

ジェルマナ グレコ Germana Greco

C0LD1017

題目 The direction where the walls lead

Observations on the Meaning of Defensive Masonry Architecture

The Mediterranean World and The Japanese Archipelago

(壁が続く方向 防御的な石積み建築の意味に関する考察 地中海世界と日本列島)

## 博士論文要約

Index :

石 Preface p. 1

石 1. The Origins of stone architecture in the Mediterranean and the definition of Castle

I. The art of building in the Ancient Age: Rome p. 3

・ The walls of *Domina Orbis* p. 28

II. Late Antiquity - Medieval architecture and the origin of castellation p. 63

石 2. The search for Japanese Jōkaku idea

I. Concepts and evolution of the defence systems p. 95

II. Fortification singularities: Kōgoishi, Gusuku, Chashi

II.I Kōgoishi of Kyūshū p. 145

II.II Gusuku of Ryūkyū Islands p. 176

II.III Chashi p. 223

III. The Japanese castle, from Azuchi-Momoyama period to Edo Age p. 230

石 Conclusive remarks p. 253

石 Bibliography: references and in-depth studies p. 259

Acknowledgements p. 276

This is the result of an exegesis of the “wall”. In the process of juxtaposition and not comparison, since the contextual differences of the two worlds were placed in parallel, without being able to count on initial common elements that could propose a search for similarities or mutual influence, an unambiguous underlying aim was pursued of understanding “where a wall leads”. That is to say, a search based on historical and archaeological data could lead us to reflections on an anthropological level. Human beings are biologically and culturally inclined to conceive and establish boundaries necessarily; a sense of limit is implicit in the definition of ourselves.

Archaeologically, we can identify this constancy in the construction of defensive structures, whose forms of expression in each culture provide us with significant clues to understanding how it related to the environment and the other peoples and understood itself. Having to describe the genesis, evolution and functions of defence systems that originated in the Mediterranean and the Japanese archipelago, one was thus forced to review the connections between historical periods and social and religious aspects inherent in different cultures. These multidisciplinary connections necessary to study defensive architecture lead us to understand its importance for the social history of a people. The mere presence and appearance of a wall, its functionality, construction technique and positioning, as single elements of a study that can characterise a site, serve as essential historical diagnostic elements due to the intrinsic connections that a wall can have with the cultic, cultural, ideological world, and the implications from the point of view of social organisation.

Thus philologically, between historical and archaeological research, we follow the concept of the wall and the construction techniques necessary to produce it, dwelling on the semantic importance of the choice of stone as a building material. We come to realise that the logical implications of the use of stone architecture have no boundaries, finally becoming the link between those two worlds presented, which have never come into contact with each other except in modern times or indirectly, and the solution we were trying to investigate and demonstrate through this partial juxtaposition. Indeed, there is an anthropological significance to the choice of stone as a building material that stands out when observing the Mediterranean world presented in the first part of this treatise. Its technical evolution of workmanship, even before practical needs, such as a defensive necessity, indicates the need for other primary conditions, such as an organised and complex social differentiation and archetypes of cultic thought, to become its cause.

In the European context, based on a history of historical and archaeological studies that has continued since the last centuries, the dependence of the evolution of the technique of masonry architecture from that elaborated in the classical age in the Mediterranean basin has been emphasised. To arrive at the formation of the medieval castle in all its forms, we see from the Ancient age the elaboration of essential elements such as city walls and the idea of the tower, from which the castle can be seen as an architectural synthesis. But in reality, we can notice how even more critical was originally the presence of a particular primordial concept of limit and delimitation. It is the idea of a “boundary” both physical and sacred, from the need for defence of the first proto-urban sites to the need to create a community identity in the places that would come to be defined as “cities”, from which indeed the very first historical definition of a city emerged. One observes how building a perimeter wall could be a constant to which ancient literature would also attribute significance. Subsequently thus, one identifies how this primordial concept of the need for definition within urban sites develops into that of monumentality. Monumental architecture becomes the means for elaborating new identity boundaries that allow for a heightened awareness of community identity through creating a shared memory. At the same time, it is the monumentalisation that drives the elaboration of masonry techniques that require engineering knowledge, time and human resources that could not be realised without a precise underlying will. The development of an architecture that selects predominantly lithic building

materials in this context, therefore, has as its first condition the development of these city cultures, which could not create themselves without having a solid idea of community identity that comes to be expressed in the act of demarcating space, and time, that is their history. Through its inherent durability and the potentially imposing appearance of the works created through it, the stone is probably the best choice to fulfil such needs among these people. Following the history of monumental art, as stone-carving techniques and different methods of masonry facades developed and were acquired around the Mediterranean, the attribution of symbolic significance emerges. Reciprocal influences between peoples and cultures living in areas in continuous contact led to the transmission of an implicit value in the use of carved stone as a building material, allowing it to evolve technically.

Thus “the castle”, synthesised by the familiar image of a defensive structure based on which comparative theses could be established, in this context does not in itself appear to be a detached element characteristic only of feudal times when observed from an architectural point of view, but rather, as we have seen in the previous chapters, is an element that evolves and connects with a much older Mediterranean history, and continues to be present in the ages up to modern times. Relative to the development and results obtained in European medievalist research, we can point to fortification as the cause and consequence of momentous social implications. It has been seen that the construction of a defensive system not only contains functional motivations, imminent threats or a state of conflict but can also include a strong emblematic value. After the city phenomenon of the classical era, castle construction imposed itself on the territory as a vehicle for repopulation, ensuring control and promoting the production of resources. The walls and the citadel buildings express the existence of a pact between prominent members and a part of the population through which a new mutual definition of the area and its inhabitants is achieved. Castles may act as strategic positions, describing the limits of a territory, but as residences, they become the fulcrum of representation of power. Hence, they need to call upon a symbolic repertoire expressed through architecture. A common ideological influence is thus discerned in the construction techniques, which are rediscovered and experimented with from the classical age. It thus becomes significant to observe how, in Europe, much of the monumental and defensive architecture that sovereigns and power elites will use as a symbolic form of legitimisation and hierarchical affirmation derives in reality from that desire for the manifestation of identity in the space of the cultures of the classical age. That is, in the awareness of differentiation assumed by those peoples, the primary intent of imposing themselves through architecture lies. The same can also be seen in ecclesiastical-type buildings, where the initial reuse of precious materials such as ancient marble can be interpreted in function of a view that saw them as forming a “spiritual legacy of the community”. The idea of enduring architecture could have stood the test of time by transmitting the same values to future generations. And it is through this idea that a technical and artistic development was possible that would continue to be re-proposed and influence the building elaborations of later epochs. Medieval architecture, as well as part of the ideology of the rulers and feudal lords of the time, even of foreign populations that came into close contact with the Mediterranean world and its legacies (e.g. as can be seen in the Arab architecture of the Umayyad Caliphate, especially in Spain), inevitably depended on that pre-existing ancient mentality.

In studying castle forms, defining a cultural identity also finds its ultimate expression in the connection between the development of fortifications and the city. In the case of Mediterranean regions that had already developed the urban phenomenon, the model of the ancient city will persist, taking on new forms such as the Italian Communes, where however walls and towers will define the distribution of specific social classes. In the same way, however, in the Middle Ages, fortifications were the nucleus of new urban organisms in other European territories that had not

been reached by classical culture in the past but which would nevertheless be influenced by it later, thanks to its emblematic power. The symbolism of power allowed the inheritance of techniques that had remained as if buried in the cultural substratum; after an apparent setback in the presence of the classical city, the conditions were created for the rebirth of some elements of the latter under the new guise of medieval towns. The force with which stone architecture once again asserts itself stems from an experience that would not have been so if the ancient cities had not been at the basis of this process. It may be thought that architecture developed within a community culture was able to imprint itself on consciences to a greater extent or instead had a better chance of making its mark on history since it was a monumentality born to express the identity participation of all its members understood as a single people, and could have been elaborated over a long time. As such, architectural expression manifests a particular approach to the environment and the idea of the inherent human limit, thus a specific will that becomes artistic and monumental ambition. This emblematic meaning seems inevitably connected with stone architecture. Thus, on the other hand, we similarly see that in Japan too. Though making a more circumscribed appearance, we are able to glimpse a process in which stone masonry from practical functionality verges on the symbolism in the development of castle forms.

In the past, the historical subdivision of Japanese epochs has often been almost “too” linear, with a tendency to delineate a peculiar isolation of Japan and “its” people, indirectly complicit with a desire to turn this trait into part of its cultural definition. Progress in archaeological research, however, has revealed more complex scenarios, where the distinction of several facies within the archipelago has made it possible to demonstrate exchanges and relations with other Asian continental regions since the Palaeolithic period. Historically speaking, the coexistence of several ethnic groups and active transport of goods had already been proposed in the observation of artefacts from the debated Kofun period (late 3rd - 7th century), a very delicate period since the origin of the unified government understood as “Japanese” depended on it. From this point of view, the very study of castle forms and how different types were developed within the same archipelago gives us further proof.

Moving to a different context, such as the Japanese archipelago, one can test the extent of the results of research on the forms of fortifications, that is, how many implications on a historical, social and anthropological level the studies on the possibility and ways of elaborating “walls” can give here as well. Here, there is no single root from which to draw an ideological model that offers the same monumental importance to the idea of the border as in the case of ancient Mediterranean cities. However, identifying different castle categories brings meaningful data on the cultural variety and social arrangements present in the archipelago. Their building formulation defines the presence of external influences and, at the same time, a constant process of attempting a political and cultural unification with the creation of a central government, which will not be resolved by the advent of the Nara age but will represent an underlying tension throughout Japan’s internal history. This situation is reflected, among other study elements, in the creation and use of “*jōkaku*”, what we can finally define as “a complex of enclosures” as a typical basic image of the idea of a “castle” in Japan. The formalisation of mediaeval fortifications follows the impetus given by the culmination of the persistent tension created by the presence of several distinct powers and identities and the desire for unification. They would also act as centripetal forces for the creation of the pre-modern cities, in which communities that had hitherto found a labile physical delimiting expression in space would obtain a definition of identity.

At the same time, the study of the three castle categories presented, starting with the difficulties faced in identifying a precise nomenclature, suggests a more complex reality at a historical and regional level. Thus the case of *gusuku* and *chashi*, which present two distinct indigenous worlds of

the archipelago, show how these fortifications are rooted in specific cultural identities. The former having represented a historical era, they may also possess an etymology that connects them to the way the ancients understood the environment and valued the use of stone, so much so that for centuries they have aroused mental associations capable of multiplying the semantics of the reference by also influencing the culture of islands outside Okinawa.

The legacy of the *chashi* from the cultures that preceded the Ainu is instead being demonstrated archaeologically with the most recent surveys, which also allow them to be associated with a series of fortifications belonging to the adjacent territories, showing the peculiarity of continuous exchanges in these areas of north-east Asia, and how they served as a focal point for the importation of goods from the continent to Japan, where cultural assimilation with these peoples can be seen in the northern regions.

In the circumscribed case of the *kodaiyamashiro*, we have one of the most significant results of this search for castle categories. Constructions from the end of a still historically unclear era, such as the Kofun period, but of key importance in understanding the formation of the “Japanese” government, the search for their identification raises new questions about the political and ethnic structure of the time. Moreover, they provide further evidence, as other coeval finds at burial mounds peculiar to the period, of the influence and craftsmanship of the Korean peninsula. But as fortified constructions, they potentially possess additional data as constituent elements of boundaries. That is, distinguishing their locations, the intentions, the timing of their building, and consequently also their abandonment can give us clues as to the actual control of the area, reflecting the degree of power exercised by a nascent government with tendencies towards centralisation, which contrasted with the existence of local forces and the management of foreign influences.

The juxtaposition of the two contexts, Japanese and Mediterranean, shows the historical differences in the origin of defensive forms of architecture, as well as observing a first discordant way of religious understanding (and thus the nature as well as oneself), from which one can inevitably explain a first derivation of a different building expression; being the architecture the human material manifestation that perhaps most of all modifies the environment around it. Thus one can see how for city cultures, it becomes necessary to constitute one’s identity utilising reference points that must be given a material definition; through one or more built elements, barriers are created that, in addition to acting as a defence system, materially allow one to feel an integral part of a community. In this context, the birth of a city must presuppose a solid architecture that enables this sense of belonging, which will become an indispensable characteristic of the defined urban site. Thus common elements define a European cultural background, among which we find the city culture of the Mediterranean peoples and various elaborations of using stone as protagonists. On the other hand, in the Japanese archipelago, we see an idea at the origin of the relationship between man and nature that is peculiar to the Asian sphere, from which we can also think of an initial idea of “delimitation” and conceptualisation of space that is different. Historically, we observe how society develops city-type poles at other times and in different ways (although we can see the similarity of conditional incipits with common traits), just as we know a monumentality that, influenced by techniques and thoughts also of external origin, derived from the continent, will be brought to focus more on the elaboration of carpentry. Indeed, even in the imported architectural models, stone does not play a significant role in construction. Still, the working techniques, thanks also probably to the introduction of immigrant artisans, are found in the archipelago already in the Kofun age, in monumental sepulchral forms as well as in practical use at the first fortified systems and, despite this, do not see a continuation of elaboration and development as can be seen for the techniques of temple architecture. These observations would confirm the need for attribution of

meaning that accompanies, beyond practical use, the continuity and progress of architectural practices. Thus, the evolution of masonry techniques later in Japan would be aligned in this sense when the development of castles rose to monumental residences. Monumentality as art needs the impetus of a desire, that is, a will, for it to be born and develop based on cultic ideas, values, and conceptualisations to be expressed, similar to what we can see in the evolution of different techniques that follow artistic ambitions, as in this context can be said for the basis of carpentry initially used in temple buildings.

Thus, while observing and analysing the differences at the origin of these contexts, one finally comes to discern the common element. The presence and development of stone architecture everywhere seem to be linked to the desire for distinction, contemporary with the birth of identity consciousness, which seems to identify itself in stone masonry, primarily through the elaboration of defensive and monumental structures, seeming to achieve a univocal human way of expression, which in part has the potential to overcome differences in history, geography and religious beliefs. Thus in Europe, as in Japan, we see how, thanks to the strength of a central government or local lords, monumental architecture turned to the use of stone and promoted the development of techniques. In the Mediterranean, longer and more continuous history of this type of architecture was derived from a joint identity force that, initially involving not single families or individual social groups but entire communities understood as peoples, allowed architectural models to continue over time, enriching themselves with new techniques and returning to emblematic abstraction. Such a mentality associated with stone architecture can also be tested in the specificity of small contexts, as seen in Okinawa. *Gusuku* seems etymologically connected to a peculiar delimiting idea of the environment defined by stone masonry, where the latter could also be linked to sacred values. And so the erroneous tendencies of the first mental associations that saw in the stone rows of *ex-kōgoishi* the idea of sacral delimitation might not even be surprising.

The study of fortification typologies is a pivotal point in understanding the social history of a people. This research leads us to think about how the advancement of studies, within a specific society or culture, on the development and explication of its boundaries is essential at the anthropological and historical level for the definition of cultural and social identity, to understand how stratified it was internally or how opened it was to relate to the outside world. What may appear to be a simple analysis of the way a defensive wall was built can thus serve as an interpretative link for various aspects such as the repercussion on the settlements, territorial governance, the technical and interchange level, the symbolic repertoire of power, and even before that, the way the natural environment was conceptualised and thus a rituality and religious paradigms behind it. One could say that the direction in which a wall is placed contains the tendency towards which the entire history of a people tends. Hence the need for deepening such studies from this perspective for future research in further contexts. A thought that has something heuristic and inductive about it, therefore, confronts us last but not least with a broader reflection; that is, how limits are part of “us”, how we need to give them an expression external to ourselves, physically, and how they are therefore part of our *forma mentis* in approaching the world, which we tend to divide in principle between an “internal” and an “external”. Turning to human societies, it leads us, that is, to the need to build “walls”, that desire to distinguish and define oneself, to exclude, to contain and to exist by assuming a “form” accordingly. Various types of “limits” make up our consciousnesses, the passages of our lives, and community living; the way we understand space and interact with the “outside world” need to find a definition inside and outside of us. Retracing what and how these “limits” have conditioned our cultural mentality and consequently our histories, it is possible to do so by dwelling on a correct reading of the presence of the material datum, especially in architecture and in the way of understanding it because can even after a

distance of time preserve values, mental archetypes and a hidden sense of identity. Making more comparisons that focus on the presence of these founding archetypes of material inheritance may still pose fascinating anthropological reconstructions and reflections for more detailed research, like the clues of a mental puzzle that never ceases to evolve, making archaeological study rich and always open to new horizons.

This thesis speaks of walls but is directed towards a way in which it is possible to break down or circumvent them. It is precisely the understanding of where “walls” are and why they are necessary that makes them lose their substance. Believing that the ultimate aim of historical study always remains that of analysing the past to look at and understand the present, I, therefore, think that observing how vital the definition and concrete materialisation of “borders” may have been for distant and different cultures, and how it was put into practice, leads us to consider how this need may still be alive today, how it still influences us and conditions our societies, right down to the individual lives of each of us.