Death and Buddhism in the Japanese Middle Ages: From the Standpoint of the Official Monks/ "Secluded" Monks Paradigm of Japanese Buddhism

MATSUO KENJI

INTRODUCTION

BUDDHIST monks in Japan today are generally perceived as being engaged only in mortuary rites. Indeed, Japanese Buddhism is often called "funeral Buddhism," primarily because ordinary people tend to encounter monks only at funerals and annual memorial services. As a result, monks are frequently considered merely the managers of graveyards in their temple compounds. The term "funeral Buddhism" implies criticism and ridicule of the Buddhist clergy, and indeed, many people consider funeral Buddhism to be a degraded form of Buddhism. Recently, the media have publicized the growing popularity of "natural funerals" (*shizensō* 自然葬) which involve acts such as the scattering of ashes in the mountains and at sea in order to "return the body to nature." Trends such as these can be seen as manifestations of an implicit criticism of present-day funeral Buddhism.

Nevertheless, by providing a fitting ritual to mark death, monks officiating at funerals are responding to an important and deeply-felt human need. This solemn ritual is one that marks an event surely as important as that of birth. In a tragic incident that recently occurred in the city of Nagasaki, an elementary schoolgirl was killed by a female classmate. The victim's

THIS PAPER is based on a lecture delivered at Tokyo University on July 6, 2004. I would like to thank the moderator Sueki Fumihiko and the other participants for their thought-provoking comments.

The Eastern Buddhist 41/2: 71–96

neck was cut with a knife and her bloodstained face was trodden on. It is impossible not to feel profoundly disturbed by this kind of news. In another incident, a corpse was cut up, stuffed into a refrigerator, and discarded at sea. Surely no one would wish to leave this world without a proper funeral, having had one's corpse cut into pieces and tossed away. No one would want their posthumous body to be treated with disrespect of any kind. That people began to look to Buddhism to provide suitable mortuary rites was a development that perhaps originated in a deep-seated need to provide an appropriate and respectful way of treating the deceased. Funerals are important rituals that relate to the salvation of the deceased, while for those left behind, they provide an opportunity to bid farewell in a ritual manner to the dead.

It was during the Kamakura period (1185–1333) that Buddhist monks began to engage actively and systematically in funeral procedures. In the following pages of this paper, I will discuss this change and its revolutionary significance for Japanese Buddhism. First, however, I would like to outline my model of Japanese Buddhism based on the distinction between "official monks" (*kansō* 官僧) and "secluded monks," or monks who renounced their status as official monks (*intonsō* 隠遁僧) in order to clarify the Japanese monastic situation in the Middle Ages. I will describe the way in which this distinction relates to the medieval Japanese view of life and death, or, more precisely, to the question of how the relation between monks and death was perceived at that time.

Scholarly discussions concerning the proper framework for interpreting the history of medieval Buddhism, which are closely connected to those relating to the question of the defining characteristics of medieval Buddhism, have conventionally focused on the following three issues: (1) What are the so-called "new Kamakura Buddhist schools" (*Kamakura shin bukkyō* 鎌倉新仏教)? (2) Is medieval Buddhism represented by the "new Kamakura Buddhist schools" or the so-called "old Buddhist schools" (*kyūbukkyo* 旧仏教)? (3) What is medieval Buddhism? Although a number of scholars have set forth their views on these issues, their theories can be roughly divided into types, which I term "Commonly Accepted Theory A (New Kamakura Buddhism/Old Buddhism Theory)" and "Commonly Accepted Theory B (Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism Theory)" (see figure 1 on p. 84 in this article).

THE OFFICIAL MONKS/"SECLUDED" MONKS PARADIGM

Commonly Accepted Theory A: New Kamakura Buddhism/Old Buddhism Theory

The major advocates of what I call "Commonly Accepted Theory A (New Kamakura Buddhism/Old Buddhism Theory)" were Ienaga Saburō[1] and Inoue Mitsutada.[2] These scholars sought to define the distinctive features of Kamakura Buddhism by identifying traits common to the thoughts of the founding monks of the new Kamakura Buddhist schools. These scholars argued that the notions of selection, exclusive practice, easy practice (an anti-precept stance), and popular salvation were shared by the founders of these schools, and hence were common to the schools as a whole. Of course, there are differences among the new Kamakura Buddhist schools. The Zen schools, for example, emphasized "self-power" while the Pure Land schools with their stress on faith in Amida Buddha prioritized "other power." However, both scholars consider the Buddhist denominations established by Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212) and Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1262) to be typical of the new Kamakura Buddhist schools. For example, Hōnen, Shinran and Ippen 一遍 (1239–1289) selected the easy practice of reciting the nenbutsu (*namu amidabutsu* 南無阿弥陀仏) as their core teaching, while Nichiren 日蓮 (1222–1282) selected the recitation of the title of the *Lotus Sutra* (*shōdai* 唱題 or *namu myōhō renge kyō* 南無妙法蓮華経) and Dōgen 道元 (1200–1253) and other Zen monks selected the practice of seated meditation as their central practice. Thus, according to the two scholars mentioned above, it was the new schools of Kamakura Buddhism that were representative of Japanese Buddhism during the medieval period. Furthermore, all these schools were concerned with the salvation of the common people. In this respect, they differed from the monks belonging to the schools of old Buddhism (the Tendai and Shingon schools, for example, and the Nara Buddhist schools such as the Hossō) that focused on providing salvation for

[1] Ienaga 1955. Ienaga points out that Nichiren retained many elements of old Buddhism (Ienaga 1955 p. 70). For example, Nichiren accepted esoteric Buddhist thought concerning prayers and supported the theory that Shinto gods were the earthly manifestations of the heavenly buddhas and bodhisattvas. Ienaga considered Nichiren, along with Kōben (i.e., Myōe) and Jōkei, to be a reformer of old Buddhism (Ienaga 1955 p. 88). This is the greatest point of contention among the supporters of "Common Theory A."

[2] Inoue 1971 and Inoue 1978.

emperors and aristocrats through their prayers for the protection and peace of the emperor and the state. According to the proponents of this theory, the monks of the old Buddhist schools did not concern themselves with the salvation of the common people.

This interpretive framework was first set forth by Hara Katsurō[3] during the Meiji period (1868–1912). Hara understood the rise of the new Kamakura schools by using the Protestant Reformation in Europe as a model. His theory was developed further by Tsuji Zennosuke, a scholar noted for his positivistic and comprehensive research on medieval Buddhism.[4] The theory also formed the basis of post-war studies on socio-economic history, especially in relation to the manorial system theory set forth by Ishimoda Shō.[5] Ishimoda believed that the system of private estates (*shōen* 荘園) was a typical feature of ancient Japan and therefore the Buddhist temples of the ancient period which utilized such estates as their economic base should also be characterized as essentially "ancient." In contrast to this situation, the spread of the manorial system promoted by the warrior class was, in Ishimoda's interpretation, the driving force in the development of the Middle Ages. This idea has long been dominant in interpreting Japanese Buddhism.

Many studies on the ideologies of Shinran, Hōnen, Nichiren, Dōgen, Ippen and other founding monks of the new Buddhist schools and their followers have been published on the basis of this theory.[6] However, it has many problems. For example, although it considers an anti-precepts stance to be an important indicator of the new Buddhist schools, the Zen school places great emphasis on the observance of the precepts. Hence, the anti-precepts ideology cannot be used as a distinguishing feature of the new Kamakura Buddhist schools as a whole. The same can be said of the claim that stress on exclusive adherence to a single practice was a defining feature of these schools. The Zen monk Eisai 栄西 (1141–1215) also practiced esoteric Buddhism and was regarded, not as a Zen monk, but as an esoteric monk in Kamakura. Furthermore, with regard to the issue of popular salvation upon which "Theory A" places such importance, it must be recognized that the teachings of Myōe 明恵 (1173–1232), Eizon 叡尊 (1201–1290) and

[3] Hara 1911.

[4] Tsuji 1944, pp. 49–51.

[5] Ishimoda 1957.

[6] See the works found in the ten-volume series entitled *Nihon meisō ronshū* 日本名僧論集 (Collection of Famed Monks in Japan) published by Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1982–83, as well as those of another ten-volume series *Nihon bukkyō shūshi ronshū* 日本仏教宗史論集 (Collection of Buddhist Religious History Theories) also published by Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1984–85. For an overview, see Kasahara 1971.

other monks of the old Buddhist schools also sought to provide means to ensure the salvation of the general public.[7] Additionally, although "Theory A" emphasizes Hōnen, Shinran and other monks of the Pure Land tradition, it almost totally neglects the important roles played by esoteric Buddhist monks.[8] For these reasons, "Theory A" has been criticized by the supporters of the "Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism Theory."

Commonly Accepted Theory B: Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism Theory

"Commonly Accepted Theory B" refers to what is usually known as the "Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism Theory." The first formulation of this theory is conventionally traced to Kuroda Toshio in the 1970s.[9] However, in a recent study,[10] Imatani Akira has found that its core concepts had been plagiarized from Hiraizumi Kiyoshi's *Chūsei ni okeru shaji to shakai to no kankei* 中世日本における社寺と社会との関係 (Relations between Shrines and Temples and Society in Medieval Japan).[11] Imatani points out that one of the essential components of Kuroda's theory, the notion that Buddhist temples and shrines were a major force in the Japanese Middle Ages, was taken from Hiraizumi.

"Commonly Accepted Theory B" can be summarized as follows. The fundamental dichotomy underlying "Theory A"—Kamakura New Buddhism vs. Old Buddhism—does not accurately portray the historical situation of medieval Japan because it is based on a view of religious history that was developed in the early modern period. In contrast, "Theory B" attempts to explain medieval Buddhism as a whole by applying to it concepts of orthodoxy, heresy and reform. It holds that the orthodox ideology of Buddhism in the medieval period was that of exoteric and esoteric Buddhism and that this ideology sought to understand Buddhism and all other religions from the perspective of exoteric and esoteric Buddhism and to interpret them in relation to exotericism and esotericism. This logic, which arose and developed in the ninth century, had reached its maturity and formed the dominant ideology by the tenth century. Historically, it developed during an age in which esoteric Buddhism enjoyed absolute superiority. In essence, it is a style of esoteric Buddhism represented by the Tendai "original enlightenment" (*hongaku* 本覚) ideology. During the Middle Ages, the new Kamakura Bud-

[7] See the introduction of Matsuo 1998.
[8] Taira 1992.
[9] Kuroda 1975, Kuroda 1990.
[10] Imatani 2001.
[11] Hiraizumi 1926.

dhist schools of Hōnen, Shinran, and others were, quantitatively and qualitatively, powerless and heretical. In contrast, the exoteric/esoteric schools were the dominant schools of Buddhism, both in terms of quality and quantity. Hence, according to the proponents of "Theory B," they can be defined as having been the orthodox forms of Buddhism of that age. When contrasted to these schools, the new Buddhist movements that began at the end of the twelfth century were heretical and reformist in nature.

"Theory B" rejects the utility of understanding Kamakura Buddhism by contrasting the new Kamakura Buddhist schools with those of old Buddhism, and attempts instead to explain medieval Buddhism by judging whether schools were considered "orthodox" or "heretical" vis-a-vis the exoteric and esoteric Buddhist schools. In order to distinguish "Theory B" from "Theory A," let us examine how the former views the new schools of Kamakura Buddhism. Noting the relationship between monastic communities and secular authorities (the court, shogunate and other powers which Kuroda conceptualizes as the "gates of power" [*kenmon* 権門]), "Theory B" views those Buddhists who chose to accept and cooperate with the secular powers as being orthodox, while the religious organizations which were considered heretical, and oppressed by secular authority for their non-cooperation, as belonging to the new schools of Kamakura Buddhism. In other words, it considers the positions of Buddhists in terms of their relationship to the secular authority.

Unlike "Theory A," which is based on a new Kamakura Buddhism-centered view of history, "Theory B" focuses on the schools of old Buddhism, or, more specifically, on esoteric Buddhism which maintained a close and symbiotic relationship with the state and which had its economic basis in the private estates of the temples. Since this theory showed that the roles of the old Buddhist temples could not be ignored in any discussion of the state and the private estates in old and medieval Japan, it exerted a very strong influence on later historical studies as well. For this reason, "Theory B" has proved influential in the study of socio-economic history as well. This field of historical study also underwent changes, inasmuch as it began to consider the private estate system as a medieval entity instead of approaching it as a substructure of the ancient political-economic system.[12] Unfortunately, however, although Kuroda invested a great deal of effort in the development of his model theoretically, he did so without sufficiently verifying that his theory was warranted by historical facts. Many later studies have

[12] Toda 1972.

attempted to rectify this deficiency by applying Kuroda's model to interpret concrete historical events.

In the meantime, other scholars, including Sueki Fumihiko,[13] Sasaki Kaoru[14] and myself,[15] have pointed out problems in the logical structure of "Theory B." These studies do not simply attempt to modify the exoteric/esoteric Buddhism theory but rather to present an altogether new model for understanding Japanese Buddhist history. In this connection, it is necessary to point out three problems with "Theory B." First, although the question of whether a Buddhist ideology is oppressed by secular authority as heretical is qualitatively different from the question of whether it is actually heretical or not from a doctrinal point of view, "Theory B" does not acknowledge this point. In other words, even if a religious organization is ideologically reformist in nature, it does not always result in oppression by the secular authorities. An attempt by Saichō 最澄 (767–822) to establish an ordination platform based on the precepts of the *Fanwang jing* 梵網経 at his temple on Mt. Hiei 比叡 was highly reformist and heretical in his day, but it was accepted as being orthodox by the emperor. Religious leaders are not always revolutionaries. They try to provide salvation to people in power, even emperors or shoguns, if they are in distress. Therefore, that they chose to accommodate themselves with the secular authorities, does not exclude the possibility that they desired reform.

Taira Masayuki has also pointed out that terms like "orthodox," "reformist" and "heretical" are employed without much precision in Kuroda's theory. He suggested that only monks who were oppressed as heretical by the secular authorities should be called "heretical." In this way, he tried to be more precise in using concepts like "orthodox" and "heretical."[16] However, if we were to follow Taira's suggestion, only a small number of monks could be classified as "heretical," and neither the individual characteristics nor the significance of the activities of the great majority of the Zen, Ritsu and nenbutsu monks and the followers of Nichiren could be understood. It is necessary to understand the novelty of the new schools of Kamakura Buddhism by looking at not only the founders but also the organizations that they created. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge the unique aspects common to the activities of these monks. For example, funerary Buddhism is often cited as a feature of Japanese Buddhism, but as

[13] Sueki 1993, Sueki 1998.
[14] Sasaki 1997.
[15] Matsuo 1990, Matsuo 1994, Matsuo 1995a, Matsuo 1995b, Matsuo 1998.
[16] Taira 1992.

will be described below, it was Zen, Ritsu and nenbutsu monks and Nichiren's followers who were institutionally engaged in funerals in defiance of the taboo against becoming defiled by contact with death.

"Theory B" also emphasizes that esoteric Buddhism lies at the core of the old Buddhist schools. This is the second problem with this theory, which can be defined as having an esoteric Buddhism-centered historical view. Yet, even if the medieval Buddhist community was heavily influenced by esoteric Buddhism, it is hardly correct to say that this was the unifying core of the old Buddhist monastic community. This is demonstrated by the fact that esoteric Buddhism remained dominant after the Nanbokuchō period (1336–1392)—an age in which the temples and institutions of old Buddhism (referred to as Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism in "Theory B") were in decline. If esoteric Buddhism were, in fact, the unifying core of old Buddhism, it follows that old Buddhism should have been thriving during the Nanbokuchō period. That it did not suggests that esoteric Buddhism did not constitute the unifying core of old Buddhism.

Furthermore, although "Theory B" claims to encompass both exoteric and esoteric Buddhism, it actually centers on esoteric Buddhism. In fact, it slights the role of exoteric Buddhism to the point that it even considers the exoteric Tendai original enlightenment theory[17] to be a typical form of esoteric Buddhist ideology. Inaba Nobumichi has pointed out the major role played by exoteric Buddhist monks and institutions in the "Southern Capital" (Nara), raising the question as to whether esoteric Buddhism was as central to the schools of old Buddhism as was formerly assumed.[18] Recently, Uejima Susumu and others have published studies shedding greater light on the reality of exoteric Buddhism.[19]

Third, it is claimed that monks and other members of the so-called old Buddhist temples sought to provide a method to ensure the salvation of all people. However, it was not the orthodox Buddhist monks (the official monks of Kōfukuji 興福寺 and Enryakuji 延暦寺) but the heretical and reformist ones (the "secluded" monks to be described below) that were systematically and institutionally engaged in the salvation of women and social outcasts (leprosy patients, beggars, gravediggers etc.), and in the performance of funeral services. If, institutionally speaking, the most important service provided by old Buddhist temples and monks were popular salvation (though since they also provided salvation to emperors and aristocrats,

[17] Regarding Tendai's *hongaku* thought as being exoteric, see Sueki 1998.

[18] Inaba 1997.

[19] Uejima 1996. See also Kan 1994.

it should more properly be defined as salvation for "individuals"), it was not the orthodox groups but only the reformist groups that were engaged in the salvation of women and social outcasts, and in the performance of funeral services. On the contrary, these activities could only have been carried out by the reformist and heretical groups. Therefore, it can be said that the most important service provided by the old Buddhist temples and monks was popular (or "individual") salvation.

Since these questions are related to the fundamental presuppositions of "Theory B," they cannot be resolved by making partial revisions of the theory. A new framework must be presented. Therefore, in attempting to understand medieval Buddhism anew, it is necessary to note what kinds of people Buddhist monks offered salvation to, and whether Buddhist monks of the Kamakura period were engaged in an organized way in activities that were not carried out by Buddhists before them. In setting forth my new interpretive framework, I have followed the approach taken by scholars of religious studies and mythology, and paid special attention to ordination rituals and myths about the founders.

Seeking a New Framework

The new framework I am proposing, which takes into consideration such factors as the ordination system, myths about founders and soteriological practices, can be roughly summarized as follows. During the Middle Ages, monks were basically classified into two groups: (1) official monks (including nuns) called *kansō* and (2) "secluded" monks, called *tonseisō* 遁世僧, who had renounced their status as official monks. Official monks were typically those who had entered the Buddhist priesthood with the emperor's permission and had undergone (or were supposed to have undergone) an ordination ceremony at an ordination platforms located either in Tōdaiji 東大寺, Kanzeonji 観世音寺 or Enryakuji in order to become full-fledged monks. At their ordination ceremonies, these monks donned white robes (symbolizing orthodox status), and their main duty was to pray for the peace and welfare of the state. In other words, these monks were authorized to pray for the protection and peace of the state ruled by an emperor who had the right to conduct national religious rites. These monks were assigned different ranks and some were also appointed to the office of monastic superintendents. They were officially invited to the three major Buddhist ceremonies (*san'e* 三会) and other gatherings sponsored by the emperor. A distinctive feature of these official monks was that they had no need to organize lay followers into religious organizations. The primary objects of their prayers were people

who, ontologically speaking, were symbols to which those prayers for the protection and peace of the state were addressed ("state" here refers to the emperor as the embodiment of the Yamato ethnic community. In other words, the emperor was considered to be the equivalent to the Yamato ethnic community).[20]

By "secluded" monks, I mean those monks who belonged to Buddhist communities that created their own ritual system for entry into the priesthood without any relation to the emperor, and who "left the world" twice, first to become official monks and then to withdraw even from that status.[21] These "secluded" monks wore black robes (symbolizing their existence in a different world) and some groups even allowed these monks to marry. They particularly stressed reverence to the founders of their organizations, and their main duty was to offer (or profess to offer) salvation to women and social outcasts. They aimed at providing salvation for the "individual," and their organization membership included lay followers. Hence, in contrast to the religion of the official monks which can be considered "communal," that of the "secluded" monks can be described as "individual" (though the meaning of the term "individual" here differs from its modern meaning).

The historical development of medieval Japanese Buddhism can be explained in terms of the (sometimes conflicting) relationship between official and "secluded" monks, or, to use contemporary terms, white-robed (*byakue* 白衣) and black-robed (*kokue* 黒衣) monks. If we consider the activities of Zen, Ritsu and nenbutsu monks during the latter part of the Kamakura and the Nanbokuchō periods, we see that these monks can be best characterized as "secluded." The freshness we perceive in medieval Japanese Buddhism has its origins in the activities, not of the official monks, but of the "secluded" ones. In short, medieval Japanese Buddhism may be characterized by the Buddhism of "secluded" monks.

Previous studies have assumed that the temples of the official monks were more powerful than those of the "secluded" ones. This assumption was based on the analysis of the fixed and formalized "Ōta bumi" 大田文 (land

[20] For verification, see Matsuo 1998.

[21] "Seclusion" originally had the same meaning as "leaving home to enter the priesthood." However, in the Middle Ages, seclusion often referred to the withdrawal of an official monk from his position in order to concentrate on Buddhist training, that is to say, a double seclusion. In this paper, the term "secluded" monks designates those who had withdrawn from the status of official monks. Later, when Buddhist orders were institutionalized by secluded monks, those monks who joined these orders, such as that of Ippen, without leaving their positions as official monks were also called "secluded" monks. They are also included in the category of "secluded" monks in this paper.

register) of the extensive estates which constituted the economic foundations of Kōfukuji, Tōdaiji and other temples of official monks.[22] In contrast, the temples of "secluded" monks were economically based not in real estate but in such things as alms and donations to the sanctuaries where Buddhist memorial tablets were enshrined. It is, therefore, doubtful as to whether the economic power of the "secluded" monks' organizations can properly be estimated by the size of the private estates registered in the "Ōta bumi."

Moreover, during the late Kamakura and Nanbokuchō periods, the "secluded" monks, especially those of the Zen and Ritsu schools, became the "official monks" for the growing warrior class, resulting in the increased power of these monks. This is exemplified in the creation of the Five Upper Ranked Temples and the Ten Temples System[23] as well as by the Muromachi shogunate policy to build temples in all provinces named Ankokuji 安国寺 each one containing a Rishōtō 利生塔 (stupa to ensure divine favor for sentient beings).[24] As a result, the temples of the "secluded" monks came to possess a power comparable to those of the official monks.

This is not to say that Buddhism as practiced by the "secluded" monks was ethically superior to that of the official monks. I simply consider that the former came to possess new religious functions and roles, primarily that of offering salvation to "individuals." Nor do I assume that Japanese Buddhist history is centered on the activities of "secluded" monks. But I believe that this new paradigm can help to shed light on both the new schools of Kamakura Buddhism as well as the old Buddhist schools, while concurrently avoiding the problems associated with conventional theories.

I have summarized below the main points of the commonly accepted theories of medieval Buddhism as well as my own theory in two tables. In the table "Commonly Accepted Theories" below, there is a column entitled "Relationship to Socio-economic History." However, this column is not given in the table outlining my own theory. The reason for this should be explained. In defining the beginning and end of the Middle Ages, scholars have adopted the chronology employed in classical Japanese socio-economic histories, mainly as a result of the influence wielded by the Marxist view of history that was long dominant in Japanese academia. Religious history, even though it is a part of cultural history, was also linked with, and interpreted in terms of, socio-economic history. For example, "Theory B"

[22] Hiraizumi 1926.

[23] For the Five Upper Ranked Temples and Ten Temples Systems, see Imaeda 1978.

[24] For the creation of the Ankokuji Rishōtō system, see Matsuo 2000, Matsuo 2002 (both reprinted in Matsuo 2003) and Matsuo 2001.

maintains that society in the Middle Ages was feudal, that its infrastructure is to be located in the private estate system, and that exoteric/esoteric Buddhism is one of its superstructures.

However, I do not subscribe to the Marxist view of history; rather, I take the position that Japanese religions developed apart from the country's socio-economic system. Now that the Marxist view on history has been rejected worldwide, it is necessary to reconsider the chronological divisions of Japanese history. Moreover, the development of religious history should be considered independently. Broadly speaking, the old period may be defined as the time when communal religions dominated, and the Middle Ages as when those of "individual salvation" did. (This, of course, does not mean that communal religions died out during this period.)[25] In short, the Buddhist practices of "secluded" and official monks coexisted in the same period, and even if they worked together, they were entities of a very different nature.

However, in his recently published "Shin bukkyō to kenmitsu taiseiron" 新仏教と顕密体制論 (New Buddhism and Exoteric and Esoteric Buddhism Theory),[26] Taira Masayuki criticized my new periodization of Japanese religious history. He concluded, based on the rejection of this periodization, that both my critique of the exoteric/esoteric Buddhism system theory and my model of an official monk/"secluded" monk paradigm were erroneous. But the periodization theory itself is a hypothesis based on a particular viewpoint. The periodization upon which Taira bases his own argument is also a hypothesis, which is founded on Marxist history. Now that Marxist history has become untenable, the necessity of positing different periods of Japanese history has presented itself. Taira's criticism neglects this fact.

Ōtsuka Norihiro[27] recently presented a new model for understanding medieval Japanese Buddhism, in which exoteric/esoteric Buddhism is contrasted with Zen and Ritsu Buddhism. His grouping indicates that the Zen and Ritsu schools, both of which were moderate ones practiced by "secluded" monks and which were strongly influenced by the Song Dynasty Buddhism in China, were different in nature from, and constituted a strong rival of exoteric/esoteric Buddhism. Ōtsuka's view is persuasive on this and other points.

If I were to compare Ōtsuka's theory with my own, exoteric/esoteric Buddhism would correspond to the Buddhism of the official monks in my

[25] Matsuo 1995b, pp. 185–86, n. 15.
[26] Taira 2003.
[27] Ōtsuka 2003.

scheme, while Zen and Ritsu Buddhism would correspond to the practices of the moderate schools of "secluded" monks. However, Ōtsuka's model does not include the radical groups of "secluded" monks under Nichiren and Shinran. Further, his model is static, making it impossible to explain how and why the differences between exoteric/esoteric Buddhism and the Zen and Ritsu schools arose. For example (and I will take this up in more detail below), his model cannot account for the reasons for the differences in the religious activities of the two groups of monks. A significant difference, for example, was that "secluded" monks were able to officiate at funerals because they were considered exempt from the rule imposed upon official monks of avoiding death-related defilements.

Important facts become apparent when we look at problems surrounding death in the Japanese Middle Ages using my official monks/"secluded" monks model. In particular, it must be noted that it was the "secluded" monks who played the central role in medieval Japan. I will take up this point in greater detail in the following section.

"SECLUDED" MONKS AND FUNERALS

The fact that the Buddhist schools of "secluded" monks began to take part in funerals was an epoch-making event. It was also significantly ideological. One major difference between the religious activities of official monks and "secluded" monks was the engagement of the latter in funeral rites. Today, the main activity of Buddhist monks is considered to be to officiate at funerals, but it was only after World War II that Tōdaiji, Enryakuji and other temples within the tradition of official monks began to offer funeral services. Until then, monks in these temples even entrusted the performance of funeral rites for their families to "secluded" monks of other schools.[28]

What accounts for this disparity in the attitudes of the official and "secluded" monks toward funerals? It arose from the difference in their attitudes toward ritual defilement, and in particular, that which was associated with death. Official monks, whose status resembled that of government bureaucrats, were required to remain ritually pure and avoid defilements, since ritual purity was necessary in order to serve in Buddhist rituals for the state. Therefore, if they were involved in funerals in which defilement associated with death could not be avoided, they were restricted for a certain period of time from participating in services to pray for the peace of the state and other divine services. For example, on 4/26/889, the Two Kings

[28] Umehara 1979, p. 8.

	Commonly Accepted Theory A (New Kamakura vs. Old Buddhism Theory)	Commonly Accepted Theory B (Exoteric/Esoteric Buddhism Theory)
New Buddhism	Buddhist organizations founded by Hōnen, Shinran, Eisai, Dōgen, Ippen, etc.	Buddhism by Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren and Dōgen and a group of followers who were oppressed
Old Buddhism and its Reformist Sects	Six Southern Capital Sects (Sanron, Jōjitsu, Hossō, Kusha, Kegon, Ritsu) belonging to Old Buddhism, and Myōe and Eizon to reformist schools	Six Southern Capital Sects and Two Kyoto schools belonging to Old Buddhism; Myōe, Eizon, Eisai and Ippen belong to the reformist schools, as do the majority of the followers of Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren and Dōgen
Features of New Buddhism	Selection of a particular practice, concentrated practice, easy training, popular salvation	Rejection of esoteric Buddhism, confrontation with secular authority (oppressed as being heretical)
Features of Old Buddhism	Studying more than one school, believing in various cults and engaging in associated practices, stressing the precepts, Buddhism for the state and aristocrats	Indistinguishable from esoteric Buddhism. Close association with secular authority
Medieval Buddhism	New Buddhism	Transformed Old Buddhism, New Buddhism is in the minority
Targets	warriors, farmers, urban populace	Farmers in the private estates
Relationship to Socio-economic History	Considers the private estate system and temples owning such estates as being old	Considers the private estate system and temples owning such estates as being medieval

Figure 1. Commonly Accepted Theories

(Niō 二王, or the two guardian deities of Buddhism) Ceremony was held in the morning and evening at the Shishinden 紫宸殿 Hall and other halls and offices in the imperial palace. It was simultaneously held at the sites of the twelve gates of the capital city, Heiankyō 平安京, at the main gate of the city, at thirty-two temples in both the eastern and western sections of the capital, in the five administrative regions around Kyoto, and in seven other regions of Japan. Significantly, during this time monks were strictly prohibited from coming into contact with things considered defiled.[29] Furthermore, according to the *Shōyūki* 小右記, the diary of the court noble Fujiwara Sanesuke 藤原実資 (957–1046), when the Two Kings Ceremony was held at the Daigokuden 大極殿 Hall (office of the emperor) on 12/18/1020, persons

[29] Yamamoto 1992, p. 259.

	Matsuo Model (Official Monk/ "Secluded" Monk Model)
Buddhism by "secluded" monks	Buddhist orders created by "secluded" monks (orders that created systems to increase membership of the order with Hōnen, Shinran, Nichiren, Eisai, Dōgen, Ippen, Myōe, Eizon, Keichin and other "secluded" monks at their cores)
Buddhism by official monks	Buddhism by orders to official monks (orders authorized by the emperor to pray for the protection and peace of the state)
Features of "secluded" monks' Buddhism	Primarily meant for "individual" salvation Ancestor worship, salvation of women and social outcasts, funerals, preaching the Dharma Entry into monastic system (black robes etc.) does not involve the emperor Organizations with lay followers as members The title of general manager of a temple is "*chōrō*" Individual religion
Features of official monks' Buddhism	Primarily to pray for peace of the state Restrictions imposed on working for the salvation of women and social outcasts, and on the officiating at funerals and preaching Entry into priesthood and ordination (white robes) under state control The title of general manager of a temple is "*bettō*" (also "*zasu*" or "*chōja*") Lay followers not included in their organizations Communal religion
Medieval Buddhism	Buddhism by "secluded" monks (the most novel feature of medieval Buddhism)
Targets	"individuals"

Figure 2. Matsuo Model

who had become exposed to defilement were prohibited from making offerings to the Buddha and from offering alms to monks.[30]

It was believed that people could become defiled by touching a corpse, or by being involved in funerals, reburials and gravedigging. A person who became polluted was required to refrain from attending religious services and from visiting the palace for thirty days (seven days in the case of a corpse whose body was impaired in some way).[31] Fearing defilement, poor monks on their deathbeds who lacked relatives and had only servants who were not related to them by blood, were often thrown out of their temples or residences, or even abandoned on the roadside or riverbed.[32] As this indicates, the concern to avoid defilement, especially that which was associated

[30] Yamamoto 1992.
[31] Yamamoto 1992, pp. 14–15.
[32] Katsuda 2003, pp. 43, 44.

with death, was a major concern for people, particularly court officials and official monks, in both ancient times and in the Middle Ages.

Official Monks and the Taboo against Coming into Contact with Death

The manner in which official monks responded to defilement caused by death can be seen in "Jien's Testament" ("Jien yuzurijō an" 慈円譲状案) written on 8/1/1221.[33] Jien 慈円 (1155–1225) was a son of Chancellor Fujiwara Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097–1164). One of his elder brothers was Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149–1207), who served as Grand Minister, Regent and Chancellor. Jien, who was appointed abbot of Enryakuji four times, was a leading official monk.[34] He was, of course, from a high-rank aristocrat family. This indicates that, by this time, the community of official monks differed little from that of the secular world, inasmuch as one's monastic position was determined by the social status of one's family.

"Jien's Testament" was addressed to Ryōkai 良快 (1185–1243), a son of Kujō Kanezane and Jien's nephew, and a disciple of bodhisattva ranking. It consists of eight articles giving instructions for posthumous treatment including cremation and memorial services. There are sections devoted to "funerals" and to "persons who have come into contact with defilement." Regarding his funeral procedures, Jien stipulated as follows. First, the corpse should be cremated at a convenient time immediately after his death, and the ashes should be taken by his disciple Jigen 慈賢 (1175–1241) and buried near the tomb of Mudōji Taishi (Jie) 無動寺大師（慈恵）. Second, the place where the cremation took place should not be used as the tomb. Jien stated that, with the exception of those involved in cremation, people who might have become polluted through contact with the dead should visit Hiyoshi 日吉 Shrine on the day after his death to pray to the Sannō 山王 deity for his peaceful afterlife. He wrote that those who would have to touch the corpse and ashes should decide what to do immediately after the funeral, but that they should certainly visit the shrine thirty days after his death to pray for his afterlife.

From this testament, it is possible to discern how the official monks at Enryakuji carried out funerals for their fellow monks in the early thirteenth century. It is clear that Jien sought cremation, and that a disciple was to collect his ashes. The document also indicates the Shinto-Buddhist syncretism which was the norm during that period. Shinto deities were considered

[33] *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文 (hereafter *KI*), vol. 5, pp. 32–33, document no. 2792.
[34] For Jien, see Taga 1989.

guardians of the Buddha, and a shrine was usually attached to a temple. The Hiyoshi Shrine was affiliated with Enryakuji as the latter's guardian. The testament suggests that monks who were involved in a funeral and came into contact with death-related defilement were obliged to refrain from visiting the shrine for thirty days after the funeral. Additionally, they were required to refrain from taking part in religious services to pray for the peace of the state and from visiting the emperor's palace.

"Secluded" monks who had renounced the status of official monks were exempt from these restrictions. They were able to engage in funerals in defiance of the taboo against coming into contact with death. Graveyards were built in the temples of "secluded" monks. Consequently, in the fourteenth century, funerals of emperors, generals and even official monks came to be conducted by "secluded" monks.[35] In order to avoid ritual impurities, funerals could not be conducted in temples associated with official monks.

For example, when Chinnōji 珍皇寺 at the entrance of the Toribeno 鳥辺野 burial ground in Kyoto (now a part of Higashiyama ward)[36] was reconstructed as the branch temple of Tōji 東寺 in 1609, the abbot of Chinnōji pledged to the head of Tōji, Gien 義演 (1558–1626), that his temple would neither conduct burials nor build tombs.[37] This suggests that, due to its location, Chinnōji was involved in funerals before its reconstruction. Since it was to be rebuilt as a branch temple of a major official temple, it had to pledge not to conduct funerals. From this episode, it can be inferred that temples counted among the official temples were not involved in funeral procedures even at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

As this shows, official monks were first reluctant, and later indifferent, to being involved in funerals in order to avoid defilement. In the next part, the relationship between "secluded" monks and funerals will be examined. First, the case of the monks of the Ritsu school will be discussed.

"The Pure Precepts Never Get Defiled"

An anecdote concerning Jienbō Kakujō 慈淵房覚乗 (1275–1363), the eleventh head of Saidaiji, demonstrates succinctly the relationship between "secluded" Ritsu monks and funerals.[38] Kakujō is not as famous as other monks of his age, but he was known as "a person of high moral character

[35] Ōishi 2004, pp. 207–55.

[36] Katsuda 2003, p. 205.

[37] *Daigoji bunsho* 醍醐寺文書 (Daigoji Temple Documents), vol. 3, document no. 537.

[38] See "Saidaiji daidai chōrōmei" 西大寺代々長老名 (Names of the Heads of Saidaiji Temple) in Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo 1968, p.73

and [as] possessing supernatural powers." He died on 1/26/1363 at the age of ninety-one. His main base of operation was Anotsu Enmyōji 安濃津円明寺 in Ise province (now Mie prefecture) and he served as the head of Saidaiji temple for only seventy-five days.[39]

An interesting document recording Kakujō's activities in Ise is contained in the fourteenth entry of the *Sanpōin kyūki* 三宝院旧記 (Sanpōin Journal).[40] According to this document, Kakujō was one of the disciples (or possibly a disciple of a disciple) of Eizon, and was assigned to live at Enmyōji on the basis of a divine oracle issued by the deity of Ise Shrine that Eizon received at Ise Koshōji. One day, Kakujō vowed to make visits from his temple to Ise Shrine over a period of one hundred days. On his way to the shrine on the final day, just as he was passing the estate of Saigū 斎宮, the emperor's daughter who served as the imperial representative at the shrine, Kakujō saw the corpse of a traveler. The people who had accompanied the dead traveler asked him to say a prayer for the deceased, and Kakujō conducted a funeral for him. When he later arrived at the Miyakawa River, an old man approached him and admonished him, saying, "You have just officiated at a funeral. Do you mean to worship at Ise Shrine when you are stained with defilements resulting from contact with the dead?" Kakujō replied, "The pure precepts never get polluted. Are you telling me that going back to Enmyōji would be the proper thing to do in this corrupt age?" Before this conversation had ended, a child in white robes appeared from nowhere and recited a poem, declaring, "From now on, no one from Enmyōji will be considered impure." The child then disappeared like a vanishing shadow.

Jien and other official monks had to confine themselves for thirty days after having been involved in funerals before resuming their visits to shrines. In the case of Ritsu monks, however, they were allowed to visit Ise Shrine, a shrine noted for its extremely strict prohibitions against defilement, in defiance of the death taboo by arguing that "the pure precepts never get defiled." These words implied that, since Ritsu monks strictly observed the precepts in their everyday life, their daily practice served as a barrier that could prevent them from becoming polluted. This provided them with a rationale for overcoming the taboos associated with the defilement of death.

The conversation between the old man (it was said that he was, in fact, a deity) and Kakujō succinctly demonstrates how monks of the Ritsu school understood the relationship between their observance of the precepts and

[39] See "Saidaiji daidai chōrōmei," Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo 1968, p.73.
[40] *Dai Nihon shiryō* (hereafter *DNS*), 6th series, vol. 24, p. 867.

their conduct of social welfare activities including funerals. Simply put, they thought that their commitment to strictly observing the precepts did not prevent them from conducting social welfare activities. Rather, they maintained that the precepts protected them from pollution. Moreover, they believed that they had the approval of the deity of Ise Shrine.

Collections of Buddhist tales, such as the *Hosshinshū* 発心集 by Kamo no Chōmei 鴨長明 (1155–1216), (dating from the beginning of the thirteenth century)[41] and the *Shasekishū* 沙石集 by Mujū 無住 (1226–1312) dated 1283,[42] contain similar episodes. One story relates how a monk on his way to a shrine meets a young woman who asks him to pray for her dead mother. Consequently he officiates at the mother's funeral. Later, when he arrives at the shrine, its deity appears before him to praise him for his good conduct. The episode concerning Kakujō above can be seen as a variation on this type of story. However, it is important to note that not only Kakujō's defilement, but (as the words "no one from Enmyōji temple" indicates) death-induced defilement of all the monks of the Ritsu order were nullified. In other words, based on the notion that "the pure precepts never get defiled," freedom from defilement was considered to apply to all the Ritsu monks of Eizon's order. The other side of the coin, of course, is that, in the age of Shinto-Buddhist syncretism, it was taboo for Buddhist monks who had been involved in funerals to visit a shrine for worship without first undertaking abstinences to cleanse them of death-related defilement.

The logic that "the pure precepts never get defiled" was instrumental for Eizon's order in its engagement with funerals and other activities involving defilement. Ritsu monks overcame the taboo against coming into contact with the dead that was imposed upon official monks, and created an epoch-making justification to circumvent the effects of death-related defilements. It was this kind of justification that enabled Ritsu monks to involve themselves in collecting donations and offering salvation to social outcasts who were feared as impure in ways other than those related to death.

Further, Ritsu monks of Eizon's order created a separate organization called *saikaishū* 斎戒衆 (association of those observing ritual fasts) which specialized in collecting donations, offering salvation to social outcasts, and officiating at funerals.[43] They were lay followers who had pledged to remain ritually pure permanently in order to perform their activities.[44] They

[41] *Hosshinshū*, vol. 4, episode no. 10.
[42] *Shasekishū*, vol. 1, episode no. 4.
[43] See Hosokawa 1987.
[44] Minowa 2004, p. 78.

were the point of contact between the common people and the Ritsu monks, and were engaged in activities such as dealing with money, with which Ritsu monks could not directly involve themselves. The formation of this kind of organization reveals the determination of Ritsu monks to involve themselves at the organizational level in activities that official monks avoided because of their need to refrain from defilement.

No Defilements in People Wishing to be Born in the Pure Land

"Secluded" monks of other schools were also engaged in funerals. Let us next consider the case of the nenbutsu (Pure Land) monks. In order to understand the relationship between nenbutsu monks and funerals, it is first necessary to consider the "deathbed rites" described in the *Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集 composed by Genshin 源信 (942–1017) in 985. According to this text, a nenbutsu monk who felt that the hour of his death was near, was sent to a *mujō-in* 無常院 (Impermanence Hall) to spend his last days attended to by fellow nenbutsu monks. The description of this rite in the *Ōjōyōshū* was influential in the creation of a nenbutsu association called "Nijūgo zanmai" 二十五三昧 (Twenty-five *Samādhi*s), which created its own textbooks on how to treat monks and lay followers on their deathbeds. From these works, it is clear that nenbutsu monks believed they would become defiled by caring for the dead. Therefore, when the nenbutsu orders of "secluded" monks who were free from such restrictions, were founded, they were able to obtain followers and alms by officiating at funerals.

More importantly, it was believed that "those who wish to be born in the Pure Land are free from the defilement arising from death." In the Middle Ages, people whose death was accompanied by miraculous signs, such as the appearance of auspicious purple clouds, sweet fragrance and music (believed to be played by the host of bodhisattvas who came with Amitābha to welcome the dying to the Pure Land) were thought to have been born in the Pure Land. People who achieved such a birth in this way were considered to be free from the defilement caused by death. In the first month of 1279, a nenbutsu monk named Man-Amidabutsu 万阿弥陀仏 visited the recently deceased monk Kawada at Mt. Tanjō 丹生 (in Hyōgo prefecture). There, Man-Amidabutsu sat down on the floor. It was generally considered that when a monk sat down on the floor of a house in which a corpse had lain, he would become polluted. However, on this occasion, someone there informed Man-Amidabutsu that the person who had been born in the Pure

Land could not be polluted. A few days later, a servant of a financial officer at the Iidaka Regional Office of the Kamakura Shogunate named Kunihide 国秀 met Man-Amidabutsu and visited Ise Shrine for worship. As a result of his visit, the deity, who was then being housed in a temporary shrine while a new shrine was being built, became stained with the defilement arising from death.

It is worth noting that Ise Shrine, which recognized that the pure precepts never get polluted, did not acknowledge that people who were born in the Pure Land are free from defilement. However, people in the area around Mt. Tanjō were aware of this notion and the nenbutsu monk Man-Amidabutsu also apparently accepted it.[45] This belief is graphically portrayed in the deathbed scene of founder monks of nenbutsu schools depicted in such illustrated biographies as *Hōnen shōnin eden* 法然上人絵伝 and *Ippen shōnin eden* 一遍上人絵伝. In these works, not only the disciples but many non-kin lay followers are shown as congregating to mourn the death of Hōnen and Ippen. In the pictures that show the final hours of these monks, purple clouds are shown trailing in the sky and a pleasant fragrance is described as having wafted through the air around the assembled people. These illustrations were intended to show that these monks entered the Pure Land when they died.

This notion that people who have been born in the Pure Land are not polluted is important. Before Hōnen, it was believed that birth in the Pure Land was possible only for the select few who had practiced assiduously and gained virtue. After Hōnen, however, it came to be accepted that all nenbutsu followers could, in principle, be born there. Hōnen preached that the recitation of the nenbutsu was the sole practice for achieving such a birth, that anyone who recited the nenbutsu could realize this spiritual goal and that nenbutsu believers born in the Pure Land are free from the defilement resulting from contact with death. Therefore, nenbutsu monks under Hōnen were able to engage in funerals in defiance of the taboos associated with death.

Zen Monks and Funerals

Zen monks, who were also regarded as "secluded" monks, also engaged in funeral rites. They officiated at the funerals of not only common people but also of emperors and the Muromachi shoguns. For example, the funeral

[45] See Chijiwa 1987.

rites for Shogun Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305–1358) were performed entirely by monks of the Zen school at Shinnyoji 真如寺.[46]

The entry for 10/24/1530 in the journal of Nakahara Yasutomi 中原安富 (1399-1457) clearly indicates that Zen monks were not subject to taboos concerning contact with the dead. According to this entry, the stepmother of Nakahara's wife had died in September of that year and a temple called Ike-an 池庵 (managed by the Zen monk Eisanbō 永賛房) took care of her funeral and the subsequent seven-week memorial ceremonies. After the mourning period was over, Nakahara's wife visited Ike-an, but the monk was away from the temple as he was undertaking a seven-day prayer vigil at Ise Shrine on behalf of a donor. As a Zen monk who was not bound by defilements caused by death, Eisanbō went to Ise Shrine without observing the thirty-day post-funeral confinement. Nakahara himself had become polluted through his contact with the death of his wife's stepmother, and was worried that the Zen monk's action would incur divine punishment.[47]

This example is interesting as it shows the contrasting attitudes of an aristocrat obsessed with the defilements arising from death and a Zen monk who disregarded them altogether. Zen monks also stood aloof from the taboos concerning death. It is not clear what doctrinal justification they gave for their actions, but it is certain that they overcame the taboos surrounding contact with the dead.

CONCLUSION

In the pages above, I have argued that (1) Zen, Ritsu and nenbutsu monks performed significant roles in funerals during the Middle Ages, and (2) this was possible because, as "secluded" monks, they were free from the restrictions imposed on official monks and were not subject to taboos concerning contact with death.

Judging from the number of *daimoku itabi*, stone grave tablets for the repose of the deceased on which the *daimoku* (*namu myōhō renge kyō*) is inscribed, it is obvious that Nichiren school monks were also engaged in funerals. The tablets were made of stone by Nichiren followers in various styles, but the seven Chinese characters *namu myōhō renge kyō* are inscribed at the center of all of them. The oldest one known today is dated 3/28/1290. From this fact, it can be said that all "secluded" monks were

[46] "Gukanki" 愚管記 May 2 1358 (*DNS* 6, vol. 21, p. 809).

[47] Tōkyō-to Ōta-ku Kyōiku Iinkai 1973. For *daimoku* grave tablets made of stone, see Nakao 1980.

engaged in funerals. To be more precise, it was the Buddhist orders that had overcome the defilements arising from death that were able to attract popular support by officiating at funerals.

Zen, Ritsu and nenbutsu monks in black robes were criticized as "impure groups"[48] and were refused entrance to shrine compounds or residences when divine rituals were in progress. This may have come about because they believed they were free from the taboo of death and so conducted funerals.

The medieval Japanese view of life and death was spread by "secluded" monks who were actively involved in dealing with death. Medieval people were constantly aware of death in their daily lives and were tormented by the fear of death. For such people, Hōnen and others preached that it was possible to gain birth in the Pure Land by reciting the nenbutsu, and Eizon taught that observance of the precepts was the cause for attaining buddhahood.[49] The Japanese Buddhist view of life and death based on such theories for attaining birth in the Pure Land and attaining buddhahood spread widely among the common people. In short, these ideas helped them to overcome their fear of death by emphasizing that their existence would not end with their death in this world.

According to a recent study by Katsuda Itaru, the number of corpses abandoned in and around the city of Kyoto decreased after the 1220s.[50] As to the historical background for this phenomenon, Katsuda points to the growth of *rendaino* 蓮台野 (cremation sites), which served as a large-scale cemetery, in the field located to the southwest of Mt. Funaoka 船岡 in Kyoto, along with the successful organization of social outcasts around Kiyomizuzaka 清水坂. (The word "outcasts" here refers to people engaged in begging and digging graves, the majority of whom were leprosy patients. It does not refer to people belonging to those excluded from the four Edo-period feudal classes of warriors, farmers, artisans and tradesmen.) Katsuda argues that the number of abandoned corpses decreased because organized groups of outcasts carried them to the established cemeteries.[51]

Setting aside the question of the correctness of Katsuda's hypothesis, I would like to focus here on the period when the number of abandoned

[48] "Yamashiro kanjin'insha gean" 山城感神院社解案, written in the fourth month of 1281, *KI*, vol. 21, pp. 98–99, document no. 15887.

[49] "Koshō Bosatsu gokyōkai chōmonshū" 興正菩薩御教戒聴聞集 (Collection of Preachings by Koshō Bosatsu Eizon) in Kamata and Tanaka 1971, p. 205.

[50] Katsuda 2003, p. 11.

[51] Katsuda 2003, p. 220.

corpses decreased—the 1220s. My personal opinion is that the formation of Buddhist orders by "secluded" monks (which laid the foundation of Kamakura Buddhism) and the creation of graveyards within temple compounds are important factors in this decrease. The growth of large-scale cemeteries and the organization of outcasts in Kiyomizuzaka occurred together with the development of Kamakura Buddhism.

ABBREVIATIONS

DNS *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料 , ed. Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjo 東京大学資料編纂所 . 12 series to date. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai. 1901–.

KI *Kamakura ibun: Komonjo hen* 鎌倉遺文 : 古文書編 . 30 vols., ed. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三 . Tokyo: Tōkyōdō, 1971.

REFERENCES

Chijiwa Itaru 千々和到. 1987. Shigusa to sahō: Shi to ōjō o megutte 仕草と作法 : 死と往生をめぐいって. In *Seikatsu kankaku to shakai* 生活感覚と社会. Vol. 8 of *Nihon no shakaishi* 日本の社会史, ed. Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘, Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦, Yamaguchi Keiji 山口啓二, and Yoshida Takashi 吉田孝. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Hara Katsurō 原勝郎. 1911. Tōzai no shūkyō kaikaku 東西の宗教改革. *Geimon* 藝文 2, no. 7, pp. 1–16.

Hiraizumi Kiyoshi 平泉澄. 1926. *Chūsei ni okeru shaji to shakai tono kankei* 中世に於ける社寺と社会の関係. Tokyo: Shibundō.

Hosokawa Ryōichi 細川諒一. 1987. *Chūsei ritsushū jiin to minshū* 中世律宗寺院と民衆. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Ienaga Saburō 家永三郎. 1955. *Chūsei bukkyō shisōshi kenkyū* 中世仏教思想史研究. Revised and enlarged edition. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真. 1978. *Chūsei zenshūshi no kenkyū* 中世禅宗史の研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

Imatani Akira 今谷明. 2001. Hiraizumi Kiyoshi to kenmon taiseiron 平泉澄と権門体制論. In *Chūsei no jisha to shinkō* 中世の寺社と信仰, ed. Uwayokote Masataka 上横手雅敬. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Inaba Nobumichi 稲葉伸道. 1997. *Chūsei jiin no kenryoku kōzō* 中世寺院の権力構造. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞. 1971. *Nihon kodai no kokka to shūkyō* 日本古代の国家と宗教. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

———. 1978. *Shintei Nihon Jōdokyō seiritsushi no kenkyū* 新訂日本浄土教成立史の研究. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha.

Ishimoda Shō 石母田正. 1957. *Chūseiteki sekai no keisei* 中世社会の形成. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

Kamata Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 and Tanaka Hisao 田中久夫, eds. 1971. *Kamakura kyū bukkyō* 鎌倉旧仏教. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Kan Masaki 菅真城. 1994. Hokkyō san'e no seiritsu 北京三会の成立. *Shigaku kenkyū* 史学研究 206, pp. 1–20.

Kasahara Kazuo 笠原一男, ed. 1971. *Nihon shūkyōshi kenkyū nyūmon: Sengo no seika to kadai* 日本宗教史研究入門：戦後の成果と課題. Tokyo: Hyōronsha.

Katsuda Itaru, 勝田至. 2003. *Shishatachi no chūsei* 死者たちの中世. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平. 1972. *Chūsei hōkensei seiritsushiron* 中世封建制成立史論. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄. 1975. *Nihon chūsei no kokka to shūkyō* 日本中世の国家と宗教. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Matsuo Kenji 松尾剛次. 1990. Kamakura shin bukkyōron no shinka o mezashite: Taira Masayuki-shi no shohyō ni kotaeru 鎌倉新仏教論の進化を目指して：平雅行氏の書評に答える. *Shigaku zasshi* 史学雑誌 99, no. 10, pp. 107–115.

———. 1994. Kanso-intonsō taisei moderu: Kamakura shin bukkyōron no aratanaru paradaimu o mezashite 官僧・隠遁僧体制モデル：鎌倉新仏教論のあらたなるパラダイムを目ざして. In *Nihon no bukkyō 1: Bukkyō o minaosu* 日本の仏教第一号:仏教を見なおす, ed. Nihon Bukkyō Kenkyūkai 日本仏教研究会. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

———. 1995a. *Kanjin to hakai no chūsei-shi* 勧進と破戒の中世史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

———. 1995b. *Kamakura shin bukkyō no tanjō* 鎌倉新仏教の誕生. Tokyo: Kōdansha.

———. 1998. *Shinpan Kamakura shin bukkyō no seiritsu: Nyūmon girei to soshi shinwa* 新版鎌倉新仏教の成立：入門儀礼と祖師神話. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

———. 2000. Ankokuji rishōtō saikō 安国寺・利生塔再考 *Yamagata Daigaku kiyō: Jinbun kagaku* 山形大学紀要：人文科学 14, no. 3, pp. 85–107.

———. 2001. *Taiheiki* 太平記. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronshinsha.

———. 2002. Shokoku Ankokuji kō 諸国安国寺考. *Yamagata Daigaku rekishi chiri jinruigaku ronshū* 山形大学歴史・地理・人類学論集 3, pp. 37–44.

———. 2003. *Nihon chūsei no Zen to Ritsu* 日本中世の禅と律. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

———. 2007. *A History of Japanese Buddhism*. Kent, UK: Global Oriental Ltd.

Minowa Kenryō 蓑輪顕量. 2004. Kairitsu fukkō undō 戒律復興運動. In *Jikai no seija: Eizon, Ninshō* 持戒の聖者叡尊・忍性. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Nakao Takashi 中尾堯. 1980. Itabi ni miru Nichirenshū girei no tenkai: Daimoku-itabi no zōryū o megutte 板碑にみる日蓮宗仏教儀礼の展開：題目板碑の造立をめぐって. *Risshō daigaku bungakubu ronsō* 立正大学文学部論叢 67, pp. 31–51.

Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo 奈良国立文化財研究所, ed. 1968. *Saidaiji kankei shiryō* 西大寺関係資料. Vol. 1. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo.

Ōishi Masaaki 大石雅章. 2004. *Nihon chūsei shakai to jiin* 日本中世社会と寺院. Osaka: Seibundō.

Ōtsuka Norihiro 大塚紀弘. 2003. Chūsei Zen-Ritsu bukkyō to Zen-Kyō-Ritsu tosōkan 中世「禅律」佛教と「禅教律」十宗観. *Shigaku zasshi* 史学雑誌 112, no. 9, pp. 1477–1515.

Sasaki Kaoru 佐々木馨. 1997. *Chūsei bukkyō to Kamakura bakufu* 中世仏教と鎌倉幕府. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. 1993. *Nihon bukkyō shisōshi ronkō* 日本仏教思想史論考. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan.

———. 1998. *Kamakura bukkyō keiseiron* 鎌倉仏教形成論. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. 1989. *Jien* 慈円. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Taira Masayuki 平雅行. 1992. *Nihon chūsei no shakai to bukkyō* 日本中世の社会と仏教. Tokyo: Haniwa Shobō.

———. 2003. Shin bukkyō to kenmitsu taiseiron 新仏教と顕密体制論. In *Nihon bukkyō: Sanjūyon no kagi* 日本仏教：三十四の鍵, ed. Ōkubo Ryōshun 大久保良峻, Satō Hiroo 佐藤弘夫, Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, Hayashi Makoto 林淳, and Matsuo Kenji 松尾剛次. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Toda Yoshimi 戸田芳実. 1967. *Nihon ryōshusei seiritsushi kenkyū* 日本領主制成立史研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Tōkyō-to Ōta-ku Kyōiku Iinkai 東京都大田区教育委員会, ed. 1973. *Ōta-ku no itabi* 大田区の板碑. Vol. 9 of *Ōta-ku no bunkazai* 大田区の文化財. Tokyo: Tōkyō-to Ōta-ku Kyōiku Iinkai.

Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助. 1944. *Nihon bukkyōshi* 日本仏教史. 10 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Uejima Susumu 上島享. 1996. Chūsei zenki no kokka to bukkyō 中世前期の国家と仏教. *Nihonshi kenkyū* 日本史研究 403, pp. 31–61.

Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛. 1979. *Nihonjin no anoyo-kan* 日本人のあの世観. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

Yamamoto Kōshi 山本幸司. 1992. *Kegare to ōharae* 穢と大祓. Tokyo: Heibonsha.