

Yayoi Period

FUJII Hitoshi

In Kinki, a symposium was held which aimed to evaluate SAKAI Ryuichi's model. Also KUWABARA Hisao discussed the importance of constructing a model based on the existence of settlement hierarchy, rather than Sakai's homogeneous and equal settlement system model ("Kinki ni Okeru Yayoi Setorumento Shisutemu Saikochiku ha Kanouka [Possibilities of Reconstructing Yayoi Settlement System in Kinki]," In *Yayoi Jidai Shuraku no Jitsuzo to Dotai wo Saguru [Reality and Movement of Yayoi Settlement]*, pp. 1-12. Nara: Kinki Yayoi-no-kai). However, it may still take time to reevaluate the Sakai model, including the possibility of coexistence with the fundamental group theory, as it is still supported by scholars such as SHITARA Hiromi, who stresses the usefulness of the Sakai model's assumption of a reciprocal and homogeneous distribution system in Middle Yayoi ("Yayoi Chuki Toiu Jidai [Phase Called Middle Yayoi]," In *Yoyoi-jidai no kokogaku, Vol. 3: Tayoka Suru Yayoi Bunka [Diversified Yayoi Culture]*, pp. 3-24. Tokyo: Doseisha).

TERASAWA Kaoru evaluated WAKABAYASHI Kunihiko's fundamental group theory, stating that it did not break away from unit group theory while it tried to leave the paradigm of existing community theory ["Yayoi Jidaishiron [History of the Yayoi Period]," In *Yayoi Jidai Jo (Yayoi Period Volume 1)*, pp. 3-82. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten]. Also, he criticized the fact that many studies are ignorant of the need for a theoretical break off to overcome Marxist archaeology, pointing out the problem of lack of demonstrability of anthropological concepts such as descent group developed by TANAKA Yoshiyuki and others. On the other hand, in "Yayoi Shurakuron to Yuibutsushikan: Jinruigaku/Shakaigaku Moderuron (Yayoi Settlement Theory and Historical Materialism: Anthropological/Sociological Models)," In *Yayoi Jidai Shuraku no Jitsuzo to Dotai wo Saguru [Reality and Dynamics of Yayoi Period Settlements]*, pp. 13-18. Nara: Kinki Yayoi-no-kai) Wakabayashi proposed that a research method based on realistic coherence should be pursued consulting anthropological results, without being bounded by historical materialism.

As for grave system study, EGE Kazuhiro examined large-sectioned graves, pointing out

¹ Kyoto prefectural board of education, Yabunouchi-cho, Kamigyo Ward, Kyoto 602-8041, Japan (hitfuj@gmail.com)

that in Middle to Late Yayoi, stratified society and equal society appeared alternatively in a large area from northern Kyushu to Tokai ["Boiki Kousei no Henka, Kukakubo no Tenkai [Change in Grave Area Structure, Development of Sectioned Graves]", In *Yayoi-jidai no kenkyu, Vol. 4: Kofun Jidai heno Taido (Signs of the Kofun Period)*, pp. 191-210. Tokyo: Doseisha]. In "Yayoi Doki no Seisaku Giho to Chiikikan Koryu (Manufacturing Techniques of Yayoi Pottery and Regional Exchanges)", In *Yayoi Jidai Jo (Yayoi Period Volume 1)*, pp. 589-617. Tokyo Aoki Shoten, FUKASAWA Yoshiki discussed pottery used as offerings by assuming production places from their manufacturing technique, and demonstrated regional exchanges supported by complex social networks. It was an important study to solve the function of chiefs and real image of the group. Continuation and development of this method will be a future issue.

On group theory, YAMADA Yasuhiro discussed the future direction of Yayoi study in detail in "Yayoi Shudanron no Kensho to Yukue (Verification and Future of Yayoi Group Theory)", In *Yayoi-jidai no kenkyu, Vol. 9: Yayoi Kenkyu no Ayumi to Yukue [History and Future of Yayoi Study]*, pp. 133-150. Tokyo: Doseisha). As for the actual picture of the group, while Tsude regards the whole Yayoi society as chiefdom phase, MORIOKA Hideto proposed an evaluation that emergence of chiefs had to be wait till Late Yayoi, and transition to the Kofun period was not drastic ("Rettonai Kakuchi ni Okeru Chuki to Koki no Danzetsu [Break between Middle and Late Yayoi in Various Parts of the Archipelago]", In *Yoyoi-jidai no kokogaku, Vol. 3: Tayoka Suru Yayoi Bunka [Diversified Yayoi Culture]*, pp. 176-193. Tokyo: Doseisha).

SEIKE Akira pointed out that the central figure in burials tends to be males in northern Kyushu and Kinki, but he evaluated the existence of female chiefs in Late Yayoi and concluded that patrilineality was not developed in Yayoi society ("Yayoi Jidai no Shinzoku Kozo [Kinship Structure in the Yayoi Period]", In *Yayoi Jidai Ge [Yayoi Period Volume 2]*, pp. 463-479. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten). As Morioka pointed out, the development from "consanguinity" to "territorial bond" (*chien*) in classic theory is not consistent with the simplified move from descent group to domicile group, and the breakthrough is not yet found ("Yayoi Shuraku Kenkyu no 40-sunen to Mirai ni Mukete [Over 40 Years of Yayoi Settlement Study and Its Future]", In *Yayoi Jidai Shuraku no Jitsuzo to Dotai wo Saguru [Reality and Movement of Yayoi Settlement]*, pp. 19-36. Nara: Kinki Yayoi-no-kai).

IWANAGA Shozo pointed out that tangible identification of buried figures in mounded tombs and the end of bronze tool rituals are linked in large areas of the Japanese archipelago, describing a process of grand burial for the leading class by controlling distribution of high-prestige goods and their allocation as the background. Therefore, discontinuity due to exhaustion of prestige goods tend to happen easily, unable to achieve stable political integration ("Funkyubo to Shuchoso no Keisei [Formation of Mounded Tombs and Chiefdom]" In *Yayoi Jidai Ge [Yayoi Period Volume 2]*, pp. 422-461. Tokyo:

Aoki Shoten).

While reevaluation of settlement theory was conducted in various parts of the country, many researchers gave summaries of the study history, developing into reorganization of group theory. Fiscal 2011 saw many ambitious research results to summarize the Yayoi period, defining future course of the study.