

doi:10.17746/1563-0110.2022.50.1.057-064

D.A. Ivanova¹ and A.V. Tabarev²¹*Far Eastern Federal University,
Ayaks 10, Russky Island, Vladivostok, 690922, Russia
E-mail: ivanova.dale@dyfu.ru*²*Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography,
Siberian Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences,
Pr. Akademika Lavrentieva 17, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia
E-mail: olmec@yandex.ru*

The Specifics of Japanese Terms Referring to the Jōmon Period, Based on Publications by Yamanouchi Sugao and Kobayashi Tatsuo

This article discusses difficulties in the use of Japanese archaeological terminology, especially with regard to the Jōmon period. The history of the notions of “style”, “type”, and “form” is outlined, which are the most adequate concepts for the interpretation, classification, and description of new styles of the Jōmon pottery. The evolution of the terms is traced using the works by Yamanouchi Sugao and Kobayashi Tatsuo. Their basic views on the typology of Jōmon artifacts and the notions behind the key terms are described.

Keywords: *Japanese archipelago, Jōmon, terminology, historiography, pottery, style.*

Introduction

The terminological apparatus is an important component of any scholarly research. Terminology issues are especially relevant when it comes to the archaeology of foreign countries. The terminological apparatus used by foreign authors often differs significantly from that used in Russia. This fully applies to Japanese scholarship. An incorrectly used term may lead to problems in understanding the essence of the phenomenon under consideration. This also applies to such broad concepts as “age”, “period”, and “culture”.

The present-day Japanese archaeological terminology is one of the hardest to understand and adapt to other languages. Many descriptive terms are purely image-based and are used to varying degrees in a regional or local context, that is over the entire archipelago or only individual islands and regions. Difficulties of translating

and understanding are also illustrated by specific aspects of collaboration with Japanese colleagues, which include relatively limited access to archaeological evidence (mainly museum expositions) and do not involve foreign archaeological expeditions to Japan (only in the form of invited participants or field schools). Another feature of Japanese archaeology is related to the specific aspect of their publications, most of which contain detailed information about individual sites, but do not provide the general picture of periods and ages for large regions and the entire archipelago.

Japanese archaeologists have traditionally used different terms depending on the period of ancient history. These differences are most pronounced when working with the collections of Paleolithic and Jōmon artifacts. When describing Paleolithic evidence, Japanese scholars use the terms accepted in European scholarship, while when analyzing specific features

of Jōmon pottery, they employ both European and Japanese terms.

In a number of articles, we have already addressed general terms applied to the Jōmon period and their origins (Tabarev, Ivanova, 2016, 2018, 2020; Tabarev, Zhushchikhovskaya, Ivanova, 2020). This study discusses the notions of “style” (*yōshiki* 様式), “type” (*katashiki* 型式), and “form” (*keishiki* 形式), used in working with large collections of pottery evidence. We will focus on specific aspects of their emergence in the works of two luminaries of Japanese archaeology—Yamanouchi Sugao and Kobayashi Tatsuo, thanks to whom these concepts were introduced and became commonly applied to scholarly research.

History of research into Jōmon pottery

A typical feature of the material culture of the Jōmon period consists of numerous ceramic vessels, most of which are decorated with sophisticated ornamental compositions. The distinctness of this pottery both in terms of decorative motifs and the shapes of vessels has attracted the attention of scholars in various fields already since the late 19th century. Studies in typology and periodization have played a central role in the history of its research. Since the late 1920s, the systematization process of a huge amount of data on ancient pottery (of the Jōmon and Yayoi cultures) began in the Japanese scholarly community, for creating a universal terminological apparatus (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2008).

In the developed periodization and classification of large pottery complexes, there are three basic, important notions: *style*, *type*, and *form*. In the archaeological community, it was Nakaya Jiujiro who discussed them in a systemic way for the first time (1929: 354–398). Later, Kobayashi Yukio carried out a systematic study of pottery of the Yayoi period in accordance with the concept of “style-type-form”, created by Nakaya Jiujiro (Kobayashi Yukio, 1933). Yamanouchi Sugao introduced the concept of “type” to which he attached fundamental importance (1932). After making a detailed comparative analysis, Yamanouchi Sugao was the first scholar to create a table systematizing pottery evidence from the entire country. Yamanouchi Sugao’s approach was to identify what he called “chronological units” according to such criteria as region, stage, and distinctive features. Each of the units corresponded to types of ceramic vessels, which were distinguished by their shape, decoration, and manufacturing features. These studies were aimed at bringing the huge amount of data on Jōmon pottery into a system by finding specific patterns.

In the 1960s–1970s, a number of scholars worked on refining, detailing, and unifying pottery typology.

Additional impetus was given by re-evaluation of the Yayoi culture, which started to be regarded as a phenomenon in its own right rather than an intermediate stage between the Jōmon and Kofun periods. In these years, attention to contextual information increased. Classification (continuation of Yamanouchi Sugao’s typology) started to be based on criteria such as shape, style, and decorative composition. Analysis of production, use, and disposal began to be actively applied. One of the main creators of the updated classification of the Jōmon pottery was Kobayashi Tatsuo, who repeatedly expressed his thoughts on the subject and elaborated his own terminology based on the classification by Yamanouchi Sugao (1975, 1977).

In the last decades of the 20th–early 21st century, it became common among the Japanese archaeologists that the term “type” designates “a set of stable features”, “style” – “unique artistic features”, and “form” – “a set of morphological features”. The completion of the process of unifying the conceptual apparatus appeared in special issues of *Kōkogaku zasshi* (*Archaeological Journal*) in 1996–1997. In addition, a series of works by Ōtsuka Tatsuō on revision of the concepts by Yamanouchi Sugao (1996, 2017) has been published. Recent publications on the pottery complex of the Jōmon period take into account such aspects as correlation of features, origin of types, varieties, styles, etc., dependence of types on distribution methods, individual and collective production, and possibility of pottery replication. These are only the main trends in the present-day concepts used in Japanese archaeology, which require deeper study and are outside the scope of this work.

In order to understand the emergence of the conceptual apparatus applied to the Jōmon period, one needs to consider the evolution of ideas proposed by Yamanouchi Sugao and Kobayashi Tatsuo regarding three basic concepts: *style*, *type*, and *form*.

The theory of Yamanouchi Sugao: “Type” as a basic unit in periodization of Jōmon pottery

Yamanouchi Sugao (1902–1970) was one of Japan’s most respected archaeologists and a key figure in systematizing the Jōmon pottery complex. In 1923, he began to successively study the variants of rope stamp impressions found on pottery of the Jōmon period (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1929). By 1930, Yamanouchi Sugao had identified almost all of their known combinations. His studies were duly appreciated in the archaeological community as “the largest analysis of rope stamp impressions”. The results he obtained made the basis for his work on general typology and periodization of pottery (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1937). After analyzing

all the archaeological evidence available at his time, Yamanouchi Sugao divided the territory of the Japanese archipelago into nine zones and identified five stages in the Jōmon period (initial, early, middle, late, and final). The subsequent studies were focused on elaborating a more detailed periodization of the pottery complex and on chronological arrangement of all sites and finds known by that time. It is important to mention that this work gave impetus to active search and identification of new styles and types of pottery in different regions from Hokkaido to Okinawa (Ōtsuka Tatsurō, 2008).

In his research, Yamanouchi Sugao focused on the following points.

1. “Type” in Jōmon pottery corresponds to a certain “chronological unit” (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1932, 1937). This category was created for resolving the controversy on periodization of the Jōmon period over the vast territory of the archipelago. Its main tool was comparative analysis and theory of continuous development of pottery traditions in the Jōmon period.

2. A group of objects belonging to the same stage of the Jōmon period and similar in shape, ornamentation, method of application, and production techniques corresponds to a single type of pottery. It contains various kinds of vessels, so the type can be divided into various subtypes (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1969). For understanding the variety of types, one needs to study social relations on the archipelago in ancient times.

As it has already been mentioned, according to Yamanouchi Sugao, the main element of pottery typology was type (*katashiki* 型式). It defines chronological and territorial differences in Jōmon pottery. The most important criterion for distinguishing type is joint occurrence of vessels in a single stratigraphic (cultural) layer, as the main temporal indicator. The second criterion is stylistic unity. It can only be used in the framework of one group of vessels with similar shape or similar ornamental motif (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1937).

According to Yamanouchi Sugao, the concept of type was sufficient for identifying Early and Late Jōmon pottery on the archipelago, but it could not escape criticism for insufficient explanation of the complicated structure of the Middle Jōmon pottery complex. In this regard, it is noteworthy that in fact Yamanouchi Sugao used the notion of variety (*shiki* 式* – abbreviation of *katashiki*), which went beyond the category of type defined by him (Ōtsuka Tatsurō, 2008). This term was suitable for describing local pottery complexes in the context of a single site, for example, the pottery of the Ento type (Late Initial – Early Middle Jōmon period, Tohoku region). However,

in the case of more sophisticated complexes, the use of the category of “type” and “variety” raises many questions. For example, Yamanouchi Sugao used the concept of “pottery of the Kamegaoka variety” (Final Jōmon period, Tohoku region), which included a large number of types (Ōbora varieties B, BC, C₁, C₂, A, and A') used as chronological units (1930). However, he did not discuss the distinction between the Ōbora and Kamegaoka varieties. For the pottery of the Angyo variety (second half of the Late to Final Jōmon period, Kanto region), Yamanouchi Sugao established the Ryōkesarugai shell midden pottery complex (Kawaguchi City, Saitama Prefecture) as referential. This group included the evidence from the Angyō, Shinpukuji (Saitama Prefecture), and Iwai (Chiba Prefecture) shell middens. It was additionally subdivided into varieties 1, 2, 3a, 3b, and 3c (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1930, 1964). Thus, it was a carefully systematized group of pottery that corresponded to the notion of “type” in the concept of Yamanouchi Sugao, based on decorative and technical and typological features that were common for all samples of this pottery. Consequently, it appears as a single whole throughout its entire existence; and therefore, this group of pottery was given one common name (Ōtsuka Tatsurō, 2008).

Using the concept of type introduced by Yamanouchi Sugao, a chronological table of Jōmon pottery was compiled for all parts of Japan. However, subsequent research in this field, and in particular the studies of Kobayashi Tatsuo, have changed the initial meaning of the term “type”, thereby resolving the terminological contradiction and providing a more precise content to the notions of “style” and “form”. In his study of 1975, Kobayashi Tatsuo observed that Yamanouchi Sugao operated with the single notion of “type”, while in research of the Yayoi pottery three notions (style, form, and type) were employed. In his opinion, systematizing pottery evidence from the Jōmon period using only the notion of type led to confusion and multiple variations, so it was necessary to use the system of notions that were applied to Yayoi pottery (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1975: 48–49).

The theory of Kobayashi Tatsuo: The concept of style, type, and form

Kobayashi Tatsuo, a student of Yamanouchi Sugao and Professor Emeritus of Archaeology at Kokugakuin University (Tokyo) and Director of the History Museum of Niigata Prefecture, is recognized as the world's authority on the Jōmon period. He published a large number of articles, collections of articles, multi-volume academic publications, popular and educational books, including some in the English language. Kobayashi Tatsuo's archaeological interests in the Jōmon period

*This hieroglyph can also be translated as “style”, which complicates our understanding of the terminological apparatus of Yamanouchi Sugao.

included the following areas: theory of type and style (1967a, b, c), calendar and economy (1975, 1983), primary and secondary tool complexes (1977), settlement system and village model (1973, 1980), decorative and narrative ornamentation (1981, 1986), adaptive strategy and socialization (1995), landscapes and ritual complexes (2005), emergence of the Japanese language (Ōno Susumu, Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2006), and many more. Central to his works are three fundamental fields (Ivanova, 2018: 29–30):

1. Jōmon society: its lifestyle, settlement development, food procurement strategies, interaction with the environment, and ways of using the landscape for people's needs. In the late 1950s, one of the dominant trends became the study of settlement complexes (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1973). Importantly, Kobayashi Tatsuo's approach to the issue was new for that time. He took into consideration various aspects of Jōmon sites, including their location, total number of dwelling structures, presence or absence of utility pits and burial grounds, number and types of finds, and duration of settlement functioning (Kobayashi, 2004: 99–130; Habu, 2004: 61–62).

2. Perception of the surrounding space on the basis of sophisticated ritual and ceremonial complexes (accumulations of stones, stone circles, massive wooden platforms), attributes of ritual practice (*dogū*, *sekibō*, ceremonial vessels), and *basshi* initiation ritual (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2005).

3. Specific aspects of pottery production and identification of new pottery styles using modern archaeological evidence. Analysis of pottery styles is primarily focused on techniques of vessel manufacturing (clay composition, nature of inclusions, molding, primary and secondary finishing, temperature impact on the quality of firing and color of pottery). Using the results of studies on the inner surfaces of vessels and experimental data, the relationship between the shape of the vessels and their possible functional purposes has been established (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1975; 1977: 159–181).

The content of the notions of style, type, and form was formed and supplemented over several decades. These terms were first used by Kobayashi Tatsuo in 1967 (1967a, b, c) and then discussed in the article “Typology” (1975). However, these concepts became widely known among scholars after the publication of Kobayashi Tatsuo's work “The World of Jōmon Pottery”, where he again insisted that at least three notions had to be applied to the description of this pottery, as with the Yayoi culture (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1977: 154). He provided a theoretical basis for differences in views on basic terms, and elaborated a system of notions for studying the Jōmon pottery. For avoiding confusion, Kobayashi Tatsuo gave the following reading of the terms that he used earlier: style (*yōshiki*), type (*katashiki*), and form (*keishiki*).

Type (*katashiki* 型式). No two vessels are alike among the Jōmon pottery. All of them have individual features, since they were made by hand without the use of a potter's wheel. However, if we look at their external features and decorative elements, we may find vessels with many common features. Such a group of pottery can be correlated with the concept of “type”.

When creating a vessel, it was as if the artisan first drew in his mind a certain model of the future artifact, and then embodied the idea in clay. The idea of the object was based on the information that potters had. Different people of the Jōmon period had a common model that formed the basis of one type. Consequently, they possessed some common information, which was based on the social structure of the Jōmon society and special organization of the living space in the settlements. The people of the Jōmon period lived in small families in semi-dugouts. In most cases, dwellings were located around a “central square”. It was a place for collective activities and rituals, the participation in which, above all else, played another important role: the exchange of information. The most striking examples of settlements with concentric structure are the sites of Nishida (Iwate Prefecture) and Saikaibuchi (Yamagata Prefecture) of the Middle Jōmon period (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1973, 1980, 1990; Ivanova, 2020). Daily communication, joint work and everyday life, and common thinking—all this influenced the development of a certain model by the potters. Since “type” was formed due to contacts within a group, we can conclude that it was a collective form of expression, a symbol of society (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1975).

A similar idea was put forward by Sugihara Sōsuke and Serizawa Chōsuke. In the former case, it was a close connection of a certain type of pottery with a certain group of people (Sugihara Sōsuke, 1943: 139–140). Serizawa Chōsuke wrote that “type ‘A’ corresponds to a group of people who were born in the same area, produced and used pottery, and died there...” (1958: 170–172).

The type of pottery is related to the appearance of vessels as a whole, including their ornamental composition. For this reason, it is almost pointless to establish it by fragments of the neck, bottom, or body. When it comes to decoration, the general arrangement of patterns and the motif determine a specific type, while individual elements or method of application make it difficult to correctly distinguish the type, as opposed to style, which can be identified from a small fragment giving no idea as to the general form (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2008: 3–4).

Style (*yōshiki* 様式). Initially, Kobayashi Tatsuo explained style as individual feeling and atmosphere (aura), but the scholarly community was against using vague concepts (Abiko Shōji, 2008: 887). Nevertheless, in the understanding of Kobayashi Tatsuo, style was related not to the physical shape of the vessel or specific

decorative motif on its surface, but to the perception of the integral image (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2008: 4).

It is standard for different types of vessels manufactured and used at the same time to be found in the same region or site. These types may differ from each other in shape, arrangement of decorative belts or ornamental motif, but they have a common “atmosphere”. Usually, it is perceived during an initial visual analysis, but sometimes after touching the pottery. This is the meaning of “style” (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1978).

In addition to “atmosphere”, style is determined by manufacturing technique and method of decoration. They are described by abstract concepts: “...each style has its own feeling and atmosphere... which already relate to the manner of manufacturing a ceramic product. At all stages of creating a pot, starting from preparation of clay, kneading the filler, preparing the compound, creating a shape, drawing a pattern, and further through the drying and firing process, a certain manner typical of different areas and periods of the Jōmon period can be discerned. Precisely the manner of making the vessel at all stages creates a special feeling and atmosphere...” (Ibid.: 44). According to Kobayashi Tatsuo, the “manner of manufacturing” was associated with various aspects of the life of society in physical and religious terms. In the former case, this concerned the choice of specific raw materials; in the latter case, various restrictions, taboos, incantations, or rituals.

Uniqueness of pottery style and its special manner manifests itself at all stages of manufacturing a vessel: in the choice of clay and types of fillers, method of molding the object, degree of drying the blanks, use of specific ornamental patterns, creation of pictorial motifs, as well as firing time and intensity of oxygen supply, etc. We will not dwell on all stages, but will only mention the most striking features of some styles. For instance, the Atamadai style pottery (first half of the Middle Jōmon period, Kanto region) is a spectacular example of a special manufacturing manner. Its originality manifests itself even at the stage of clay preparation, to which mica was added as a leaner. Mica created the effect of pieces of golden leaf, making the surface of the pots shine. A large amount of talc was added to the clay of the Sobata style pottery (Early Jōmon period, Kyushu), which gave the products a special smoothness and dull gloss.

There are many similar examples throughout the Jōmon period. In some cases, we see the use of non-standard types of leaner (graphite, mica, talc, chlorite slate, vegetable fiber, wool); in others, addition of large objects to the clay, such as whole acorns (Early and Middle Jōmon period) (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1977, 1978, 1981). Thus, the manner of making pottery, which is observed at the stage of preparing raw materials, created a certain specific atmosphere for the pottery, and this was not limited to visual perception, but might also be felt

during primary processing of the artifact at the level of tactile sensations.

If in most cases at the stage of preparing clay and molding the vessel, similarities have been observed, an “explosion” of stylistic originality has been noted at the stage of applying ornamentation. A special manner of manufacturing is manifested in processing the surface of a vessel (by rubbing or polishing), using various ornamental patterns (stamps, bundles, a shell, bamboo stick, or spatula), and creating pictorial motifs. The stage of applying ornamentation was the most creative process during which a unique stylistic atmosphere emerged. The most vivid decorative variety both in terms of technological methods and tools, and in terms of ornamental compositions, appears among the evidence of the Middle Jōmon period. According to archaeological data, twenty three pottery styles existed on the Japanese archipelago at that time, each with its own special “atmosphere”. A good example is two variants of one of the classic methods of applying rope decoration, when sections with and without the pattern were separated by drawn lines. In one method (B), first the impressions of the rope were stamped, and then the outer or inner part of the pattern limited by lines was smoothed; in the other method (A), the outline of the pattern was first drawn, and then imprints of the rope stamp were applied inside or outside it. The smoothed variant of ornamentation (variant B) appears on the pottery of the Moroiso (second half of the Early Jōmon period, Kanto region) and Katsusaka (middle Middle Jōmon period, Kanto region) styles. However, variant A was typical of the Kasori E (second half of the Middle Jōmon period, Kanto region), Daigi 9 and 10 (same time, Tohoku region), and Horinouchi A (early–mid Late Jōmon period, from the south of Tohoku to Kinki) styles, while variant B was typical of the Kasori B style (mid Late Jōmon period, Kanto region). At first glance, both of these variants produce almost the same effect, but this distinction reveals different choices in pottery ornamentation in terms of time, territory, and style (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2008: 8).

Each pottery style had its own temporal and territorial framework (the so-called stylistic zones). It is important to mention that styles were not isolated from each other: their mutual influence and borrowings can be observed in the border zones. In some cases, single specimens of pottery from the neighboring “stylistic zones” penetrated far into the depths of the adjacent territories. The spread of a style can be seen by the spread of the types that constitute it. This indicates the territorial unity of the group that used the same manner of pottery manufacturing. According to the majority of experts, the spread and mutual influence of styles occurred due to marriage unions (Ibid.: 9).

For the space of 10,000 years of the Jōmon period, Japanese scholars have identified over seventy five

main pottery styles*, which appeared one after the other in different places. They were the markers of local (regional) communities. According to Kobayashi Tatsuo, this indicates the existence of groups distinguished by commonality of thoughts regarding a certain atmosphere and its embodiment in pottery (1995). Yamanouchi Sugao described a territorial unit as an area corresponding to the habituation of a tribe (group) speaking the same dialect. The sedentary way of life, protection of one's own territory with its further modification (improvement) led to stabilization of the Jōmon society of hunter-gatherers. Development of trade networks within the archipelago led to the emergence of federations and areas with domination of specific dialects. Their boundaries to some extent may reflect the areas of specific styles (Yamanouchi Sugao, 1969: 86–88; Ōno Susumu, Kobayashi Tatsuo, 2006).

Form (*keishiki* 形式). Unlike “type”, which determines style at a particular time and place, the notion of form goes beyond style. This notion is associated with the kind of items that have common morphological features, such as deep pots (*fukabachi* 深鉢), shallow pots (*asabachi* 浅鉢), jars (*tsubo* 壺), plates (*sara* 皿), etc. Form correlates with the function of the item, and characterizes it as an item belonging to kitchen utensils.

Forms of Jōmon pottery resulted from consistent adaptation of the carriers of the Jōmon culture to the natural conditions of the Japanese archipelago. Pottery was originally intended for cooking (boiling and frying), and this is why the vast majority of vessels were deep pots (*fukabachi*). They existed throughout the entire period and were the dominant type of pottery. Depending on the shape of the neck and body, from two to five or six varieties of *fukabachi* are often distinguished within the styles. However, with the development and sophistication of material culture, there was an increase in the variants of shapes and their functional diversity. Changes were most pronounced in the Middle Jōmon period in the regions of Kanto and Chubu. For example, the Katsusaka style stands out from other styles of that time by the variety and uniqueness of shapes. In addition to the classic type of pottery (deep *fukabachi* pots), there appeared a variety of ceramic trays (*kidaigata doki* 器台形土器), stemmed bowls (*daitsuki bachi* 台付鉢), vessels with handles for hanging (*tsurite doki* 釣手土器), and with edging and holes along the rim (*yūkōtsubatsuki doki* 有孔罎付土器) (Kobayashi Tatsuo, 1981, 1986; Ivanova, 2018: 182–188).

*The singular and largest collection of pottery from the Jōmon period was published in 2008 (Sōran jōmon doki, 2008). This book was timed to the celebration of the 70th anniversary of Kobayashi Tatsuo, and was the first comprehensive work in the history of Japanese archaeological science on an individual cultural phenomenon. 169 authors contributed to this collection, which presents data on the 110 pottery styles that existed throughout the Jōmon period.

Conclusions

After considering the background behind the emergence of highly specialized terms for the Jōmon period in the works of Yamanouchi Sugao and Kobayashi Tatsuo, we may draw the following conclusions.

1. In the 1930s, the process of accumulation of data was underway. The first attempts were made to create a unified typology of Jōmon pottery, which involved the emergence of specialized terms used for describing the pottery complex.

2. The term “type”, proposed by Yamanouchi Sugao, was the most widely used term in the academic circles of his time. His main goal was generalizing a huge array of information on Jōmon pottery with further creation of a system based on development patterns in the pottery complex. A detailed comparative analysis by Yamanouchi Sugao resulted in a unified periodization table of the Jōmon pottery for the entire archipelago, based on the notion of “type”. The main criterion for distinguishing type was joint occurrence of vessels in a single stratigraphic layer, which proved the simultaneity of the pottery complex. Stylistic unity was also important. This criterion could only be applied within the framework of one group of vessels with the same shape and similar decoration. The work performed by Yamanouchi Sugao was invaluable for the first half of the 20th century; but owing to the variety of pottery from the Jōmon period, the notion of “type” did not become a universal tool that could fully describe all its specific features.

3. The model created by Yamanouchi Sugao formed the basis for the chronological scale that, with clarifications and additions, has been successfully used by Japanese archaeologists as a unique and most accurate tool for dating archaeological evidence of the Jōmon period.

4. In the mid 20th century, there was a need to improve the Yamanouchi Sugao model in accordance with new data and trends of the time, which resulted in a more detailed periodization of Jōmon pottery proposed by Kobayashi Tatsuo, based on the notions of style, type, and form. Currently, these are the basic notions for studying pottery complexes of the Jōmon period.

It can be concluded that it is necessary to adapt the Japanese conceptual apparatus used for analyzing technical and typological manufacturing features and decoration of vessels to the terminology and typology adopted in Russia for describing archaeological evidence. This would involve a long and difficult process that would consist not only of detailed study of literary sources, but also of consultations with Japanese colleagues who could point out some nuances in the use of terms in the course of field research, in reports at conferences, and in the educational process. An important step would be the creation of at least a

trilingual (Japanese-Russian-English) dictionary on the archaeology of the Japanese archipelago in general and the Jōmon period in particular.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project No. 19-39-60001). The authors are grateful to their Japanese colleagues from Tohoku University (Sendai) Professors Akoshima Kaoru, Kanomata Yoshitaka, and Kanno Tomonori for their important comments on the topic of the article. Special thanks go to K.G. Matafonov for his help in translating theoretical works.

References

- Abiko Shōji. 2008**
Jōmon doki kenkyū kaidai – Kobayashi Tatsuo [Bibliography of the Jōmon pottery studies – Kobayashi Tatsuo]. In *Sōran Jōmon doki*. Tokyo: UM Promotion, pp. 880–895. (In Japanese).
- Habu J. 2004**
Ancient Jōmon of Japan, R.P. Wright (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Ivanova D.A. 2018**
Sredniy dze:mon ostrova Khonsyu (5–4 tys. l.n.): Obshchiye kharakteristiki i lokalniye osobennosti: Cand. Sc. (History) Dissertation, vol. 1. IAET SO RAN, Novosibirsk.
- Ivanova D.A. 2020**
Poselentsheskiye kompleksy srednego dze:mona regiona Tokhoku: Obshchiye cherty, lokalniye osobennosti i osnovniye terminy. *Teoriya i praktika arkheologicheskikh issledovaniy*, vol. 32 (3): 36–58.
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1967a**
Jōmon sōki zenhan no mondai [Problems in the study of the first half of the Early Jōmon Period]. In *Tama nyūtaun iseki chōsa hōkoku*, vol. 2. Tama: Tama New Town Site Study Group, pp. 37–53. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1967b**
Nagano-ken Nishichikuma-gun Kaiden-mura Yanagimata iseki no yūzetsusentōki to sono hangata [Stone stemmed points from the site of Yanagimata, Kaida village, Chikuma, Nagano, and their variants]. *Shinano zasshi*, vol. 19 (4): 269–276. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1967c**
Jōmon banki ni okeru dohan to ganban kenkyū no zentei [Prerequisites for the study of clay and stone tablets of the Final Jōmon Period]. *Busshitsu bunka*, No. 10: 1–8. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1973**
Tama nyūtaun no senjū-sha [Former dwellers of the Tama New Town – settlement system in the Jōmon Period]. *Gekkan bunkazai*, iss. 112: 20–26. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1975**
Taiporōji [Tipology]. In *Nihon no kyūsekkai bunka sōron-hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Yuzankaku, pp. 48–63. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1977**
Jōmon doki no sekai [The Jōmon pottery world]. In *Nihon genshi bijutsu taikai. Jōmon doki*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Shinsensha, pp. 153–181. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1978**
Jōmon doki [Jōmon pottery]. *Nihon no bijutsu*, No. 145: 1–94. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1980**
Jōmon jidai no shūroku [The Jōmon Period settlements]. *Kokushigaku*, No. 110/111: 1–17. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1981**
Jōmon doki no yōto to katachi [Form and function of Jōmon pottery]. In *Jōmon doki taisei chūki*, iss. 2. Tokyo: Kodansha, pp. 168–173. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1983**
Sōron - jōmon Keizai [Essay on the Jōmon economics]. In *Jōmon bunka no kenkyū nariwai*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Yuzankaku, pp. 3–16. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1986**
Jōmon dokihen'nen no kenkyū [Study of periodization of Jōmon pottery]. *Kikan kōkōgaku*, No. 17: 14–16. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1990**
Jōmon jidai no shūroku [The Jōmon Period settlements]. *Kikan kōkōgaku*, No. 44: 14–16. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 1995**
Jōmon jidai ni okeru shizen no shakai-ka [Nature socialization in the Jōmon Period]. In *Kikan kōkōgaku bessatsu*, vol. 6. Tokyo: Yuzankaku, p. 103. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 2004**
Jōmon Reflections: Forager Life and Culture in the Prehistoric Japanese Archipelago, S. Kaner, Oki Nakamura (eds.). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 2005**
Jōmon randosukēpu [Jōmon Landscape]. Tokyo: UM Promotion. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Tatsuo. 2008**
Jōmon doki no yōshiki to katashiki to katachishiki [Style, type, and form of Jōmon pottery]. In *Sōran jōmon doki*. Tokyo: UM Promotion, pp. 2–12. (In Japanese).
- Kobayashi Yukio. 1933**
Senshikōkōgaku ni okeru yōshiki mondai [Problems of style identification in the ancient archaeology]. *Kōkōgaku zasshi*, vol. 4 (8): 223–238. (In Japanese).
- Nakaya Jiujiro. 1929**
Nihon sekki jidai teiyō [Brief Description of the Stone Age in Japan]. Tokyo: Okashoin. (In Japanese).
- Ōno Susumu, Kobayashi Tatsuo. 2006**
Jōmon-gaku to no taiwa [Dialog with Jōmon]. In *Kōkōgaku jinrui-gaku gengo-gaku to no taiwa – nihongo wa dokokarakitano ka*. Tokyo: Iwanami, pp. 105–150. (In Japanese).
- Ōtsuka Tatsurō. 1996**
Doki – Yamanouchi Sugao katashiki-ron no saikentō yori [Pottery – revision of Yamanouchi Sugao type theory]. *Kōkōgaku zasshi*, vol. 82 (2): 11–25. (In Japanese).
- Ōtsuka Tatsurō. 2008**
Jōmon doki kenkyū kaidai – Yamanouchi Sugao [Study of Jōmon pottery – Yamanouchi Sugao]. In *Sōran jōmon doki*. Tokyo: UM Promotion, pp. 872–879. (In Japanese).
- Ōtsuka Tatsurō. 2017**
Nanzan ākaibuzu Yamanouchi Sugao no Jōmon bunka moderu no nanten [Deconstructing the idea of Jōmon 'Culture': Revisiting the Model of Yamanouchi Sugao]. *Arukeia: kiroku, jōhō, rekishi*, iss. 11: 83–116. (In Japanese).

Serizawa Chōsuke. 1958

Jōmon doki [Jōmon pottery]. In *Sekai tōji zenshū 1 Nihon kodai-hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Kawade Shobo, pp. 159–176. (In Japanese).

Sōran jōmon doki. 2008

Tokyo: UM Promotion. (In Japanese).

Sugihara Sōsuke. 1943

Gen shigaku joron – kōkogaku-teki hōhō ni yoru rekishigaku kakuritsu e no shiron [Introduction to the history of prehistoric times: Essay on the establishment of history by archaeological methods]. Tokyo: Ashiga Shobo. (In Japanese).

Tabarev A.V., Ivanova D.A. 2016

Dze:mon, Yaponskiy arhipelag: Kultura? Traditsiya? Epokha? In *Razvitiye vzglyadov na interpretatsiyu arkheologicheskogo istochnika: Tezisy dokl. Vseros. nauch. konf.* Moscow: IA RAN, pp. 69–70.

Tabarev A.V., Ivanova D.A. 2018

Pogrebeniya, keramika, rakovinniye kuchi: Iz istorii izucheniya pamyatnikov epokhi dze:mon, Yaponskiy arhipelag. *Gumanitarniye issledovaniya v Vostochnoy Sibiri i na Dalnem Vostoke*, No. 2 (44): 36–42.

Tabarev A.V., Ivanova D.A. 2020

V nachale bylo slovo: Iz istorii termina “dzemon” v rossiyskoy arkheologicheskoy literature. *Pervobytnaya arkheologiya: Zhurnal mezhdistsiplinarnykh issledovaniy*, No. 2: 62–76.

Tabarev A.V., Zhushchikhovskaya I.S.,**Ivanova D.A. 2020**

On the term “Jōmon” and contribution of Russian scholars to the Jōmon studies. *Documenta Praehistorica*, vol. 47: 2–13.

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1929

Kantō kita ni okeru sen'i doki [Vessels with fiber admixture in the northern Kanto]. *Shizengaku zasshi*, vol. 1 (2): 117–146. (In Japanese).

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1930

Iwayuru Kamegaoka-shiki doki no bumpu to Jōmon-shiki doki no shūmatsu [Distribution of the so called Kamegaoka ceramics and the end of the pottery with cord-like decoration]. *Kōkogaku*, vol. 1 (3): 139–157. (In Japanese).

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1932

Nihon enko no bunka [Ancient cultures of Japan: Review of the pottery traditions of the Jōmon]. *Dorumen*, vol. 1 (4): 40–43. (In Japanese).

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1937

Jōmon doki katashiki no saibetsu to taibetsu [General classification and subdivisions of Jōmon pottery]. *Senshikōkogaku*, vol. 1 (1): 29–32. (In Japanese).

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1964

Jōmon-shiki doki sōron [Pottery with cord stamp, general comments]. *Nihon genshi bijutsu*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Kodansha, pp. 148–158. (In Japanese).

Yamanouchi Sugao. 1969

Jōmon bunka no shakai - jōmon jidai kenkyū no gendankai [Jōmon society: Modern stage of the Jōmon studies]. In *Nihon to sekai no rekishi*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Gakken, pp. 86–97. (In Japanese).

Received August 25, 2021.

Received in revised form November 4, 2021.