

Editorial

CAROLINE MALONE, SIMON STODDART & SIMON KANER*

Archaeology should combine practical methods, scientific techniques and a good dose of ideas if it is to achieve its proper aim — the description and interpretation of the human past. How the balance of these all too easily separated components is determined has long exercised our discipline. Over the years, the statutory bodies like English Heritage, the funding councils, specialist societies and, indeed, even the university departments have colluded in dividing the specialist branches of archaeological practice into theorists, object-art-technology specialists, scientist-technicians and field archaeologists. Such divisions cannot be healthy for a small discipline, which ultimately has one concern — the discovery and understanding of our past — achieved by whatever means are available to do this.

Doubtless, examples from most countries can be found to demonstrate this unwelcome intellectual and practical fragmentation, but here we wish to discuss the recent changes seen in English Heritage. Before 1985, 'state' archaeology in Britain was attached to the Civil Service via the Department of the Environment and the regional Offices (Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish), and Inspectors of Ancient Monuments and support staff provided a specialist group for Archaeology and Historic Buildings. Since the formation of English Heritage, Historic Scotland and Cadw, there have been massive structural changes in the way that the 'heritage' has been organized, funded, and how specialist staff have been deployed. English Heritage, especially, has been redesigned on several occasions in the last 15 years, as new structures to provide regional cover have been put into operation. There are many branches of archaeologists, even within English Heritage, those responsible for statutory advice on Scheduled Ancient Monuments, in the management and interpretation of Guardianship sites, in Education, in the Ancient Monuments Laboratory, in policy and curation, and in the practical matters of excavation, survey and publication.

As we reported last year, the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments for England has been wound up and amalgamated with English Heritage, and its activities and many of its staff combined with the rather different culture of the government organization. This has not happened in the other countries of Britain, but has been pushed ahead in England, ostensibly because it was perceived that the two bodies were achieving similar goals (the recording and presentation of archaeology and historic buildings) and might as well become one. Thus two very different communities have come together, and much must be done to integrate them successfully into a new type of organization. Alongside this has come regionalization, in tandem with government initiatives to impose regional government and identity across the different areas of England (and more broadly, the British Isles). New regional offices have been opened and staff formerly located in central London are now out in the provinces in teams covering archaeology, monuments, buildings and planning.

The 'centre' at the aptly named Fortress House has been dismembered even further, with the aim of building up a new archaeology centre at Portsmouth in the imposing remains of an 18th–19th-century coastal fortress — Fort Cumberland. For many years this has been the home of what was once called the 'Central Unit', then the 'Central Archaeological Services' — a roving and highly effective specialist archaeological unit which has provided the practical means for English Heritage to exercise its statutory duties in rescue work, research excavation, evaluations and post-excavation. Now under the new title of Centre for Archaeology (CFA) a new addition includes the Ancient Monuments Laboratory, which has developed as a major research, monitoring and advisory resource covering archaeology across England. It has specialist staff to deal with conservation, materials and technology, archaeozoology, archaeobotany and all areas of environmental



The spacious new quarters of English Heritage's Centre for Archaeology at Fort Cumberland, Portsmouth, Hants.

archaeology, curation and artefact studies and information systems. Combined with the expertise of the archaeologists from the field unit in one spacious, if isolated, site, the possibilities for consolidation of research and development amongst this impressive pool of expertise seem to be excellent. Not everyone may be pleased to be placed on the edge of Portsmouth, far from the perceived intellectual and political centre in London, but there are undoubted advantages, and the local universities of Portsmouth and Southampton have already joined forces for combined seminars and discussion. Above all, space is there in plenty, awaiting appropriate repair and conversion from military monument to archaeology centre.

Conversion of the former military garage has provided the opportunity to create some splendid new laboratories, which are infinitely better than the cramped conditions on the top floor of Fortress House. Light, airy, flexible spaces, fitted with purpose-made equipment and benches now offer an environment that can adapt to the changing priorities of technical analysis and research. There is much enlarged storage for sensitive materials like wood, and climate control enables the scanning electron microscope to work much better than before. Our visit in March followed hard on the heels of the main office move to Fort Cumberland, but already much is unpacked and in use. Over the next few months, the 'lab' will be operating fully, and will provide an unparalleled re-

source, matched only, perhaps, by the British Museum and similar institutions. The importance of combining the practical operators of archaeology with the scientists and technicians offers an opportunity for the cross-fertilization of ideas, and more rapid and more integrated intellectual impact on the wider community. The future management and direction of these different areas have traditionally been under the direction of two different panels of English Heritage, the Ancient Monuments Advisory Committee for the archaeologists and the Science and Conservation Panel for the laboratory, but these will have to be more closely aligned on common projects and research. This recombination of two basic and essential areas of archaeology is perhaps what should be seen elsewhere as well. The funding councils divide archaeology, the universities often do, and as suggested above, archaeology has suffered badly from this fragmentation of its component parts. The new Centre for Archaeology clearly has the intention of working closely with archaeological units, universities and the English Heritage staff in the regions, providing a better focus for research and practical implementation.

📖 In this issue, we have a number of 'responses' to material published in *Antiquity*. One response is from the Arts & Humanities Research Board, which was criticized last year for the way that research funding in archaeology was distributed. The AHRB want to make their po-

sition clear, but in our opinion fail to address the main issue we raised in our Editorial that the great tradition of British field archaeology, particularly abroad, is now under severe financial pressure. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, a field archaeologist needed either to be personally wealthy or to secure a great sponsor. In the early 21st century, a field archaeologist will need to pursue the same strategy, albeit that the AHRB might be one of those sponsors. It will no longer be possible to put together a portfolio of financial support (complementary to that provided by the local community) since the intermediate level of funding between £5000 and £20,000 is now almost entirely elusive, and the higher levels of funding are understandably available only to a few. The AHRB should know full well that QR funding (research funding for the universities) has been so much eroded that it cannot provide the alternative support suggested. It is, therefore, ironic that some of the largest AHRB history grants should have been given in support of public institutions like the Public Record Office, which by the same count should have sufficient resources to fund their own research. In such cases, new money is simply money which should come directly from the government to cover its responsibilities in libraries, archives and museums. In other cases of the current funding regime, new money only covers immediate expenses and not the long-term running costs. The successful voluntary tax of the lottery has helped create the new Great Court structure which was once the British Library at the British Museum. However, no new money is being provided to cover the running costs of curation of these new display spaces. Redundancies among research staff are an unavoidable consequence unless the funding regime is changed.

We will make further points in a debate which we will continue to monitor. However, for the moment we have preferred to invite additional comments from others in the field, showing what a lively issue is the matter of money and research! It is an issue that all relatively new and emerging disciplines will need to fight, in order to maintain their position with respect to large and old disciplines.

☛ Stonehenge often makes a justifiable appearance in *ANTIQUITY* and this year is no ex-

ception. This contribution provides an important update on the position of the monument and its future management, and is written by one well qualified to provide such comment, having himself been instrumental in persisting with pressure on government and officialdom. We are pleased to publish Professor WAINWRIGHT's account of the current state of affairs at our national icon. We shall wish to open the debate of Stonehenge later on, because there is still much disagreement about how best to secure the appropriate landscape and access to the site. Please contact the Editors if you wish to comment.

☛ Japan has a similar geographical position with respect to a continental land mass as the United Kingdom. One of us (SS) recently had the opportunity to visit Japan on the occasion of a conference which compared agricultural and complex societies in Asia, including the Yayoi period in Japan and the British Iron Age. This conference showed an eagerness by a significant group of Japanese scholars to break down barriers of language and culture and work with their wealth of archaeological data in a broader theoretical context.

In this context, we have invited SIMON KANER to join us in making some observations about the two ends of Asia. We report on these discoveries in some detail, not only because of their intrinsic interest, but also because of the power of '100% sampling'. The current regime in the United Kingdom is financial, which records a sample of what is to be destroyed. We consider sampling schemes to be very important in introducing rigour into archaeological investigation, particularly in the recovery of palaeoenvironmental and palaeoeconomic information; but we have yet to witness a sampling scheme which can reconstruct many of the complexities of archaeological evidence. The spatial development of complex society in the Valleys of Mexico and Oaxaca would not be known at an appropriate scale if the surveyors had employed transects or probabilistic sampling. The sites which are constantly revisited are Glastonbury Lake Village and Skara Brae, which not only had good preservation but also extensive excavation, even though both were dug in the first part of the 20th century. The aspirations of the excavator of Iron Age Danebury hillfort in Wessex towards an extensive sam-

ple have also raised similar questions in recent decades. This debate is particularly important in the light of a recent review article on Japanese archaeology by Barnes & Okita (1999) which recommends sampling as a solution to many of the current financial concerns of Japanese archaeology. These authors point out the curation problem created by a 100% collection strategy and the attempts by the Agency for Cultural Affairs in Japan to produce in February 1997 a document on the Management of Artefacts. We would equally like to point out that the disconnected sampling quadrats created by the sampling strategies of contract archaeology in the United States and rescue archaeology in the United Kingdom will require many a grant (AHRB ?) to sort out in the coming millennium. The Japanese discoveries below show a positive result of this '100 % sample': a rich array of meticulously collected information. We all sample when we excavate. The challenge is to maintain that appropriate hierarchy of scales to understand both the wider picture of a Jomon midden or a Danebury hillfort, and the intricate detail of a selectively sampled array of ecofacts, where only a limited number of scholars will ever be available to make the necessary analyses and interpretations.

Despite continuing relative economic difficulties over the past few years, Japan continues to produce surprising archaeological discoveries. These are regularly reported in an annual, well-attended, travelling exhibition of fresh archaeological finds. The most recent, 'The Japanese Archipelago Excavated '99', was sponsored by Asahi Newspapers, one of Japan's largest media groups. The exhibition travelled all round Japan, starting in the stylish Tokyo Metropolitan Edo Tokyo Museum, visiting seven venues in eight months. Highlights from the Palaeolithic include some concrete evidence for the mobility of hunting groups in the form of three refitting flakes from the sites of Nakajimayama in Miyagi Prefecture on the Pacific coast and Sodehara 3 in Yamagata Prefecture on the Japan Sea side of the Dewa Mountain range. Dated using tephrochronology, the two sites are thought to pre-date 100,000 years old, making this the oldest discovery of refitting from Japan. The sites were investigated as part of the on-going Palaeolithic research project in northeastern Japan, which a couple of years ago demonstrated that the Japanese Palaeolithic

dates back to perhaps 700,000 years ago at sites such as Kamitakamori. At Kamitakamori one of the most remarkable finds were three pits, containing what appeared to be carefully deposited caches of stone tools. European archaeologists, used to the concept of polished and ground stone tools appearing in the Neolithic, may be surprised by the edge-ground stone axes from the Hachimori site in Yamagata Prefecture. Edge-ground stone tools are known from *c.* 20,000 years ago in Japan, and early examples are also known from Papua New Guinea. The example from Hachimori dates to about 13,000 years ago and was found in association with a spear-head bearing traces of bitumen used for hafting.

The image of the long Jomon period (*c.* 12,000 BP–*c.* 300 BC) is undergoing a major overhaul. In the last volume of *ANTIQUITY* we published a paper by Junko Habu which mentioned the large site of Sannai Maruyama on the northern tip of Honshu in Aomori Prefecture. Sannai Maruyama extends over 35 hectares, and to date over 600 of an estimated 1000 buildings have been investigated. The excavations started life as a rescue project in advance of the construction of a new prefectural baseball stadium. The scale of the discoveries led to a public outcry and a movement to preserve the remains in a historical park, where some of the buildings have now been reconstructed. The site was occupied for over 1500 years, according to the pottery chronology. The exhibition contained two clay figurines in the shape of bears — the smaller of the two was only 6.5 cm long.

Excavations have continued since, and now a 'stone circle' has been identified associated with the settlement. There are no true megalithic stone circles from the Jomon, but rather arrangements of large river cobbles and blocks of stones, marking out circles, platforms or alignments. The most famous of the Jomon stone circles is that at Oyu in Akita Prefecture, a short distance to the south of Aomori, where, amid the apple orchards there are two circular stone arrangements, including possible 'sundial' monuments. Another example has been recently found at Achiyadaira (colour photo, p. 261). Kobayashi Tatsuo of Kokugakuin University in Tokyo has recently been undertaking research into the astronomical significance of these monuments. A road divides the Oyu site in two and Japanese archaeologists are very interested in the plans for Stonehenge. Plans are afoot to in-

clude Oyu and another large stone alignment at Komakino, close to Aomori, in a bid for World Heritage Site status. Although the remains of many buildings have been excavated on Jomon sites, there is little direct evidence for their upper structure, although preserved architectural timbers were discovered at the waterlogged site of Sakuraimachi in Toyama Prefecture a couple of years ago. Clearly showing mortice-and-tenon joints, Sakuraimachi is testimony to Jomon architectural expertise that would be the envy of Flag Fen. Later designs on bronze mirrors from the Yayoi period and *haniwa* tomb figures from the Kofun period show what buildings looked like in the protohistoric period, and reconstructions have been made on this basis (colour photo, p. 261), but the remarkable tufa model of an apparently hipped and gabled house from Sakae 1 in Hokkaido is unprecedented. Waterlogged sites from the Jomon have also produced remarkably preserved lacquered vessels and there were examples from Takasaki Jouhoudanchi II in Gunma Prefecture and the Itoku site cluster in Kochi Prefecture, much further to the west, as well as from Akita. Another Jomon site in the exhibition was the Shimooda shell midden in Chiba Prefecture, just north of Tokyo. A large cemetery had been investigated which demonstrated changing burial customs over a number of phases. Some of the grave goods were very striking, including a set of wild boar tusk pendants and armllets.

Rice agriculture arrived in the later half of the 1st millennium BC. The Yayoi period also saw the appearance of metallurgy, both bronze and iron working. The large cemetery at Hirakubo Moroni in Fukushima Prefecture, in eastern Japan, is evidence for the great social changes that rice agriculture brought about — over 300 graves. Jomon pottery is usually much more decorated than Yayoi pottery, but the Joutou site in Okayama Prefecture has produced an exquisite small vessel bearing a series of incised panels representing faces. The Yayoi is often regarded as seeing the first evidence for organized warfare in the archipelago and the wooden remains of a crossbow from the Himebara Nishi site in Shimane Prefecture add to this picture. This contrasts with the lack of portrayal of war (particularly the Second World War) in the National Museum of History

1999 was clearly also a vintage year for the investigation of the great mounded tombs of

the Kofun period (c. 300–700 AD). Bronze mirrors from the Kurozuka tomb, Nara Prefecture are testimony to links between the early Yamato élite and Chinese emperors (colour photo, p. 261), while the famous Tsubai Otsukayama tomb was also further investigated. The many bronze mirrors from this tomb formed the basis for Kobayashi Yukio's ground-breaking study of alliance networks in Japan at the time of the formation of the earliest states. The study of imperial tombs has traditionally been under the control of the Imperial Household Agency, who have produced a received version of the genealogical chronologies; however, such are the methodological problems of combining history and material culture, it is unlikely that much would be altered by free access. Many of these tombs have been very well preserved and show as traces in the field patterns. In Gumma Prefecture an exceptionally well preserved example at Asada 3 was investigated, protected beneath the same thick volcanic covering that has preserved whole villages and fieldsystems from the 6th century AD — the Pompeii of Japan.

Many of these discoveries are the product of considerable finance from a buoyant economy. In the relative crisis of the Japanese economy, 100% sampling cannot be sustained. Archaeological organizations are having to lay off staff for the first time in their histories, and some are faced with closure. There are problems with not being able properly to assess what is being dug up in the rush to get reports published. Many archaeological organizations directly funded by national government (National Universities, National Museums, National Archaeological Research Centres) are now being turned into 'agencies'. The very English Heritage which opened this Editorial is being employed as a model. Perhaps we can advise the Japanese that their previous strategy had advantages, provided the finance is secure. In 1997, approximately £660 million were spent on 35,366 archaeological investigations of all types, falling under the impact of recession from 41,000 investigations in 1996.

The means of securing that finance is to make sure that there is strong public support behind archaeology. One approach avidly followed in Japan is the presentation of the results to the public. Modern museums employ extensive dioramas and other forms of reconstruction of the past. Jomon pottery is reconstructed experi-

mentally in activities which engage with the general public. There is some concern that sponsorship by newspapers (e.g. Asahi) may lead to a control of interpretation. There is further concern that too many museums may lead to a decline in public participation. The primary concern must, however, be that the prosperity of the Japanese economy be sufficient to sustain what may ultimately be considered a luxury, when there is a tent village of the unemployed in the woods opposite the main national museum in Tokyo.

Reference

Barnes, G. & M. Okita. 1999. Japanese archaeology in the 1990s, *Journal of Archaeological Research* 7(4): 349–95.

☞ In this issue of *ANTIQUITY*, we publish an interim report on a new interdisciplinary project inspired by the work of the late *TIMOTHY POTTER*. The list of authors deliberately — and uniquely in *ANTIQUITY* — sounds like a nuclear physics report in *Nature*, because this initiative is a conscious attempt to bring scholars together in a coalition of ideas and interests centred around the study of urbanism along the Tiber corridor. This is partly a product of *AHRB* times. Large, well-funded projects have inherent advantages in providing proper infrastructure. However, the aim is also to provide a common forum for the exchange of ideas, for which the British School at Rome provides the focus, and proves that the British Schools abroad have considerable worth in this post colonial world of European integration.

All this is a tribute to the work of *TIMOTHY POTTER*, Keeper of Prehistoric and Romano-British Antiquities at the British Museum, who died on 11 January at the early age of 55. Tim Potter managed to combine research in both north and south Europe, from the prehistoric to the medieval period. He had the ability to write effective analytical narratives of the past both in stimulating lectures and in masterly written syntheses of the East Anglian fens, Algeria and South Etruria. He was a keeper of Romano-British Antiquities, but his fieldwork and international interests drew him away from narrow concerns with museum artefacts and, like all greater curators, he placed his artefacts in a broad interpretative context. To our knowledge, there is only one field project he never published and that is his Ager Faliscus survey in South Etruria. This lack of publication is also a tribute to his generosity, because he handed it on to others to complete and through his chair-

manship of the Tiber Valley Project enthused others to speed ahead with new dating, new fieldwork and new computerized analyses. Its completion will be one of his many important continuing legacies.

☞ We printed a mistype in March on p. 1. ‘Glyn Daniel . . . chaired the very popular Anglia TV programme’ should read ‘He chaired the very popular BBC TV programme “Animal, Vegetable, Mineral”, which included amongst its guests such popularizers of archaeology as Mortimer Wheeler and Stuart Piggott. Daniel then became a director of the new Anglia TV channel, further promoting archaeology in the media.’

☞ **Ruth Daniel** (5 July 1915–4 April 2000) We are very sad to announce the death of *RUTH DANIEL* (5 July 1915–4 April 2000), for 30 years (1958–1986) the Production Editor of *ANTIQUITY* alongside her husband Glyn Daniel as Editor. Not only did she ensure the accuracy and high standards that characterized the journal, but also the rapid turnover and efficient production of a regular journal produced at a time of traditional printing and postage. Glyn and she made up a quite remarkable team, he providing the humorous, wide-ranging and perceptive editorship that so characterized his term as Editor, and she the quality, detail and efficiency of a truly professional production editor. Long after she retired from *ANTIQUITY*, Ruth continued to proof-read books and papers for colleagues and publishing houses — such work in many ways was a vital part of her life, indeed, it might be suggested that Ruth played the key role in making *ANTIQUITY* what it was and is, she made it happen and over 30 years! Ruth was a scholar in her own right, a Geography graduate of St Anne’s College, Oxford, a devoted musician and life-long supporter of St John’s College Choir at Cambridge. She was also a talented and keen cricketer and calligrapher. As a Trustee of *ANTIQUITY*, and a great supporter of the recent Editors and Production Editor, she will be sorely missed. There is a memorial fund to Glyn and Ruth Daniel for the support of graduate research in archaeology (or music) at St John’s College, and if readers would like to contribute towards this enduring memorial, please write to the Senior Bursar, St John’s College, Cambridge.

☞ Archaeology faces fragmentation everywhere — too many specialized areas, too many professionals. Our Reviews Editor, *NICHOLAS*

*Glyn and Ruth Daniel at Heffers' bookshop, Cambridge, during the party for the launch of Glyn's autobiography, *Some small harvest*, in 1986.*



Stone circle at Achiyadaira (Niigata prefecture), constructed from 250 river pebbles. (Photo Weekly Asahigraf, December 1998: 7.)



Mirror from the Kurozuka mounded tomb. Bronze mirrors provide a link between early Japanese rulers and the Chinese empire.

Reconstruction of Yayoi period shrine at Ikegami-soné in Osaka, which will be opened this spring 2000.



JAMES represented ANTIQUITY at the April 2000 meeting of the Society of American Archaeology in Philadelphia, and reports as follows:

The Society for American Archaeology in 2000

Some 3000 archaeologists and more than 1500 short papers and poster presentations made up the 65th annual meeting of the Society for American Archaeology in Philadelphia from 5 to 9 April. It is the world's biggest archaeological society; and, together, its members have an immense effect on archaeology all around the world. Yet, for a few years, now, they have been concerned about the Society's focus.

Some 39% of all the papers and 'posters' were on North America, about 31% on work in Latin America, about 21% on work elsewhere — drawing many contributors from Europe — and about 5% were devoted mainly to method and theory. Up to 18 running at once, most sessions comprised presentations assembled more or less coherently by the organizers; but several symposia and workshops were focused more tightly on theory, method and technique, and on particular sites or districts. Among the latter were sessions on rescue work in New Jersey and Washington State, on research at Cactus Hill, Hell Gap, Watson Brake and Hickory Bluff, in the USA, in Belize and Yucatan, on Copan, Honduras, at Conchopata, Bolivia, at the Marshall's Pen plantation, Jamaica, at Pompeii, and at Al Basra, Morocco. There were three sessions on China and one on Medieval Ireland. Symposia were held in honour of K.C. Chang, R.S. MacNeish, R.L. Hall, T.P. Culbert, L.G. Freeman, W.L. Rathje and the late George Hasemann. The annual meeting is also the occasion for other meetings, before, during and afterward, mostly concerned with professional affairs.

Two main issues for the Society are the balance between the academics and their colleagues in 'public' and 'contract' archaeology and the balance between work in North America and research further afield. The issues are not unrelated. It is 25 years since the Society decided to establish a Register of Professional Archaeologists (ANTIQUITY 50 (1976): 230); but some now worry about divergence of interest and ethos at its annual conference. A forum on publication brought forth strongly felt responses to the Society's proposal for suspending *Latin American Antiquity*. This journal was launched 10

years ago in order to cope with the increasing volume of papers on research beyond the Rio Grande; but it has come to be regarded as a poor — less widely distributed — cousin to the established *American Antiquity*. The proposal now is to bring Latin America back under the latter's purview next January, and to publish six times a year, taking the total volume of the journal up to the equivalent of the two together. 'A combined journal', urged the proposal, 'could help bring archaeologists together . . . at a time when we face increasing common threats to the archaeological record'.

Dissemination and education was the theme of five sessions. The Society's Public Education Committee sponsored one, organized by J. Carman *et al.*, which included, among others, contributions from the editor of *Current Archaeology*, from P.M. Messenger on the Science Museum of Minnesota's 'multivocal' 'Window on Catalhoyuk', and from C. McDavid on visitors' participation at the Jordan Plantation. There were suggestions that professionalism tends to divide archaeologists from their lay audience. The same Committee also sponsored a symposium on 'mixing student training, research, and public education'.

The address by Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior, on the US government's recent achievements in archaeological preservation — notably in parks — was well received. At the same session, the Society presented its awards, including to 'Scotty' MacNeish for 'more than a half-century of excellence in interdisciplinary research', to William Lipe for his work in 'public archaeology' and education as well as research and teaching, to George Stuart (National Geographic Society) for 'public education' and to Clive Gamble for his book, *The Palaeolithic societies of Europe* (reviewed on pp. 442–4, below). Another highlight was the silent auction in aid of the Native American Scholarship Fund. ANTIQUITY encourages readers to donate craftwork to next year's. Do let the Chair know of offers: Dr Warburton, NAU, Navajo Nation Archaeology, BRC PO Box 6013, Flagstaff AZ 86011, USA.

A large party from the conference was invited to the University of Pennsylvania's fine Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology. The curators must have been satisfied that the new alarm responded so very loudly; and they kept an admirably stiff upper lip over the explosion, shortly before our visit, of a steam duct in the archive.