

Kofun Period

HIGASHIKAGE Yu

Fiscal 2011 Kofun period studies were quite diverse. Publication of books on the Kofun period was especially abundant, summarizing Kofun period study in the past and indicating new viewpoints.

TSUDE Hiroshi, *Kodai Kokka wa Itsu Seiritsu Shitaka* (Establishment of the Ancient Nation) (Tokyo: Iwanami) incorporated a newly developed interpretation of the Kofun period and early nation theory including recent research results. In HIROSE Kazuo (ed.), “Kofun Jidai wo Taikeiteki ni Miru (Systematical View of the Kofun Period)” (*Archaeology Quarterly*, 117 (themed issue)) diverse viewpoints of the Kofun period were indicated including not only domestic viewpoints but also ones from China and the Korean Peninsula, as well as folklore. SHIMOGAKI Hitoshi, *Kofun Jidai no Oken Kozo* (Sovereignty Structure of the Kofun Period) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan) discussed figures buried in mounded tombs in Early and Middle Kofun, and the structure of sovereignty they constitute. Gina L. Barnes, “Kofun Jidai Zenki ni Okeru Touchi Sihaiken Kasetsu (Jyo) • (Ge) (Hypothesis on Sovereignty in Early Kofun Part 1 & 2)” (*Kodaigaku Kenkyu*, 190: 1-16, 191: 26-45) developed a hypothetical experiment on political ideology of Early Kofun. The second part of the article contained reactions from a few Japanese researchers and the difference in each view was interesting.

There were many publications to organize division of the Kofun period and transitional viewpoint, as well as to contain chronology and dating in various places. HIROSE Kazuo and WADA Seigo (eds.), *Koza Nihon no Kokogaku 7: Kofun Jidai Jo* (*Lecture on Japanese Archaeology 7: Kofun Period Part 1*) (Tokyo: Aoki Shoten), and ICHINOSE Kazuo, FUKUNAGA Shinya, and HOJO Yoshitaka (eds.), *Kofun Jidai no Kokogaku* (*Kofun Period Archaeology*) *Volume 1: Kofun Jidaishi no Wakugumi* (*Frameworks of the Kofun Period History*). (Tokyo: Doseisha) regarded frameworks of the Kofun period on the whole through time division, actual dating, and chronology of each artifact. To clarify structures and characteristics of burial mounds and funeral rituals conducted, it is inevitable to interpret the Kofun period, and *Kofun Jidai no Kokogaku* (Kofun Period

¹ *Archaeological institute of Kashihara, Nara Prefecture, 1 Unebi, Kashihara City, Nara 634-0065, Japan*

Archaeology), Vol. 3: *Kofun Kozo to Soso Saishi (Structure of Burial Mound and Funeral Rites)* (Tokyo: Doseisha) discussed such issues.

KISHIMOTO Naofumi, “Yokoanashiki Sekishitsu no Keishiki wa Hisosha no Katsuyakuki wo Shimesu (Horizontal Stone Chamber Type as Indication of Active Time for the Buried)”, *Kokogaku Kenkyu*, 58(1): 78-89 referred to a possibility that mounded tombs were constructed before the death of the buried. On the other hand, HOZUMI Hiromasa, “Kofun Jidai ‘Soso Iseki’ Toiu Wakugumi (Framework Called ‘Moso Iseki’ in the Kofun Period)” In *Biwako to Chiiki Bunka: HAYASHI Hiromichi Sensei Tainin Kinen Ronshu (Lake Biwa and Local Culture: Memorial Publication of Professor HAYASHI Hiromichi’s Retirement)*, pp. 54-59. Hikone: Sunrise Shuppan] is important as it indicated funeral rituals other than burial mounds called *mogari*.

Journal *Historia*, No. 228 had a special featured article on Kawachi-otsukayama burial mound with a high possibility of it being a king’s tomb. The burial mound was discussed from both viewpoints of archaeology and document history. Although being a king-class tomb, it is hard to specify who was buried in it, and interpretation of researchers was quite different.

Research and study on palaces and villages are showing progress in recent years. Outlines of archaeological excavation results were published on Makimuku site in Sakurai City, Nara Prefecture and demonstrated the existence of a large building assumed to be a palace of early Kofun period. Excavation research is also being conducted on Wakimoto site, which is supposed to be related to the palace. On analysis of villages, Journal *Historia*, No. 229 had a detailed discussion on the relationship between production of manual industry and immigrants.

There were quite contrasting studies. One regarded the relationship between central sovereignty and each region as “center” and “region,” and assumed an orderly relationship between them, valuing common qualities of keyhole-shaped mounded tombs, and the other valued differing qualities of each local society from diversity of grave systems. TANAKA Yoshiyuki, FUNAHASHI Kyoko, and YOSHIMURA Kazuaki, “Miyazaki Ken Nairikubu Chikashiki Yokoanabo Shisosha no Shinzoku Kankei (Kinship of People Buried in Subterranean Horizontal Graves in Inland Miyazaki Prefecture). *Kyushu Daigaku Sogo Kenkyu Hakubutsukan Kenkyu Hokoku*, 10: 127-143 clarified characteristics of regions that did not turn into patrilineality that was common in Japanese Islands in the fifth century CE.

Trends to summarize the Kofun period study in the past and to indicate new study viewpoints are getting active. However the framework used for such standards is often following chronological study conducted 20 years ago, which tried to create a universal chronology for the whole archipelago. It is clear that it is not easy to regard the whole archipelago equally, as grave systems of communities holding the same objects are not

TRENDS IN ARCHAEOLOGY IN JAPAN

necessary equal in quality. Study that values not only burial mounds but palace and villages is becoming active. There are many issues to be discussed such as how burial mounds are related to palaces and villages.