaeologists are divided into two camps: those that believe that the hunter-gatherer theory can be applied to all cases and those who wish to see this applicability tested for each particular case. Most Japanese archaeologists belong to the second group, and for me it was really surprising to note how Habu inappropriately applies Binford’s models to many Jomon cases with the simple qualification that, “I find [the models’] applicability surprisingly wide” (p. 12).

What is the definition of hunter-gatherers? Habu consistently refers to the Jomon people as hunter-gatherers, in spite of substantial evidence that the Jomon people were beyond the range of normal hunter-gatherers in the latter half of the period. Although Habu remarks that new models will be needed if it is demonstrated that plant cultivation was important during certain parts of the Jomon period, she does not expand upon this topic. The reason for this lapse is clear: if the Jomon were not hunter-gatherers, theories related to hunter-gatherers would not be applicable and research involving the application of these theories would not be valid.

It goes without saying that the methods employed in scientific research are diverse and that individuals are free to...
The settlement system of the Early Jomon Moroiso phase

The topic of Habu’s Ph.D. dissertation, the subsistence-settlement system of the Moroiso phase of the Early Jomon, is one of the main themes of the present book. Initially, Habu establishes an analysis in which one of Binford’s hunter-gatherer models is applied to the Moroiso phase. Although she later introduces an alternative model of Hitoshi Watanabe, this model is not adopted in her research. The possibility that all existing models are inadequate and that none are applicable is not considered. Habu then assumes one-to-one correspondences between movement-residential modes and degrees of site size variability, as well as between movement-residential modes and degrees of variability of stone tool assemblages. Foragers, she assumes, leave sites with small size variability and stone tools with small assemblage variability. In the same manner, seasonally mobile collectors are characterized by large site size and lithic assemblage variability, whereas year-round sedentary collectors show less variability for both of these factors. Habu verifies the degrees of the two sets of variability in Moroiso sites according to their sub-phases. Controversially, she does not consider other factors that may affect this variability. The fundamental tenet that ‘the reverse is not necessarily true’ is neglected. After checking the actual variability, Habu concludes that, except for a small temporal sub-set of the population, the Moroiso people were seasonally mobile collectors. Unsuspecting readers may fall into the trap of this defective logic: it is important to realize that the author has set up the problem in such a way at the beginning of the book so as to conclude the applicability of one of Binford’s models.

Why should the variability of site size be a criterion for the residential mode alone? It is clear that the number of occupants and the length of occupational duration affect site size. Although not explicitly stated, Habu clearly establishes the premise that the sizes of the basic groups in her field are identical and that seasonal movements alone produce the variability in site size. Habu also assumes that the sub-divisions of the Moroiso phase that she adopts are the smallest time units and provide the basis for comparisons of site size. However, as a Japanese archaeologist, she cannot but know that the settlements were moved several times and that the pit-dwellings were rebuilt several times within her adopted time units. The provision of such time units and basic group sizes appears to be indispensable for her discussion. I cannot accept an analysis that is performed on so many self-serving premises. Furthermore, Habu simply designates the degree of variability of stone tool compositions as small or large, without describing well-grounded quantitative criteria that are crucial for objective judgment. While statistic-like figures are displayed, Habu’s subjective evaluation is the sole functioning criterion. She assigns site size and stone tool compositions as the two independent criteria for judging residential mode. According to her adopted theory, both are affected by seasonality. Thus, two different types of change must have taken place concomitantly with each season. If this is true, the author should state categorically which sites were occupied during which seasons. This would lend credibility to her discussion.

In my own research, I further divide the Moroiso-c phase, which Habu designates as one of the smallest time units, into six sub-divisions according to serial morphological changes in ceramics (Imamura, 2000). In the first three of these sub-divisions, two distinct and stable local traditions of the Chubu Mountain region (Habu’s Area III) and the Gunma region (Habu’s Area I) are recognized. In the latter three sub-divisions, sites in Area III maintain this stability, while sites in Area I suffer a drastic decline into a sporadic distribution of very small sites, and the pottery of the Area III tradition spreads over Area I and becomes dominant there, although its total quantity is very small. One could interpret this as the territorial extension of Area III groups into Area I in the latter half of the Moroiso-c phase. This is a realistic reflection of history and Japanese archaeology closely follows such changes in detail. Is there any meaning, based on dubious statistical analysis and with debatable premises, to apply only one of Binford’s models to the historical context of such large changes?

After her analysis of residential systems, Habu remarks that the sparse distribution of Moroiso-c sites in the southern Kanto (Area II) implies population movement from there to the Chubu Mountain region (Area III) and that this movement resulted in population pressure and the subsequent cultural developments of the Middle Jomon. This discussion represents an extremely dubious leap of logic. Most importantly, there is a span of several hundreds years, with serial changes of pottery style that can be understood only after division into ten separate stages, before the development of the Middle Jomon. During this time span, people with local pottery traditions moved initially from the Hokuriku region, then from western Japan, then from the Chubu Mountain region, and finally, from the Tohoku region into the southern Kanto. This is the reality of history. Habu skips over all ten stages and suggests that an invisible migration during the Moroiso-c phase, which is assumed without any proffered evidence, resulted in the development of Middle Jomon culture. Habu fails to acknowledge the differences in Moroiso-c-type pottery between Area II and Area III, and apparently ignores the meaning of pottery chronology, which is an important basis of Japanese archaeology. Her ideas regarding population pressure and consequent social development appear to have been borrowed from Anglo-American theory.
Settlement system of the Sannai Maruyama site

The Sannai Maruyama site, which dates from the Early to Middle Jomon, is discussed in detail as Habu’s second case study. This site has been excavated intensively since 1992 and has become widely known as the largest Jomon settlement site. I agree with Habu that some archaeologists are incorrect in stating that this settlement maintained its enormous scale over 1500 years and could be called a ‘city’. However, I accept the special value of the new information that has emerged from the research at Sannai Maruyama. Palynological analysis carried out at this site has revealed that when people settled themselves at this spot, the surrounding trees, chiefly oak, were burnt and chestnut trees proliferated until their pollen represented 90% of all arboreal pollen (Tsuji, 1995). The levels of non-arboreal pollen also increased, albeit to a lesser extent. The forest around the settlement was artificially changed into one in which chestnut trees predominated. The Sannai Maruyama people put the nuts in numerous storage pits, some as large as two meters in diameter, and lived there throughout the year. This stable lifestyle and rapid increase in population resulted in the over-hunting of deer and wild boar, which were the usual sources of big game for the Jomon people, and the extinction of these species in the surrounding areas, with the outcome that few bones of these animals were left at the site. Instead, the mammalian remains found at Sannai Maruyama are mainly those of rabbits and flying squirrels. Although Habu suggests that this situation prevailed during period I only, Nishimoto and Toizumi (1995) have shown that the same condition persisted throughout the occupation of Sannai Maruyama. Fishing seasons reconstructed from fish bones indicate year-round residence. There is no discrepancy amongst these different data. The prosperity represented by many similar large settlements with vast numbers of storage pits and large houses in the northern Tohoku region in the middle of the Early Jomon is a truly epoch-making phenomenon. This prosperity gradually spread southward and persisted under the similar prosperous conditions of the middle of the Middle Jomon in central Honshu, as mentioned above.

In spite of this epoch-making change, Habu clings to a model of seasonally moving collectors. Although at certain points, she refers to the possibility of year-round settled collectors, she chooses not to include this in her conclusions. Habu explains that people moved away from Sannai Maruyama in the winter, on the grounds of the scarcity of residual pollen. She assumes that the large amount of pottery found at Sannai Maruyama was produced for trading activity, and that most of the pit-dwellings are small because of short, seasonal use. Habu suggests that the many pit-dwellings at Sannai Maruyama were the result of assembly for trading activity, and that most of the pit-dwellings are small because of short, seasonal use. How, then, can the large amount of pottery found at Sannai Maruyama be explained? Was it discarded, unsold goods? The presence of many local colors in pottery and their small distributional areas in Aomori Prefecture, clear at least for the Lower Ento-d phase, is not in accordance with Habu’s seasonally moving collectors theory.

In her first case study, Habu used statistical analyses, which were not entirely persuasive for this reviewer. In this second case study, in order to extrapolate the collector model to the Jomon culture, only simple ideas are put forward and secure data acquired through painstaking analyses by various researchers are largely neglected. Is this the goal of what Habu calls a ‘theoretical approach’?

Habu’s response to new data

In Japan, following the emergence of important new data, several opinions have been expressed that have led to a fundamental reconsideration of the Jomon culture. Taniguchi and Kawaguchi (2001) have noted that the earliest part of the Jomon period dates from the Pleistocene and that, accordingly, it should be excluded from the Jomon period, in spite of the presence of pottery. Fujio (2002), in discussing the general conditions of the Jomon period, especially its use of plants, and pointing out that similar conditions are termed ‘Neolithic’ in the UK and other north European countries, advocates that Jomon culture should be recognized as an East Asian type of Neolithic adaptation to the Holocene environment. I myself have proposed that the periodization of Japanese prehistory should use proper names, such as Pre-Neolithic, Jomon, Yayoi, and Kofun, in order to avoid confusion with internationally used terms (Imamura, 2002). In terms of the international periods, the Pre-ceramic period is the Paleolithic before the emergence of pottery and the Jomon period corresponds to three periods, i.e. the Paleolithic with pottery, Mesolithic as a time of hunter-gatherers in the Holocene, and Neolithic as the period of food producers. Habu’s book does not acknowledge these opinions, and consistently calls the Jomon a hunter-gatherer society, for the reasons outlined above. Habu plays down the implications of plant cultivation in the Jomon period based on the notion that it did not provide staple foods. The beginning suggests a potential trigger for the ensuing changes. Moreover, the modifications that occurred in the forests around the settlements to increase the number of chestnut trees and the consequent mass production of chestnuts certainly reflect the production of staple foods. The large settlements with numerous storage pits that are concentrated in eastern Japan do not fall within the definition of normal hunter-gatherers. Before the pollen analyses at Sannai Maruyama, I examined in detail this situation and proposed the concept of an ‘arboREAL Neolithic’ (Imamura, 1996). I suggested that in human history food-producing societies other than grain cultivators who propagated grass seeds have existed. Habu’s research may seem progressive to Japanese readers who are not familiar with the theories that she employs. However, her research is rather conservative, following seemingly established theories and lacking the flexibility required to adapt our understanding to the emergence of new discoveries.
Problems with the application of ethnographical information

The distance of 10 km appears frequently in Habu’s book. This is the radius of foraging from a residential base. This distance, which is used without allowance for variability, is derived from observations of human behavior in modern ethnographic cases. However, a value derived for areas with sparse distribution of resources cannot be applied automatically to hunter-gatherers who were surrounded by rich resources from forests, rivers, or seas. It is common sense that people who live in a rich habitat do not usually need to travel far to obtain resources and that in a dense population, one human group is not allowed to monopolize an extensive area. The actual foraging radius must be considered on an individual basis, and consequently, Japanese archaeologists examine the number of sites distributed at a particular time in a certain area.

Numerous Middle and Late Jomon settlement sites have been identified in the east Tokyo Bay area. Many of these sites were used over a long period of time, maintaining a donut shape and forming similarly shaped shell-middens. Most of these settlements were located within 5 km or less from each other, and many of them probably co-existed, judging from their continuous occupational remains. Therefore, the radius of settlement activity for each settlement was essentially 2.5 km, which appears to be feasible for food producers. In my opinion, larger areas were permitted for fishing and hunting by agreement with neighboring settlements. Based on hunter-gatherer theory, Habu argues that plural residential bases could not have existed within a distance of 10 km from each other, and suggests that the apparent overcrowding of shell-midden sites may have resulted from the repeated use of “special-purpose camps for the seasonally intensive exploitation of marine food” (p. 257). Habu repeatedly depends on this reasoning for justification of her notions regarding the seasonal movements of Jomon settlements (p. 102, p. 131, p. 257). In this respect, she ignores the knowledge acquired from widespread coring surveys, which have shown that most of these shell-middens are located quite far from the contemporary shoreline (Horikoshi, 1972; Matsushima, 1979; Teshigawara, 1998). People lived in these settlements and walked up to 10 km for the purposes of fishing and collecting marine shellfish. They did not select settlement location for the convenience of seasonal activities on the seashore. Instead they depended mainly on forest resources and avoided seasonal movements; they chose to walk long distances for activities of secondary importance. Incidentally, sites that undoubtedly represent special-purpose campsites are known for the same period, one of which is the huge Nakazato shell-midden (cf. p. 75), which is located on the beach of the contemporaneous sea and where human artifacts are rare. This site is quite different from the large settlement sites with shell-middens containing rich remains of artifacts that Habu assumes are seasonal camps.

Social complexity

The last topic presented by Habu is social complexity. She criticizes the Marxist historical theory that has influenced Japanese archaeologists to regard the Jomon as an egalitarian society. Instead, Habu suggests that social complexity increased throughout the Jomon period and points to several phenomena, such as the presence/absence of burial goods, especially in child’s burials from the Late-Final Jomon, as reflecting the emergence of social inequality.

I find it difficult to understand why Habu, who admits the possibility of different uses of the word ‘complexity’, criticizes the old egalitarian theory that essentially meant the absence of political rule or exploitation, as she herself does not find these phenomena in the Jomon period. The type of general theory put forward may have been sufficient when unearthed material was very scarce, but the most important reason why many Japanese archaeologists regard Jomon society as egalitarian is the clear social changes reflected in the burial sites and prestige goods of the Jomon, Yayoi, and Kofun periods. Clear social distinction appeared during the Yayoi period and increased rapidly until the Kofun period, at which point an enormous quantity of labor was concentrated on the construction of a small number of huge mound royal tombs. This social distinction has remained constant, even though archaeological information has increased several hundredfold.

As Habu remarks (p. 244), the increasing complexity of rituals and distinction of personal roles in Jomon society was not necessarily accompanied by increasing complexity in terms of subsistence or settlement systems. I have termed this condition the ‘swelling of ideology’ (Imamura, 1999). The clarification of concepts in a broad historical perspective is more important than the scrutiny of slight differences or the stretching of concepts. In this context, Habu makes the important point that some of the elements observed for clearly stratified Northwest Coast Indians are not seen for the Jomon (p. 197). One hopes for more of this type of analysis from someone who is working in North America.

Habu’s style of discussion

A repeated pattern is obvious in Habu’s style of discussion, which derives from her pursuit of originality in her application of Anglo-American theories to Japanese archaeological material. To facilitate their application, the theories themselves are extended, the Jomon is not allowed to exceed the parameters of hunter-gatherer societies, and unnatural interpretations are construed as basic facts. Furthermore, in order to evaluate further the American theories that she uses, Habu underestimates the contributions of senior Japanese archaeologists.

In Chapter 7 (Discussion and conclusion), which summarizes the preceding chapters and applies Anglo-American theory, Habu presents an entire original reconstruction of the temporal changes and regional variations of the Jomon culture. Although, as noted above, her two case studies are not very convincing, Habu proceeds to allocate Binford’s categories of forager, serial forager, and collector to many phases of the Jomon period in an assertive way, though based on weak evidence. I think it is unlikely that I am the only person who finds Habu’s approach here reminiscent of the discussions by Marxist historians, who attempted to impose their authorized historical stages onto Japanese history.
American Anthropological Archaeology and Japanese Archaeology

Opposite directions of the leading methodologies
Since various methods are used by Japanese and Anglo-American archaeologists, it is not possible to represent each group with only one method. However, it is possible to recognize and abstract clearly opposed leading methodological directions for each of these interests.

Japanese archaeology concentrates on the meanings of individual facts, in similarity to historians who decipher words in old documents one by one and reconstruct history from the bottom upwards. Although research is progressing steadily, we cannot yet present a reliable impression of the final historical images. Those who do not understand this situation, i.e. most Anglo-Americans who are interested in Japanese archaeology and a considerable number of Japanese archaeologists, despise this type of approach as a meaningless description of trifling facts. In contrast, American anthropology establishes general theories for a limited number of cases in comparison to the whole history of mankind; subsequently, it attempts to apply these theories in a top-down manner to all societies from the various periods and areas of the world. These theories appear so magnificent and straightforward that even those who do not know archaeology are charmed by them and feel capable of understanding them. However, the applicability of this type of general theory can only be verified by strict examination of numerous cases based on the actual material evidence. This examination may reveal many cases that do not fit with any of Binford’s models. In this context, the Jomon, with its immense quantity of available data, is ideal for checking these theories.

Japanese archaeology attempts to assign the rightful positions to each society and their components through comparisons of the largely different societies of the Preceramic, Jomon, Yayoi, and Kofun, which underwent separate changes in the same area with continuous transition of the environment and within a chain of historical causes and results. This is a historical approach and the processes recognized cannot be easily applied to other areas without the same historical context. This is the main reason why Japanese archaeology is reluctant to depend on models that have been devised for American archaeologists, it is not possible to represent each

Recent advances in Japanese archaeology
Habu refers to the relative chronological study of Jomon pottery as only a base of research, and suggests that the reluctance to adopt radiocarbon dating has delayed progress in this area. In this regard, it is necessary to point out her limited understanding of Japanese archaeology. The chronological study of Japanese archaeology can be divided arbitrarily into two parts: basic studies that provide a temporal framework and applications, such as reading human behavior or social phenomena on a fine-grained temporal diagram. It took a very long time to set up the basic framework because the potteries of the Jomon, Yayoi, and Kofun consists of numerous temporal and regional variations. Nevertheless, we are now proceeding to the next stage of applications. One of the basic techniques is the recognition and tracing of traditional sequences of pottery in as precise a manner as possible. This enables us to recognize rare cases of the collective movement of pottery traditions from their original areas to distant, alien locations. We then carefully observe the relationships and interactions between the intrusive and indigenous traditions. Although the fruits of this type of approach have not been great to date, the following cases have emerged as important.

For the Yayoi period, several cases have been recognized in which a comparatively small group with a specific local pottery tradition migrated to a faraway place and settled there, building new settlements, often with a defensive surrounding moat, in areas of alien pottery traditions (Matsumoto, 1993; Hidai, 2004).

At the beginning of the Kofun period, when keyhole-shaped tombs spread over most of Japan, astonishing cases are known in which a large group made violent advances so as to bring about the extinction of the indigenous pottery tradition of the area in which they settled (Hidai, 2003, 2004). In northern Kyushu, a pottery tradition that originated in the central Kinki region is known to have appeared en masse at several large settlements and overwhelmed the local tradition (Inoue, 1991). This information is now providing answers to the long-lasting controversy over whether the Yamatai kingdom recorded in Chinese chronicles was located in northern Kyushu or central Kinki, and whether or not it was an ancestral form of the archaic Japanese Yamato state.

For the Jomon period, which lasted a very long time and saw stupendous changes in pottery, the basic chronological study is finally proceeding to the next stage. It is known that pottery traditions did not move often during certain phases but moved actively during other phases, especially at times of settlement decline. In some cases, these movements filled the vacuum left after the extinction of indigenous traditions (Imamura, 2000), while in other cases, the intrusive tradition co-existed with the indigenous tradition in each settlement (Imamura, 2001). It is astonishing that some pottery traditions moved several hundred kilometers yet still kept ties with the source area, maintaining shared changes of pottery decoration for considerable periods of time (Imamura, 2001, in press). This is a characteristic of Jomon migration that is not seen for the Yayoi or Kofun periods and which must have deep roots in Jomon society.

Although the chronology is not based on pottery, Japanese archaeologists who study the Preceramic period use the lithic material and morphology of numerous stone flakes from many sites in order to elucidate which stage of stone tool processing produced each artifact. This research sheds light on the functions of each site and the modes of transport and supply of stone material. Putting these sites in a chain-like scheme, non-sedentary but quite regulated human movements that connected several stone resources are being reconstructed (Kunitake, 2004). The supply system changed according to the development of lithic technology and changes in suitable stone materials for new technology. Although this residential system is similar to the so-called forager system, it differs with respect to the regular, repeated use of the same sites.

All these new studies, which are based on precise artifact chronologies, were carried out in the last one or two decades.
These concrete advances could not have been attained by top-down imposition of general theories; they were achieved only through persistent efforts to understand the process of production of each piece of pottery or stone tool, even though much of the pottery concerned has no decoration and seemingly reveals few clues regarding cultural change. These advances were carried out, not so much by building from the bottom upwards, as by digging further down from that basal layer.

Toward real mutual understanding

The aforementioned methods of Japanese archaeology are very difficult to understand for Anglo-American archaeologists, and it is perhaps impossible for them to participate fully in these methods. The methods of Japanese archaeology are too painstaking and time-consuming and probably it is only the passion to resolve the details of the history of one’s own native country that make these endeavors worthwhile. Making the situation worse, the original Japanese methods and research cases have rarely been introduced to foreign scholars in European languages. These studies, which deal with enormous quantities of tiny, concrete facts, are not easy to teach across different specialized fields, even in the Japanese archaeological community, and the difficulties associated with writing and publishing this research in English are overwhelming. Even if it could be done, we cannot necessarily expect that this work would attract a large readership. It is an undeniable fact that most books and articles on Japanese archaeology written in English by Japanese scholars present research conducted using Anglo-American methods or on themes that are expected to be of interest to Anglo-American archaeologists. Habu’s book is a typical example of this trend.

Ancient Jomon of Japan is probably easy to understand for Anglo-American archaeologists; although the material is exotic, the methods are familiar, the reasoning is simple, and the use of unified theory is plain. How comfortable it is to know that the intricate prehistoric cultures of Japan can be explained by American theory! Readers must feel relieved to know that they need not take the trouble to read detailed, complicated, and lengthy discussions of Japanese archaeology before they can get an overview of Jomon culture. I fear that this book, which aims to bridge the gap between Japanese and Anglo-American archaeology, may in fact nip off the buds of a real mutual understanding.

Of course, it is not only a question of criticizing Habu’s approach; we also have a duty to transmit overseas the true methods and results of Japanese archaeology. Japanese archaeology has certainly learned Anglo-American theories, including those of Binford, albeit in a diversified manner; some have accepted these theories with enthusiasm, others have aggressively rejected them, and the remainder falls into the uninterested majority. For those who reject these theories, theory building prior to the construction of the basic foundation may seem fanciful. However, construction of the super-structure of Japanese archaeology has been started and the lack of design of the overall structure and the total concept for building are problems that will be resolved before long. A conscious, explicit approach will naturally be more fruitful than an implicit one. Anglo-American archaeology has and will continue to demonstrate the importance of this approach. The real ‘bridging’ is not to apply American theories to the bottom half of Japanese archaeology but to apply the total entity of American anthropological archaeology, which extends from the top to the bottom, to Japanese archaeology, which builds from the bottom to the top. This combination requires not only that Japanese researchers learn Anglo-American theory but also, and this may be the more difficult part, that Anglo-Americans learn the Japanese method of archaeology. Finally, I wish to repeat that the gap, although narrowing, is still very large. Ironically, Habu’s Ancient Jomon of Japan clearly shows the width of this gap.

† Jomon Reflections by Tatsuo Kobayashi was published in the same year (edited by Simon Kaner, Oki Nakamura and published by Oxbow Books). This book is based on a translation of Jomonjin no sekai [The world of Jomon people] published in 1996.
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