

commuting from Osaka where he lived with his aunt who worked as a live-in housekeeper at a dormitory for workers of a small factory (the famous paternalistic practice of Japanese industry); his broader participation in the urban living after securing a white-collar job with one of the leading manufacturers of electrical appliances; and the establishment of a small urban household following a modern compromise of arranged marriage with a relative of his supervisor who saw in him many of the traits valued in Japanese industry today. His wife's upbringing as a daughter of a well-connected family with a long tradition in commerce is given to provide a glimpse of a different sector of Japanese life.

As a coherent account of related families, there are a few unfortunate inconsistencies. For example, Aunt Shizu, who played an important role in the life of the urban brother (p. 58 ff.) cannot be the rural brother's sister (p. 55), especially if he is 44 (p. 27) and his sisters are all younger than he (p. 31) while she was already 46 when she moved to Osaka (p. 55). Similarly, the younger brother could not have lived in Tokyo for three years when his daughter is 3 years old (p. 57), as we are told that he was transferred to that city when the baby was "nearly two years old" (p. 78).

The author may have gone a little too far in attempting to avoid giving offense to any Japanese who might read his book, for the individuals depicted are all remarkably well-disposed and most of them quite virtuous. However, the many practices, attitudes and values so skilfully incorporated in the accounts are those which may be encountered very frequently in Japan today, if they are not the very representative. It was not the intention of the author to portray a representative, over-all average, and perhaps for this reason no interpretation or generalization is attempted, for he says (p. 23): "My aims are more modest. I hope to tell something about the present by showing both the old and the new, which in fact constitute the present." The book serves the stated purpose very well, and one hopes that the author will present us with a full-length account of his observations on the changing Japan.

FUMIKO IKAWA
Montreal

* * *

The Dynamics of Stylistic Change in Arikara Ceramics. JAMES DEETZ. Illinois Studies in Anthropology 4. Urbana, University of Illinois Press. 1965. 111 pages; 27 figures, 3 maps. \$2.50.

This is a tightly written, problem-oriented, innovating study. It takes as its focus an archaeological situation in which social change is known to have been occurring and examines the ceramics to see if the change is reflected in them. The archaeological situation utilized in the study is that of an 18th century Arikara village, the Talking Crow site, on the Missouri River in South Dakota, which was excavated by the Missouri Basin Project of salvage archaeology in 1957 and 1958.

In the first portion of the monograph, Deetz presents the archaeological, social anthropological, and ethnohistorical matrix into which the Talking Crow site fits. He organizes the archaeological data from the Middle Missouri and Central Plains regions in terms of Willey and Phillips (1958)¹ systematics, utilizing particularly their concepts of region and phase. This results in some clarification of the sequences where abundant data have promoted the confusing escalation of McKern-derived foci and aspects. Next Deetz attempts to demonstrate that pre-contact and early contact Arikara social organization, in common with other northern Caddoan groups in early times, was matrilocal and probably matrilineal with a Crow type kinship terminology. This appears to be logical and is accepted in a recent publication by Eggan (1966:67),² although it disagrees with Murdock's reconstruction (1949:341).³ The reconstruction of early Arikara kinship terminology as of the Crow type acts as a control when compared to early 19th century Arikara social organization which was widely divergent from the earlier model. However, a strange lack in Deetz' study is the absence of an adequate description of the workings of 18th and 19th century Arikara society. One gathers from the kinship diagram (page 26) and from scattered statements that there was a shift toward a generational, rather than a lineal emphasis in terminology, a shrinkage in the size of the social unit, and a great deal of flexibility in residence. A number of documented factors which were in operation during the occupation of the Talking Crow site including a new environment, population reduction, trade, and warfare, are held responsible for the shift in social organization.

The second major section of the monograph deals with archaeological data presented by the Talking Crow site. A somewhat skimpy summary description of the site is presented and its temporal divisions, the latest three of which were in the 18th century, are discussed. Here a site map, stratigraphic diagrams, and provenience counts would have been useful — as it is, one has to take the evidence for the three 19th century components at the site mainly on faith. This is unfortunate for much of the succeeding analysis rests upon the validity of the three components at the site. The method of ceramic analysis is then discussed. Briefly it involved taking the rim sherds from the site, recording their qualitative stylistic attributes on IBM cards, plotting their distributions in relation to the components, and from the results selecting those attributes which were sensitive to change for further analysis. The processing was done by an IBM 704 computer. In order to utilize these data to see if they reflected the social change that was occurring among the 19th century Arikara, the following hypothesis was set up — that in a situation of matrilocal residence such as the early Arikara are presumed to have had, the female potters in a residence unit would share models of attribute combination throughout their

¹ WILLEY, GORDON R. and PHILLIP PHILLIPS. *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958.

² EGGAN, FRED. *The American Indian Perspectives for the Study of Social Change*. Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

³ MURDOCK, GEORGE PETER. *Social Structure*. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1949.

lives which would be reflected in the consistency of patterning of the ceramic attributes observed by the archaeologist. It follows that in a situation such as was progressively occurring in the 18th century Arikara with a breakup of the stable matrilocal unit into flexible units with no strict form, females from different natal households would come together in adult life and exchange ceramic ideas which would result in weaker associations of attribute combinations. Again the computer aided in testing this. The results were positive — the earliest Arikara component at the site showed more consistent association of attributes than did the latest component which showed a more random association.

The third section to Deetz' study examines the conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis and forecasts the degree of consistency in attribute association that can be expected from various social organizational models.

Deetz' paper is innovating in several ways. Perhaps aside from the main point, but still important, it is the first study to employ Willey and Phillips (1958) systematics to the northern Plains, a practice which is becoming increasingly popular (Lehmer and Caldwell 1966).⁴ More important, particularly when the date of the original manuscript from which this publication was taken (1960)⁵ is realized, it was the first study to do what is now a popular pastime among the avant-garde of the profession — structural or social archaeology. Although most of the practitioners emanate from the University of Chicago as either teachers (Binford) or former students (Longacre, Brown, Freeman, Struever, Hill), it is interesting that this early expression of essentially the same philosophy appeared in a Harvard dissertation. The study also was one of the first to utilize computers in handling archaeological data, another action which is becoming increasingly popular. Finally Deetz' paper signals an era in which archaeologists have become sophisticated in the utilization of social anthropological data. What archaeologist 20 or even 10 years ago would have the temerity to evaluate critically and eventually reject a formulation of Murdock regarding social organizational regularities as Deetz does. Although worry is often expressed concerning the disparity of the various subfields encompassed under the subject of anthropology, studies such as the one under consideration which combine archaeological, social anthropological and ethno-historical data into a viable whole illustrate the usefulness of the broad anthropological training in our major universities.

MICHAEL P. HOFFMAN
University of Arkansas Museum

*
* *

⁴ LEHMER, DONALD J. and WARREN W. CALDWELL. Horizon and Tradition in the Northern Plains. *American Antiquity*, 31:511-516.

⁵ DEETZ, JAMES D. F. *An Archaeological Approach to Kinship Change in Eighteenth Century Arikara Culture*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, Harvard University, 1960.