

Correspondence

A Request for Clarification

I find that two paragraphs were omitted from the revised version of my review of *From Court to Capital: A Tentative Interpretation of the Origins of the Japanese Urban Tradition*, by Paul Wheatley and Thomas See (*JAS* 39, no. 1 [November 1979]: 166–68).

The following should appear between the first and second paragraphs on p. 168:

It seems to me that secondary urban genesis is a phenomenon in which cultural forms are transmitted through trade and religious interaction systems to societies which have reached the requisite levels of economics and social differentiation and specialization to have an interest in these forms. At the same time they have a well developed local subsistence base. Wheatley and See's study brings out the important fact that secondary urban genesis directs our attention to the dynamics of the secondary urban center rather than dictating a preoccupation with the elements of high culture which are diffused, since their quality is transformed in the new context.

The following should appear between the second and third paragraphs on p. 168:

The reader who would use this book as an introduction to contemporary Japanese archaeology will be disappointed. Virtually all of the argument rests on J. E. Kidder, *Japan Before Buddhism* (Praeger, 1966) and Namio Egami, *The Beginnings of Japanese Buddhism* (1973; English translation of the Japanese *Nihon Bijutsu no Tanjō*, Heibonsha, 1969). While both of these are key references by eminent authorities, they are old secondary sources which have little of the anthropologically oriented information necessary for testing the hypotheses. No sources are given for most of the sites used as examples, and the sections on *dotaku*, jar burials, and mirrors are virtually undocumented. The source of data for the artifact distributions in Figure 3 is not divulged. The theoretical statements in the book are not generated by archaeological data. Instead, the archaeological data are used to illustrate points taken from historical sources, and the ultimate evaluation of the book must rest heavily on its use of the Japanese and Chinese historical evidence.

RICHARD PEARSON
University of British Columbia