# Religious and Secular Monarchy in Medieval Europe and Japan [1]

## Sono Morishita

## Introduction

Not many studies have tried to make comparison between the popes' relation to secular rulers and the Japanese emperors' relation to Bakufu in the medieval age. There are many differences of historical and cultural background between Europe and Japan, and it is not always easy to draw any conclusion from a simple comparison between the two, however, I believe that through the consideration of this theme, new aspects of the relation between the sacred and secular power can be observed. The person who noticed the similarity of the pope and the emperor early on is a missionary of the Jesuit. In 1548, Nicolao Lancilotto from Urbino sent a letter to the Jesuit from Goa, and in this letter he explained that 'one king has ruled over Japan with dukes and counts ... and this king is called the emperor... Japanese people regard him as the pope of their country, and he has the supremacy over the priests as well as over the secular people.' [2] Duality is one of the most conspicuous characteristic of the medieval European history, and to consider the relationship between two cores, sacred and secular in the medieval age, examination of the area of overlap is indispensable. In Japan, there is also duality (or frustrated tendencies in that direction) and especially through the middle ages, from the eleventh to fifteenth centuries, the complicated relation between the emperor and the shogun has provoked controversy. In this paper, I shall attempt to find the similarities and differences of the duality between the western and Japanese history. Firstly, I shall cast light on the medieval European ordeal by comparing this with medieval Japanese one. Then, I shall examine the relation between sacred and secular power in both areas, especially concerning the relation between the sacral kingship and the royal saints which can not be found in Japanese history.

## I. The Ordeal in Europe and in Japan.

In the medieval period, the conception of jurisdiction was quite different from

that of the modern age. The ordeal, trial by fire and water, is one of the customs of the medieval age which must alien to modern ideas. The judgment by the God or gods may reveal the mentality of medieval people about participation of the God/gods in ordinary or secular affairs. Firstly, I shall trace the origin of ordeal, then I shall give a short description that how the ordeal worked in the Western society mainly by following Bartlett.[3] And it shall examine the reason of the disappearance of the ordeal. Secondly, I shall examine the ordeal in Japan.

The early history of the ordeal in Europe can be divided to two stages; one is before AD 800, and the other is after this. At the former stage, there are not many records about the ordeal, and they are mainly the law codes of the Germanic tribes. At this stage, the ordeal by hot water (the ordeal of cauldron) was mainly used and no other type was recorded. The procedure of ordeal is to pick up a pebble or ring in the cauldron which is filled with boiling water. The ordeal by cauldron is found on several tribes' law codes, however, the absence of the ordeal from many Germanic tribes' law codes suggests that this custom was not of pan-Germanic origin. The trials by water may have been from pagan Frankish, and may be introduced to other area, except Ireland, in the process of spread of the Frankish power. Trial by ordeal in Frankish custom was applied for the case of theft, crime without witness and contempt of court. In Irish law, ordeal was applied to test a doubtful claim for the rights and property as a legitimate kindred. From the reign of Charlemagne, the ordeal became quite common way to settle various disputes, and not only the ordeal by water but various types of ordeal had been recent innovations, such as the ordeal by hot iron, by cross, by cold water and by hot ploughshares. The ordeal was regulated by both popes and emperors, and it was applied for both sacred and secular matter; for example, in 775, a dispute over the possession of a monastery was settled by the ordeal, and in 806, the decision about the division of imperial territory between the emperor's sons was made by the ordeal. By the mid-ninth century, various types of ordeal entered their heyday.

In the range of cases to which the trial by ordeal applied is important to note. The ordeal employed not only in a trial of criminal case such as theft or homicide, but often to prove sexual misconduct of women. The case of queen Teutberga of Lotharingia, in 858, is a good example of the ordeal in great political important incident, because in this case, not only the honor of the queen but the inheritance of the Lotharingian crown was at the stake. To attempt to prove something by the ordeal left strong impression on people, so it was often used as a political gambit by both strong ruler who intended to crush an enemy, and by the weaker parties, potential victims of political strife, as a trump card. Thus it may be natural that ordeals were used in

connection with political issue continuously from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries. The trial by ordeal also played an important role in the history of the Gregorian Reform. The reformers used the ordeal against simoniacs, and in the council of Mainz(1049), 'a certain bishop of Speyer, Sibico, who was accused of the crime of adultery was cleared by sacrificial ordeal.' [4] As they used ordeal to judge the doubts about sexual purity, in the case of determination of the orthodoxy of religious belief, ordeal was applied. For example, to decide between Arian and Catholic doctrine, or to clear a cleric who had fallen under suspicion of heresy, the ordeal by fire and water was important. In the twelfth century, the ordeal was a regular way of judgment of heresy. In these days, people thought that the heresy was insidious conspiracy and like a bad decease, so that people might be 'contaminated' by heretical doctrine. People detested heresy, and there was no means to find out heresy, the ordeal was the only mean of reaching judgment. The ordeal by hot iron needed three days to get the result, but crowd who required the ordeal could not wait and usually adopted the ordeal by cold water which showed the result immediately by whether accused person sank in water or not. 'The cold water trial of heretics was thus particularly susceptible to crowd influence and mob justice', like a witch-hunt. [5]

Not with only such dramatic cases but also with ordinary crimes like murder, fire-raising and forgery, the legal records show many references to the ordeal. As a part of regular judicial procedure, ordeal was employed at a certain situation; the ordeal was used only the case there was no other evidence. It was the last resort. As valid evidence, witness, oath, testimony and written agreements were employed. Usually, written evidence was not popular in the middle age except some part of Europe (for example, northern Italy), and there was preference for verbal evidence over written one. If these other kinds of evidence were not available, or accused person's oath were not reliable, he would call on God as his witness which meant use of ordeal.

The term from the ninth to twelfth centuries was the heyday of ordeal and in every part of Christianized European countries, the regular employment of ordeal could be seen. Although its origin may from pagan custom, the ordeal was regulated by the church and was introduced to other area such as Islamic territory through the activity of Christianity, notably the crusades. The procedure of ordeal was normally regulated by religious or royal authorities, and often the right to conduct the ordeal was given to particular places. Through the conduct of the ordeal, the church could take part in not only the spiritual cases (such as heresy) but in the secular justice. In addition, participation in ordeal brought special revenue, 'not only in shape of fines and confiscations, ... but also in the fees paid to priest or the church.' [6] And also there was

another privilege for priests; the exemption from the ordeal. If it was necessary to take ordeal, there was other kinds of ordeal which gave less pain – the eucharistic ordeal; or when priests had to undergo the ordeal by water and fire, they could sent unfree servants in place of themselves. Also the Jews and some townsmen were exempt from the ordeal, however, the reason was different, and in these cases, exemption from the ordeal meant the loss of optional choice.

On the other hand, the sceptical attitude to the legitimacy of ordeal by the church and secular people existed from the early stage. In the ninth century, Agobald, archbishop of Lyons, stated in his work that the ordeal was invention of men, and in view of the inscrutability of God's judgment, the way of ordeal was unreliable.[7] The absence from the bible and Roman law was also reason to attack the ordeal, and the Roman lawyers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did not adopt them as judicial proof. Pope Stephen V condemned the ordeal in his letter on the grounds that the ordeal was a superstitious invention. In the twelfth century, the formation of sacramental theology made the confession to the statutory duty for layman, and the development of this new theology caused the question that what would be happened if the accused person confessed before the ordeal. In 1063, Pope Alexander II banned the use of the ordeal to clear priests accused of murder. In the twelfth century, 'the ordeal became one of the targets in the campaign which high churchmen launched against custom in the name of law.'[8] Pope Alexander III aimed to bring about the withdrawal of clergy from the participation in the ordeal, and the ordeal was not permitted to use in ecclesiastical jurisdiction, however, this did not imply the prohibition of the clergy from the carrying out the ordeal in secular courts. Thus the clergy were involved in secular affairs, which was against the attempt of Pope Gregory VII to make clear the distinction between the clerical and the lay. The condemnation to the ordeal became stronger, because from the theological point, it was wrong to test God and to expect a miracle and by it's nature, it was irrational. Whether people could make the clear distinction between the category of crime, which was belong to secular world, and sin, which was of spiritual matter was another problem. The complicated relation between the spiritual and the secular matter also can be found in the controversy about the ordeal. Finally, in 1215, the trial by ordeal was abandoned by the decision of Lateran IV. At the countries with which there were close relationships with the papal monarchy, the disappearance of ordeal is remarkable. Custom of ordeal was removed by other way, such as witness, oath and confession by torture.

Before tracing the origin of ordeal in Japan, It may be useful to fill in a little of the background. The first resource in which Japan is described is the record of Han

(China) compiled at mid first century. According to this record, in those days, Japan was divided into more than hundred small groups and each groups was ruled by each leader. One of the leaders sent envoys to the court of China, and was given the seal which showed he was a vassal of Chinese emperor. In the third century, also on the Chinese record, the name of Japan appeared again as united kingdom which consisted of 28 tribe groups. This country is ruled by Queen Himiko who was regarded to have magical power and was respected by people as the religious authority. She was supported by her brother, and he may be an administrator and military leader. There is no clear evidence which shows the development of this kingdom after the record, and until the fifth century when new kingdom appeared at Nara is the dark age of Japan. This new kingdom may consist of many small tribes which covered main part of Japan, and king, not queen, ruled people. The king is called '0-kimi' which means king of kings, and later it become to be called 'Tenno' (emperor). 0-kimi have all authority of religion, administration and military. 0-kimi did not rule all the people directly, but ruled through each leader of tribes. Their religion is Shinto (polytheism), but during the sixth century, through the relationship with China, Buddhism was introduced into Japan, and was believed by upper class people of society. In the seventh century, Japan learned Rituryo system (penal and administrative code system) from Chinese court, and established strong authority of emperor. And at the same time, following the model of China, two books of Japanese history, *Kojiki* and *Nihon Shoki,* were compiled by order of emperor. In these books. Japanese history was traced back to the age of gods and goddesses, and the emperor was described as descendant of Goddess of sun, 'Amaterasu'. In those days, many gods and goddess are worshipped, and each tribe has it's own 'Ujigami' (guardian gods of clan). 'Amaterasu' was also one of these guardian goddess, but when *Nihon Shoki* was compiled, the compiler rearranged the mythical local stories and made new family tree of 'Amaterasu as the most respectful and powerful goddes of all other gods. In this way, the religious authority of emperor was established.

Before the seventh century, trial by ordeal may already has become common in Japan. If there is any problem, people report it to leader of clan, and under the authority of 'Ujigami', leader decides the case by 'Kugatachi' (ordeal by boiling water). In those days, there was no distinction between sin and crime, and anything which makes gods or goddess angry was thought as sin. If somebody committed such fault, a Shinto priest had to cleanse ones sin and try to calm gods and goddess. The oldest reference of sin is found in *Kojiki*, and crime against the society (such as destruction of rice field fence), incest, and infectious disease were defined as sin. At the ancient age, disease was also regarded as sin, because these disease was caused by evil spirits and patients were

thought that they were contaminated by something evil. In some case, such as sudden emperor's illness or bad weather, priests took the ordeal against many people to find somebody who committed sin which may have been the reason of these disasters. [9]

In Japan, the ordeal was applied to find the sin and to cleanse it. But through the process of growth of emperor's power, the object of the ordeal began to change slightly. Not only sin against gods, but crime against the emperor was also regarded as felony, and a suspected person has to take the ordeal. During the establishment of emperor s authority, small groups of tribes started to be involved into the one society. The opportunity to have contact with other tribes was increased, and trouble between tribes occurred. Usually, this kind of trouble was used to solve by ordeal of each tribes Ujigami. However, in such cases, under which Ujigami the ordeal should be employed was problem if more than one tribe was involved. In these special cases, the emperor gave judgment and settled the case. If all these trouble between clans should be solved by the emperor, arbitration would become his major occupation. When the Ritsuryo was introduced from China, the Japanese judicial system was also changed. To govern people efficiency, Japanese ruler adopted law code, and custom of judge went by the law code became usual way of solution. However, there was crime which there was no witness, no evidence, and in that case, the trial by ordeal was still remained. [10]

Unfortunately, the part of the emperor in the ordeal is not clear. Usually, the Emperor has the responsibility for his people and country's prosperity, and sometimes it was thought that certain kind of natural disaster was caused by emperor's fault. so he had to abdicate. However, there is no surviving evidence whether in that case, the ordeal was employed or not. Records about the ordeal are quite limited, and it is not clear that emperor or people of upper class of society had any participation with ordeal. When conflict was occurred between royal family and noble people, often the one trapped the other, for example, false accusation by a friend, and expelled the other from the court. It seems that there was no chance to clear one's suspicion by the ordeal or other means. So from the seventh century, the ordeal is declined at least the noble class society in Japan. However, in other class, ordeal was remained as a last resource to solve the judical trouble. By the twelfth century the ordeal by hot water was once disappeared, and instead of ordeal, a special oath in the shrine or temple became to be used to these cases which had no evidence during Kamakura period (1192-1333). A person who made ones oath that he had not committed such a crime should shut himself in the room of shrine or temple during certain days. and after he had come from the room, people and priest checked his health or circumstance (including his family and house). If there was no unusual change (one's illness or sudden death of one's own horse), he might be judged

innocent. In Nuromachi period (1336-1573) the ordeal by hot water appeared again, and this was fused with the oath in shrine or temple: Before the ordeal, an accused wrote down his oath, burnt this and drank ash of this. Then he picked a pebble from cauldron. [11] It may notable that at the Muromachi period, the emperor's religious authority was usurped by Shogun. the head of warriors class. The ordeal was used when the authority of the emperor was lost.

In both cases of Europe and Japan, the ordeal was employed when there was no Other evidence and proceeding of ordeal was supported by strong authority~ in Europe. by the church, and in Japan. by the leaders of local clans. In both cases, the ordeal was used to clear the accusation, even when there was no accuser. Also in both areas, the ordeal was disappeared when the society was changed and the necessity of making distinction between spiritual and material world became consciousness: in Europe. the Gregorian Reform may be one of the reason to prohibit the clergy to be involved the ordeal, and in Japan establishment of the imperial authority required the emperor to become the arbitrator instead of each clans' guardian gods. The difference between the west and Japan can be explained by the difference of monotheism and polytheism, and also by the difference point of view of the sacred and secular. Next, I shall examine the relation between these two in the West and in Japan.

## 2. The popes' relation to secular rulers in Europe

Watt stated that 'Dualism in fact meant different things to different types of ruler. The papacy accepted a principle of dualism but it was so fundamentally conditioned by another axiom, the superiority of the spiritual power, that it was in effect replaced by a unitary view of the two powers. Emperors and kings, in the name of dualism, challenged and rejected this hierocratic logic.' [12]

The relation between the pope and secular rulers is often explained that the church and the emperor (or king) should take care of the spiritual and the secular affairs respectively, but reality is rather complicated. It is said that pope representative of sacred power, takes care of spiritual part, and kings take care of material part. However, it is difficult to find clear line between spiritual and material matters. The pope was not only the spiritual leader, the successor of St. Peter and St. Paul. but the office holder and lawgiver of the papal monarchy. In the same way, medieval kings had a sacral role. Firstly, I shall trace the ideal image of the medieval kings; secondly, the dispute about sacral kingship and royal saintly; finally, I shall deal with inauguration rituals.

The model of ideal king can be found in the bible. Morris stated that 'The king was a hero-figure or a bearer of sanctity. and men looked to him not for a uniform administration but for interventions to promote justice and righteousness'.[13] Alcuin's comparison of Charlemagne to King David may be an good example. The king's main task is to provide justice, to protect the realm and to be the defender of the faith Einhard describes Charlemgne as a great lawgiver and judge for his people'.[14] To be supporter of the faith may be most important factor from the view of the church. Pepin was recognized by Pope Zacharias as a legitimate king of Frankish kingdom, because in these days the papal monarchy was threatened by the Lombards and for pope had no physical means to oppose with his enemy. The pope could regard King Pepin as guardian of faith. Pepin donated land of Ravenna, and donating land or property to the church is also required ideal kings. The ideal image of kings from the point of view of the church is represented by Charlemagne who ruled 'on the concept of peace and concord between secular and religious authority'.[15] There is no emphasis on possession of any mystique or charisma, however it is thought that in the Germanic tribes, kings or leaders had a certain kind of magical power.

Next, I shall trace the 'holy' part of the kingship. In France and England, kings have been thought to have special healing power. And at the same time, there were kings who were canonized. What kind of relation can be found among these Germanic king's charismatic character, the power of healing a certain disease, and royal saint may be considered. First, I shall discuss about the Germanic king's charisma. The ideal image of kings or leaders is similar to the Christian kings' image; to take care of people and protect one's land against the enemy. However, in the Germanic tribe, these elements may have been divided between two leaders, at least at a very early stage; the king who has an ability to derive fortune and luck from gods for people, and the king as a warrior. The former were regarded as holders of magical power. These two elements of Germanic kingship were gradually emerged into one, and as a title, Warrior king is remained. However, Germanic kings may be regarded as a holders of a certain magical power, and later, in the course of medieval period, traces could be observed in kingship. It is important that these Germanic kings were not succeeded by automatically by their Sons, but there was an election and conflict between kin, and though sometimes the throne was occupied by persons who not in the direct line, he still holds this sacral character.[16] Royal touch for disease may be one of them. Next, I shall examine that. The kings of France and England healed by their touch patients who suffered from scrofula.. The definition of this disease was ambiguous and fluid during the medieval age, but it was called 'king's evil', because touch of kings healed the disease. It is kind

of disorders of the neck and face caused by tuberculosis, but in Roman period, the term 'morbus regius' was applied to jaundice. In the source which described the miracle healing by king Edward the confessor, leprosy was confused with scrofula. Bloch examined in his study. The Royal Touch that the origin of the touching can be retroactively to eleventh century. He tried to seek the origin back to the Merovingians or Carolingians, but the clear evidence could not be obtainable from the age. Although written evidence describes the custom of touching scrofula by kings as a regular activity, from king Louis VI and his father Philip I, after them until thirteenth century, there is curious silence about the royal touching. In England, Edward the confessor is reported to have healed the disease. and after the Norman Conquest, Henry I also exercised this custom. Bloch tried to explain the silence of French kings' royal touch from Louis VI to St.Louis by the hypothesis that the Gregorian reform gave influence to clerical writers. He quoted from William of Malmesbury's opinion of people who believed in the sacral nature of kingship. The sacral power of cure of king's evil was thought to be belong to king's blood, royal lineage, not to personal holiness, and this thought offended the church. William added his opinion that this healing power of king was not sacred. Barlow reappraised the study of Bloch, and about the origin, he stated that 'the evidence for the existence of the custom in either kingdom before the end of the thirteenth century is, however, so sparse and Bloch's use of it so bold...'[17] Barlow indicated the origin of English king's touch in the end of the thirteenth century. Because of king's merciful alms which is one of Christian king's duty to poor and sick, these people crowded around king who was thought to have magical power, and from this situation, the idea of the royal touch developed. To care these poor and sick may be easily turned to cure. As Bloch had already mentioned, popes did not much like royal touch. When Pope Gregory VII excommunicated the emperor Henry IV, he 'stripped emperors and kings of any magic'.[18] Pope Gregory VII intended to make distinguish between saint's miracle and king's miracle, and to attribute this power to the church exclusively. It may be suggestive that in France, Father of Louis VI, Phillip I lost his healing power because of his sin. Phillip was excommunicated, and it is natural to think his sin related with this. In twelfth century, Peter of Blois wrote two letters. One showed his opinion that he could not respect king. The other letter written when he was dying show opposite, and he mentioned that 'the sacrament of unction at his coronation was not an empty gift. Its virtue will be most amply proved by the disappearance of disease which attacks the groin and the cure of scrofula'.[19] In France, after the mid thirteenth century, royal touch became regular custom. and through the decline of papal monarchy, the custom of touching became more substantial. Anyway, touching for king's evil has continued until

eighteenth century, and it was thought of a royal prerogative. The reason of existence of royal touch for king's evil only in France and England may be answered simply: it was introduced to England from France. William of Malmesbury wrote about king Edward the Confessor, and he stated that royal touch was a novelty to English. Bloch pointed out that rite of both countries is almost same, and it may first originated in France, and then may have been imitated by the English kings.

Next, I shall turn to the royal saint. This should be distinguished from sacral kingship. 'n brief, sainthood was defined by reference to monastic-ascetic values and it was virtually monopolised by representatives of the monastic and clerical orders of society'.[20] Thus, at an early stage, royal saints are grouped into these two types: kings who abdicated from the rank and became monks, and kings who were martyrs. In early medieval age, kings could not be saint unless he withdrew from the secular order. The word 'royal saint' itself connote contradiction, because of duality popes care to spiritual, sacred matter and kings care to material, secular matter. Even in the eleventh century. the saint king regarded as 'crowned monk'. From the same point, clergy disliked the existence of special power which depended on the royal blood. By ritual, the church gave king a certain spiritual authority; however, it does not mean king was given sacred power nor was consecrated, or that the being became saintly. Nelson stated that 'for what distinguishes a saint from a sacral or holy person is the very obvious, but crucial, fact that a saint is dead'.[21] And the behaviour of saint kings not only follow a good Christian model of king but also take a hand to restrict the kings secular action, for example, taxation on church's property. Kauffmann's study about the image of St. Louis is a good example of a royal saint.[22] Initially, there is a merged similarity between the images of St. Louis in pictorial and written evidence. These images showed the king's activities such as service to poor, sick people, being given punishment by his confessor, collecting the bones of crusaders, and a miracle which returned prayer book to him by angel. These all show St. Louise s pious character.

Next, I shall give a brief description about the relation of these three elements: sacral kingship originating in Germanic custom, royal touch for king's evil, and royal saint. There is an opinion that some part of character of royal saint may be derived from sacral Germanic king, and that under the influence of church, the image of royal saint was formed. Royal touch may be one of trace of sacral kingship. However, according to Klaniczay, there is no direct relation between sacral kingship and royal saint. Before conversion, the character of sacral leader had been absorbed by military leader, so it seems unlikely that there was simple continuity between the sacral character which was contained in military leader and the royal saint whose image was far from military king,

at least at early stage. The character of royal saint may be made by church, because at the first stage of conversion, to give a new cult to christianized kings helped church to convert heathen people. It may be necessary to strengthen king's authority to establish Christian king's rule. There was no saint king in Poland. and this may be attribute to the existence of strong authority of kingship, which did not need any help from church. But, on the other hand, there was conflict between church and secular ruler about the promotion of royal saint. It may be natural that church wished to limit the sacred character of kings, because it should be belong to territory of church. As a result, as I mentioned, royal saint was given an image exclusively of martyr or defender of faith, such as Saint Louis. the Church denied any sacred character which is attribute to lineage of kings. However, the custom of royal touch had been retained, and this was often attacked by the popes. The power of healing a certain disease was attribute to royal blood, and without church's approval, kings exercised this power. Even royal saints, such as St. Louis or Edward the confessor, had been thought to have this magical power. Peter of Blois's letter may have been typical of the attitude of the church to royal touch: first, denial of king's having sacral power, then trying to explain this power as a gift from the god to defender of faith. Anyway, the origin of royal touch may be in Germanic sacral kingship, and not in church activity. On the other hand, the image of royal saint was under church influence. However, even the image of royal saint was changed gradually from spiritual model to real king's model between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries. For example, St. Wenceslaus was firstly appeared as martyr king, but later, he was described as a knight, and at last, it was 'refashioned so that he become the hero of chivalric romances'.[23]. The image of saint king with sword was appeared, and it may mean that the image of secular king was added and emerged into of holy saint. And another character appeared from the thirteenth century in central Europe: saint princesses. As image of saint kings become to wear swords, the image of peaceful princesses saints came out. And though the sacred character had been given by church to individuals, not by lineage, a princess, such as Edith, the first wife of Otto I, could be praised by priest because she was a descendant of martyr king. And at the same time, these princesses canonization to saints would strengthen their lineage, or king's authority. It seems important to have royal blood to these canonizations of saint princesses, and this fact may show the change of balance of power between the popes and kings. The importance of royal blood means establishment of king's strong authority.

Finally, inauguration rituals may give a explanation about how the church took part in making king as secular ruler. Inauguration rituals differ a good deal from country to country. and it seems to be difficult to make any general explanation. However,

according to the dictionary of middle age, it consists of several rituals, such as election, acclamation, anointing and crowning. The former two factors seem to reflect Germanic procedure, and the first of latter may derived from the bible. The last custom may have survived from Roman time. Anyway, anointing and crowning seems to be unified, and even after election, nor just succession of throne by king's son without election, kings needed to be anointed by clergy, because anointing ritual gave kings authority. However, in early middle age, there were kings who were not anointed, especially among Frank's co-king. In fact, kings may hold their own authority independent from the church, but when the rival came out, it helped one to assert one's right. And Nelson stated that 'if relatively many reigning Melovingians and no Carolingians were assassinated, this can hardly be explained simply in terms of the protective effect of anointing.... More relevant here are such factors as the maintenance of s fairly restrictive form of royal succession.' [24] Through the anointing, clergy gave exclusive influence over king-making procedure.

The fact that, on the one hand, kings had sacred powers, while, on the other hand, the church had a certain grip on that sacred power (through the claim to define sanctity, control of inauguration rituals) might itself indicate an important dualism. However, as we have seen, there were tendencies to dualism in Japan too, even if the Buddhism and Shinto tendencies on the whole cancelled each other out. What brought the implicit dualism in the Western system into the open, in a form which can be sharply contrasted with Japan was the Reform movement of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The Reform movement of the church caused the investiture contest between the pope and secular rulers, and the meaning of duality had become hot dispute. To examine dual system in the West, firstly I shall summarize the arguments during the investiture contest, and then examine the meaning of duality.

In the eleventh century, a reform movement was started partly under the influence of Cluny, and the attack on simony, control of clerics and on influence of the lay over the ecclesiastical matters were made to restore the clerical order. The reform was backed by medieval kings at the early stage, because firstly, the object of the reform movement belonged to the spiritual world, and secondly, the movement might give them some political advantages; for example, prohibition of clerical marriage might keep the church property from becoming hereditary and prevent the clerics from exercise of the power like secular local rulers. [25] In 1046, Emperor Henry III deposed three popes because of their disqualification as popes, and appointed Leo IX. The right of appointment of the new pope had been exercised by the emperor as the traditional right from the Roman Empire, for example, from 955 to 1057, there were 25 popes and five

of them were deposed by the emperors, and twelve of them were appointed under influence of the emperors.[26] Even the power to appoint and dismiss was held by the secular ruler, and it seemed quite natural that the emperor or king appointed the bishops by giving a pastoral staff and a ring, the symbols of the clerics. In addition, bishops paid homage to the emperor or king as the holders of feudal estates. Especially in Germany, the relation between these bishops and the emperor became close, because the emperor organized the clerics as his state officers, and held the rulership over the church property in his territory (Reichskirchenpolitik). The bishops became vassals of the emperor, and simultaneously, they were prelates of the Roman church. Then the prelacy was occupied by the member of noble families.[27] The bishopric was regarded as one of the private properties, and the complaint of Berengar, viscount of Narbonne in 1056, shows that buying and selling of bishopric was not rare.[28] A buyer of bishopric could insist by way of excuse that he paid only for royal grant of land and he did not commit simony. According to Arnold, the secular rights to control German churches derived from several sources; 'from imperial protection and patronage of bishoprics… from an ancient conception of churches as items of real property; from juridical immunity for ecclesiastical lands and the consequent need for effective... and aristocratic officers to execute the law...; from the canonical restrictions... upon the exercise of criminal jurisdictions, more especially the infliction of the death penalty, by clerics.'[29] The last one caused controversy relating to the involvement of clerics in the ordeal. The ordeal was usual juridical procedure from the ninth to twelfth centuries as I stated above, and one of the reason to order clerics not to be involved in ordeal was that from canonical tradition, it was taboo for clerics to have relation with the matter which resulting the shedding of blood. There was dilemma that a priest faced on one hand with pressure from his prince, bishop. ... and on the other, with the knowledge of their immoral nature.'[30] In the medieval period, secular rulers and popes depended on each other politically and economically: lacking his own army, the pope had to rely on secular rulers to keep peace, and financial Sources of the Roman church were tithes and donations from secular lords. Under both secular and sacred influence, bishops and clerics were often in dilemma between the pope and the emperor. The strong movement against the intervention of the secular rulers over these bishops and clerics was not explicit until the pontificate of Leo IX.

In 1049, Leo IX held the council at Rheims. The French king Henry I refused to attend the council, and consequently, the number of prelate who attended was small. At the beginning of the council, Leo IX ordered the attendance to declare whether one had paid money for one's post or not and to swear his words by the relic of the Saint. Only a

few of them could swear their words, and some of them were excommunicated, and some of them were reappointed after the penance. Leo IX declared that without election by cannons and people, no one could get one's post in the church, and prohibited the simony. The pope did not come into conflict with the emperor, Henry Ill in his reign, but after his death, next pope. Nicholas II was elected without consulting Henry IV, boy king. In 1059, Nicholas II introduced a new system for election of the pope doctor me that the pope should be elected by the cardinal bishops, and the first prohibition of lay appointment of bishops was also made; 'That no cleric or priest shall receive a church from laymen in any fashion, whether freely or at a price.'[31] The church started to challenge the authority of the emperor, and tried to be free from royal control. A cardinal of Leo IX, Peter Damian accepted the authority of kings, but he also insisted that if king opposed to the divine commands, he would lose his dignity.[32] Another cardinal Humbert had more radical opinions; he denied the emperor's right of appointment of bishops, and argued that anyone who committed the simony could not become a true bishop and that any priests who were appointed by that invalid' bishop were also not true priests. He compared the priesthood to soul and the kingship to the body. Following through his logic, he concluded that the soul excelled the body, therefore, the priests dignity excelled the royal dignity. This analogy was quoted by other theologians again and again later, and this became a strong theoretical base.[33] In addition, the political background in Germany was changing. In the eleventh century, the development of frontier was made in rapid progress, and huge amount of land were newly cultivated. This development was mainly carried by monasteries. At the end of the reign of Otto I. the number of monasteries in German was around one hundred, and at the reign of Henry IV, around 700 monasteries existed in German. The noble people obtained the rulership over the newly developed lands, because through donation of their lands, they became the patrons of these monasteries. The emperor tried to control these monasteries and gave protection for them. The noble people coped with the emperor, and sought relation with the pope, and the pope made contact with these princes. Consequently, this caused the conflict between the emperor and the nobility, and similar situation was also seen in Japan. The prerequisite for severe conflict between the emperor and the pope had been already filled.[34]

In 1073, Gregory VII became the pope, and drove forward the Reform. In 1075, in his 'Dictatus Papae', Gregory VII declared that the pope alone could depose bishops, and the pope could depose the emperor. He insisted on the absoluteness of papal dignity and no one could judge the pope. At the same year, he also decreed that any lay person who appointed the clerics should be excommunicated. The next year in the letter to the

pope, Henry IV attacked Gregory as an usurper, and responded that he was anointed to kingship and except on the case of deviation from the Christianity, no one could judge him. Gregory excommunicated Henry IV, and deprived of his authority, and prohibited that anyone to serve him as king.[35] The conflict between the pope and the emperor involved the noble people in Germany, and the rebellion at the Saxony weakened the power of the emperor. He sought the pope's pardon, and in 1077 at Canossa, Gregory gave him absolution and released him from excommunication. Gregory could not deny his desire of reconciliation because it was duty of spiritual pastor. The princes of Germany elected Rudolf as a new king, and Germany was fought over between two emperors. Henry defeated Rudolf in 1080, while Gregory deposed the former again at the same year, and banned the lay investiture not only of bishops but lower clerics. Henry did not seek reconciliation with Gregory again, but he elected antipope Clement III at the diet, and attacked Rome with his army. Pope Gregory VII rescued by the Normans of south Italy. and died at Salerno in 1185. However, the pope did not lose. On the contrary, the emperor, Henry IV lost his ground to insist that the king was a head of church and could fully control the appointment of clergy, because he had to insist that the priesthood and the kingship were separate matters; he quoted the story of two swords from the bible, as a proof of significance of duality.[36] The conflict between the pope and the emperor caused 'the war of polemical pamphlets'. Many clerics were involved this war to discuss the theological issue. The Anonymous of York held a theory of sacral kingship, and supported the king's supremacy over the pope that 'No one should take precedence by right over [the king]... who is consecrated and made like unto God with so many and such great sacraments... Therefore he is not called layman, for he is anointed of the Lord,...chief and highest prelate'.[37] The authority of sacral kingship had remained for centuries after 1100, and was still supported by people as the ground for supremacy of kings and the emperor over the church. On the other hand, there was an effort to deal the sacred and secular matter as two different parts, The opinion of Hugh of Fleury was that the king could be involved investiture of the new bishop with giving temporal lands, and king's recognition became one of the procedure of canonical election. Giving the staff and ring should be done by the archbishop because these things were symbols of pastor of soul.[38] This opinion had been gradually accepted as the goal of contest; the concordat of Worms, in which finally both sides recognized the existence of duality.

Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's (Luke 20:25). In 1122, at the synod of Worms, the dispute was finally settled. Both the pope and the emperor came to realize that there were two separate orders, and

there was although some overlap, each power should recognize the right of the other. And both of them also recognized that matter could not always clearly divide into secular and sacred. Pope Paschal II had tried to settle the contest by renouncing of the regalia of the church, because he realized that 'the management of material estates does not become a spiritual activity simply because bishops are set in charge of them'.[39] His proposal was accepted by emperor Henry V. but, bishops repudiated this agreement. At last, pope Paschal II had to give up his idea. Without their rights as secular landholder, bishops could not maintain their activities, and as long as bishops enjoyed secular privilege, the emperor s right of investiture remained. The concordat of Worms is a compromise with which both sides could. by and large, be satisfied.

The investiture conflict was settled, but once the dualism had been made explicit, new controversies arose. Between the pope Innocent III and the French king Philip II, or between the pope innocent IV and the emperor Frederick, or the pope Boniface VIII and the French king Philip IV, there were conflict over the supremacy. In each case, the pope insisted on the supremacy of church, however, even Innocent III, who titled himself 'the vicar of Christ', did not deny the authority of secular ruler. It can be argued that he did not intervene in the secular affairs because of his supreme temporal authority, but always justified his activity by other reason. In the decretal *Novit* in 1204, he wrote that.... Let no one suppose that we wish to diminish or disturb the jurisdiction and power of the king when he ought not to impede or restrict our jurisdiction and power.'[40]  The pope Innocent IV deposed the emperor Frederick II, but the former limited the cases in which spiritual authority could intervene in the secular affairs. For example, a case of legitimating, Innocent IV interpreted that the church could only give a legitimate child the right of joining the clerics, and the right of inheritance of secular property should be given at the secular court. In principle, he denied the intervention of the church court to the secular court.[41]  The dispute between Boniface VIII and Philip IV was initially caused by taxation on the church lands. In *Unam Sanctam*, Boniface VIII confirmed the supremacy of the spiritual authority; however, in his letter in 1302, he stated that he did not wish to usurp the jurisdiction of the king.[42]  Thus, through the medieval period, the idea of a dualism of secular and sacred remained a powerful force.


## 3. The Japanese emperors relation to the Shogun Bakufu

To consider the relation between sacred and secular authorities in Japan, it is

indispensable to examine the intricate connection of the emperor, Shintoism and Buddhism. Firstly, I shall try to summarize the change of religious authority of the emperor at the Heian period (790-1192). Then I shall consider the influence of Religious authority on secular rulers, i.e. Shogun, from the Kamakura period (1192-1333) to the mid Muromachi period (1336-1573).

As I mentioned above, at the beginning of 1-Ieian period, the emperor had already established his religious authority as the direct descendant of Amaterasu, the goddess of sun. The idea that the emperor is the member of sacred goddess's family gave him the religious supremacy and the respect of his blood was so strong that it seemed impossible for another noble family to usurp the throne. The title of the emperor was taken from China, but there was difference between Chinese emperor s and Japanese one s authority over the secular world; in China, the emperor was considered as the 'vicarius dei' and he held the both seats of sacred and secular power. On the contrary, in Japan, people regarded the emperor himself as the family of sacred goddess, and ironically, this idea kept him away from the direct government of the secular world, because there were many taboos and regulations which had to be kept and these required him to shut out himself in the palace for long period to pray for gods and goddesses. Naturally, the secular affairs came to be left for other high clans to settle. Though still the emperor held the legislative power (in fact, often his words was regarded as the law), gradually the frequency of his participation in the secular affairs was reduced. [43] Rituryo(the penal and administrative code system) prescribed the council of state and the department of religious as the supreme organs of government, and the head officer of both departments managed secular and sacred affairs.

The emperor held the authority over the sacred affairs, and his control over the Shinto and the Buddhism was exercised through the officer of the religious department. In the ninth century. the 'classification' of the Shinto shrines was enforced. At the court of the emperor, noble people were usually given the court rank (perhaps comparable to the status of count or baron in the Western world), and without this rank people could not join the organization of government nor could attend any political meetings. The classification means that each Shinto shrines as well as the individual nobles were given the court rank as well as the human beings, and the group of the high ranked shrine was regarded as the specially designated by the emperor. At special ceremonies, such as the coronation of the emperor, the state officers were sent to these designated shrines and dedicated the letters from the emperor. These authorized shrines were given financial support from the government. The purpose of the classification of shrines was the same as the compilation of *Nihon-shoki* (the history of Japan). There were many shrines over

the country and each shrine enshrined the guardian gods of local clans. To give the court rank for these gods meant the establishment of the hierarchy and on the top of this, the Ise. shrine of Amaterasu was placed. The Ise shrine was not given any rank, because in Japan, the court rank was only for the subject: the emperor did not need the rank. This classification of the shrines (or. de facto, the classification of the gods themselves) showed the religious authority of the emperor as 'the living god' who ruled even the gods. [44] At the beginning of the ninth century, the emperor Kanmu regulated the rule about the Shinto ritual and priests, and in this rule, he prohibited unauthorized ritual. such as an oracle, and banned the priest's marriage. The Shinto priests had to manage the ritual properly, and the post of he priest should not be held concurrently by the officer of the secular affairs. However the system of designated shrine gradually decayed in the tenth century. A decline the Shinto had already become evident in the eighth century. At a certain shrine, there was an oracle and in this oracle the god confessed is sin as the Shinto god and wished to be Buddhist for salvation f his soul. [45] To understand this curious oracle, it is necessary to examine the movement of the Buddhism at the same period.

At the sixth century, the Buddhism was introduced into Japan from China, and was spread in the noble families. At the first stage, there was a controversy over whether the Buddhism was a heretical religion, but at last people accepted Buddhism as well as Shinto. The main reason of this acceptance may be due to the immaturity of doctrine of the Shinto. because the origin of the Shinto gods are natural spirits (such as sun, moon, wind, sea, and Eire), and even the emperor could not control the weather and prevent natural disaster. The only thing he could was to pray for the prosperity of his country, but the salvation was not always guaranteed. On the contrary, the Buddhism was a new idea which could give consolation about individual souls salvation. In the eighth century, the Buddhism was mainly for the emperor and noble families. When famous Buddhism priest. Gyoki started a religious movement for the common people and preached the salvation of their soul on the roads of villages and towns, his reputation gathered many people around him and this was seen as the challenge to the authority of the emperor. The emperor Gensho banned Gyoki's local activity and abused him as a law-breaker in his declaration in 717. [46] The Rituryo had the task of regulation of the Buddhism activities, and through this law code the emperor tried to control the Buddhist priests as well as Shinto priests. However, this new religious activity often threatened the status of the sacred emperor, because the noble families involved the famous Buddhism priests and temples into their political conflict to strengthen their opinion. When the emperor Kanmu decided to move the capital city to Heian-kyo in 794, he banned to build temples

in the capital except two state temples.

The Buddhist priests were also classified by the rank, and the emperor appointed the highest ranked priest. When people wished to become the Buddhist priest or priestess, they had to get permission from the department of the religion. Many Buddhism priests studied at China, and when they came back to Japan, they were treated as highly ranked priests by the emperor and noble people. These famous priests founded the temple at the outskirt of the capital city, and many priests joined these temples to study doctrine and were organized under each temple's rule. The noble family also founded the temples, and they financially supported these temples. If the Rituryo fulfilled its function properly, the emperor could control these Buddhist Temples as well as the Shinto shrines. However, the decline of the Rituryo began from the eighth century and the collapse of the Rituryo became obviously in the tenth century. Under the Rituryo, all land was held by the emperor, and common people were obliged to cultivate land and pay tax to the officers appointed by the state council. There were still many lands which were not cultivated. so the government regulated that anybody who cultivated the land could held the land as his private property. From this rule, many private manors were appeared and usually these manors were possessed by the noble families. Even the state officers who were appointed by the government to manage the state lands tried to become landowners and employed local clan's people to cultivate the new land. The problem is the manor had gradually eroded the state land, and to keep the right as a landowner and to exempt from the state tax, these landowners donated their lands to the noble families and got the protection in return. [47] This movement caused the collapse of taxation. Consequently, Buddhism temples and Shinto shrines lost their financial support from the state government, and the necessity of new patron caused the new relation between these temples/shrines and the noble families. Simultaneously, common people were involved these religious activities. For example, the Kofukuji temple, one of the most authoritative temples, was given the state land as temple's private manor by the government, and at the same time, the right of fiscal immunity was also given. In addition, local clans people donated their own manor to the temple to keep their rulership over the land. Thus, the Kofukuli temple established their religious authority supported by this land ownership. The other example is the Ise shrine. Even Ise shrine needed new financial support, and the local powerful families donated their land in return of being appointed themselves as the lower priest officer of Ise. [48] These two examples were the successive ones of finding new financial support. But not all of shrines and temples could easily found such patrons. The movement of the Shinto gods who wished to be the Buddhist was caused by these social background. From the tenth

century. the syncretism of the Shinto and the Buddhism became conspicuous, and the Shinto gods and the Buddha were worshiped in the same buildings which called Jinguji(shrine-temple). Shrines and temples supported each other to maintain their activities, and only the most successful shrines and/or temples could keep the name of designated shrines/temples. They can be divided into several groups; for example, traditional shrines which enshrined the guardian gods and goddess of the emperor's and the noble families, and the newly raised shrines/temples which could show obvious miracles and strongly appealed their religious power to the common people. The organization of the religious world was almost completely changed, and naturally, the relation between these shrines/temples and the emperor had been changed. Under Ritsuryo system, shrines were managed by the emperor through the local state officers, but the collapse of Rituryo also destroyed a kinship of local village system, and sometimes whole village was vanished because people moved under the private manorial system from the Rituryo system. Under such condition, the local shrines lost people who worshipped them, and instead of these shrines, other shrines/temples were founded by local people. The court tried to control these newly founded shrines/temples, and chose twenty-two shrines/temples to give special worship at ceremonies. [49]

To manage the secular affairs, the member of council of state was appointed from noble clans, who had got their high status by assistance for the establishment of the emperor's supremacy during the ancient age. However, just being born in the noble family did not automatically give them the right to rule over the secular affairs. The most powerful noble family, the Fujiwara won their high status as the regency of the emperor by the blood relationship with the emperor. They arranged the marriage between their daughters and the emperor (in these days, noble men had many concubines), and if their daughter had the prince, they had tried to make her the empress and the prince crown prince. Whether the noble family, such as the Fujiwara. could keep their post of the regency depended on the birth of prince, so there was no stability of their supremacy and frequent conflict between noble families and their princes sometimes brought the opportunity for the emperor to recover their authority over the secular world. In the eleventh century, the emperor Shirakawa re-established his supremacy over both religious and secular world. He adopted new form of administration; the direct control by himself as the retired emperor, called 'In-sei', and the retired emperor was called 'Joko'(upper ranked emperor). The merit of this system is that the retired emperor was not under the taboos and complicated regulation of Shinto rituals, so he could continue to administer state effectively without losing his status as the emperor. Jo-ko held both roles of the emperor and the regency, and held his own

government for ruling the secular world. Thus the monopoly of the state council by the Fujiwara family came to an end and they lost their political power. To control the religious world, a new system was also appeared in the eleventh century; the Monzeki system. Princes and princesses, sons and daughters of the noble family occupied the head post of designated Buddhism temples. Through the appointment of head priests, Jo-ko tried to control the religious world.[50] It worked, but at the same time, this appointment caused secularization of the temples. The Buddhist priests from the nobility maintained their private properties and moral shortcomings of the priest became clear. The head post of the designated temple became to be regard as the one of political status at the secular world. Each temples had their own doctrine and there were frequent conflict between the temples, and even within one temple, priests might be divided into several sects and fought against each other. The land donation from the local people brought common people into the organization of the temple, and some of them were appointed as the guard of the temple; the priest soldiers. Sometimes priests denied the inauguration of the prince as the head priest, and to demand additional financial privilege, often these priest soldiers rose against Jo-ko. Also from the Shinto shrine, the lower officers of shrines sometimes rose against the government and with the authority of their gods, they demanded dismissal of the local state officers who often arose trouble between them from the tax collection.[51] The hierarchy of the religious world had collapsed, and this made difficult for the emperor or Jo-ko to control them effectively. To re-establish the emperor's authority over the religious and secular world, the rise of Samurai (warriors) class was indispensable.

From the eleventh to twelfth centuries, new power of Samurai class arose and finally held the rulership over the half of the Japanese territory. This power had military backing, and was completely extraneous to the authority of the emperor. If we could say that the authority of the emperor was derived from his sacred image, we could call the Shogun as the secular ruler. In fact, almost all the power to rule Japan was held by Shogun, however, the authority of the emperor was still strong. In Kamakura period, relation between the emperor and temples/shrines and Shogun was quite complicated. In eleventh century there was an idea that called 'Buppo-Ouho Soui-ron which means that both Buddhism and the emperor was essential to keep the world peace, and both of them depended on each other. In 1053 from the manor of Todaiji temple, a written petition was submitted to the emperor. People of the manor asked the emperor fiscal immunity from the state tax, and as a reason, they used this idea for; if a state officer could impose heavy tax on the manor, the temple might lose it's financial income and would be decayed. The Buddhism and the emperor had close relation, comparable to two wheels

of a cart (the state), and if one of the wheel came out, the cart could not move. Also if the temple decays, it might cause the decline of the state, so they thought that the emperor had enough reason to save them from the heavy taxation.[52] This idea showed a certain kind of dualism. In 1007, from the Shitennoji temple, a document which justified the rule of the manor by the temple was found. This is forgery document like the Pseudo-Isidorus in the western world. With the collapse of Ritsuryo system. Buddhist temples developed uncultivated lands and became land owners, but still the local state officers' pressure for taxation was strong, and to protect temple's properties, they had to make new doctrine which gave them sacred authority. Different from the relation between the Shinto shrine and the emperor, the Buddhist temples had no direct connection with the emperor, so they had to create new religious authority. By the end of Heian period, six sects of Buddhist temples established their authorities. In Kamakura period, new sects of Buddhism rose and were opposed with old traditional six sects. In the letter from the Kofukuji temple, one of the most influential temples, they asked the emperor to prohibit the religious activity of Honen. a famous priest of new Buddhism, and as a reason, they insisted that the Buddhism which supported the state with the emperor was limited in the six sects, and if Honen wished to found a new temple, he had to ask the permission for the emperor first. These traditional temples tried to protest against the rise of new sects which were supported by common people, by involving the authority of the emperor.[53] However, still these traditional Buddhist temples were frightened to lose their private manors, especially after the foundation of Kamakura Bakufu. To protect their manor, a custom with legal force that land which once was donated to the temple should not be taken back by the donor or his family was made. This 'law' was only customary, and was not authorized either by the imperial court or Bakufu, however, this custom was employed when the conflict occurred between the temple and lay people. There was general rule that the property which was given to the other people should not be asked to give it back. In some case, there was an exemption, but if the person who was given the property was Buddha (=temples), there was no exemption. An ground of this rule was that the landowner of the temple's manor was not priests but Buddha. so the land belonged to Buddha (in case of shrines, the lands belonged to gods), and common people who lived in these lands also belonged to Buddha. so the local state officers or officers of Bakufu could not touch them. Usually the donation of lands to temples was made to keep the landowner's right from the state officers, so often the right of ownership became the subject of controversy.[54] In 1337, there was an record of trial which involved legal office of Bakufu. Bakufu gave the land for one of Shogun's vassal, but that land had been donated to the temple. Under

feudalism, to assure the landholding for vassal is essential factor, however, in this trial, legal officer of Bakufu judged that the right of the temple had the priority, and Bakufu gave up that land.[55] From the landowner system, the Buddhist temples established the status as third power against the emperor and Bakufu. Shinto also worshipped by both the noble people and Samurai. but there were difference between these two groups: the former regarded the emperor as the member of gods and with him they should rule the state. But though the latter worshipped the Ise shrine, and asked the emperor to permission to found the shrines at their lands, they did not think the emperor had the authority over the secular affairs.[56]

During the Kamakura period, Bakufu paid minimum respect for the emperor, and after the break of Minamoto's lineage. Bakufu (Hojoshi family) asked the emperor to send his prince as the Shogun. In the Muromachi period, the situation for the emperor became worse. The third Shogun Ashikaga Yoshimitu tried to usurp the throne of the emperor. At the beginning of the Muromachi period, the emperor still held the right to regulate the religious ceremony. To give the purple cloth for Buddhist priests was one of the important right of the emperor, and the emperor used to receive money in return. The purple cloth can be compared with the pallium for archbishop in the western part: the pope ordered to archbishops to come to Rome to receive Pallium. and in return of this ceremony, the pope imposed charges to archbishops.[57] Ashikaga Yoshimitu even deprived of this right from the emperor, and tried to make his child next emperor. The sudden death of Ashikaga Yoshimitu in 1408 prevented him from usurp of the emperors throne. Yoshimitu used the title of 'king' for the letter to the Chinese emperor, and ruled Japan as de facto king who had both secular and sacred authorities.[58]

During the middle age, the authority of the emperor had been threatened by Shogun, however, once the turbulence occurred. the religious authority of the emperor was restored. At the end of the Kamakura period, when Mongolian invaded into Japan, the idea that Japan was under the sacred gods was appeared and Shinto gods restored their dignity over the Buddha. As the emperor was thought as the member of Gods, this idea helped the emperor to restore the authority. In 1438, there was coup d'etat against Shogun, and Shogun had to ask the emperor to to give him the document which legitimate his attack against the enemy. Also the temples approached the emperor to get the purple cloth. At the Kamakura period, new sects of Buddhism called 'Zen-shuu' was introduced into Japan from China, and Bakufu gave protection for them, because many Zen-shuu priests made local activities for common people, and through the control of Zen-shuu temple. Bakufu tried to rule the common people. The traditional sects sought the support from the emperor, as I mentioned above. Even in the Zenshuu sect, the

hierarchy was organized, and top of them called 'Gozan'(Five mountains). Through the Kamakura period to Muromachi period, Bakufu supported Gozan priests, and other influential Zen-shuu temples tried to get the support from the emperor. In 1491, Shogun. Ashikaga Yosimasa got angry because the emperor gave the purple cloth without Shogun's permission. But at the same time, there was coup d'etat, and Shogun needed the help of the emperor, so it was perhaps natural for the emperor to get back his own religious authority from Shogun. [59]

In Japan even there was difference between religious and secular world, duality between the sacred and secular could not be recognized clearly like in the West. The reason may attribute to the difference between a society with more than one state religion, and a society with only one religion recognized by rulers. In Japan, from the point of view of Shinto, the emperor belonged to the sacred because he was a member of gods. However, from the point of view of Buddhism the emperor was recognized as rather secular authority as well as Shogun was. Thus, the relation between sacred and secular world was complicated, and instead of dualist, there were three different factors which was linked each other like three rings of Borromeo.

## Conclusion

Since both societies had the conception of sacred and secular, it may be understandable that there are many similar points; for example, in both societies, there was the ordeal, and the process of landhold of the monastery (temple/shrine) and struggle over the control of the landholding system between the monastery (temple/shrine) and kings (Shogun) was similar to each other. Also giving pallium(purple cloth) to authorize the religious order can be seen in both societies.

It may be rather surprising thing that although in both societies had many similar points, the relation between sacred and secular authorities is quite different. In West, dualist could be seen clearly. There were two factors, sacred and secular, and they fought against each other to decide the border between these two world. Western society could be indicated as two pyramids which overlapped each other.

On the other hand, in Japan the relation between sacred and secular was not so simple. If the Japanese emperor had had to deal with Shinto alone, he might had been 'the pope in Japan: If there had been only Buddhism alone, the emperor might had been 'the king'. But since there were both, each religious authorities neutralized each other, and it became impossible to make clear definition of 'sacred and 'secular' world.

Naturally, the struggle between the secular and sacred powers had formed many cross-cutting lines, not only one border line as in West. Japanese society could be described as three circles, and they formed one pyramid. On each corner, there were the emperor, Shogun and the head of influential Buddhist temples. The difference of the relation between West and Japan attributed to the difference of religious situation. Western Medievalists have occasionally looked to Japanese history for illumination of 'feudalism'. They have not realised how much light a comparison with Western medieval history can cast on Japanese medieval history.

---

[1] 本論文は 1994 年ロンドン大学留学時に作成したレポートをサバティカル中に修正したものである。日本との比較の視座をひらいて下さり、ご指導くださった当時の指導教官、ロンドン大学 University College London, History Department の David D'avray 先生に心より感謝申し上げる。

[2] 東京史料編纂所編『日本関係海外史料、イエズス会日本書翰集訳文編Ⅰ―上』東京大学出版会、1991 年、36-37 頁。

[3] Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water*, Oxford, 1986.

[4] Brian Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300* (London. 1988) p.32.

[5] Bartlett, op.cit., p.23.

[6] Ibid., p93.

[7] Ibid., pp.72-73.

[8] Ibid., p.86.

[9] 利光三津夫『日本古代法制史』1986 年、慶應義塾大学出版会、17-21 頁。

[10] 利光三津夫『裁判の歴史―律令裁判を中心に―』1964 年、至文堂、1-22 頁。

[11] 杉山晴康『日本法制史概論』1980 年、成文堂、200-201 頁。

[12] J.A.Watt. 'Spiritual and Temporal Powers' in: *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c350-c.1450*, ed. J. H. Burns, Cambridge, 1988, pp.367-368.

[13] Colin Morris, *The Papal Monarchy*, Oxford, 1989, p.15.

[14] Henry A. Myers and Herwig Wolfram, *Medieval Kingship*, Chicago, 1982, p.131.

[15] Ibid., p.l34.

[16] Ibid., pp.2-6.

[17] Frank Barlow, 'The Kings Evil', *English Historical Review* 95 ,London, 1980, p.3.

[18] Ibid., p.15.

[19] Ibid.. p.19.

[20] Janet L. Nelson, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, Hambledon Press, 1986, p.70.

[21] Nelson, op. cit., p.73.

[22] Martin Kauffmann. 'The Image of St Louis' in :*Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne J. Duggan, London, 1993, pp.265-286.

[23] Gabor Klaniczay. 'The Paradoxes of Royal Sainthood as Illustrated by Central European Examples' in: *Medieval Europe,* p.367.

[24] Janet L. Nelson. 'Inauguration Rituals' in: *Early Medieval Kingship*, eds. P. Sawyer and I. N. Wood, University of Leeds, 1977, p.59.

[25] Myers and Wolfram, op. cit., pp.l72-l73.

[26] 梅津尚志「グレゴリウス理念とドイツにおける叙任権闘争」出崎澄男、梅津尚志編、『ヨーロッパ・キリスト教史 2』、中央出版、1971 年、42-43 頁。

²⁷ 同上、423 頁。

²⁸ Tierney, op. cit., p.29.

²⁹ Benjamin Arnold, *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany* , Cambridge, 1991, p.83.

³⁰ John W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes and Merchants vol.1* , Princeton, 1970, p.330.

³¹ Tierney, op. cit, pp.43-44.

³² Ibid., p.39.

³³ Ibid., p.40.

³⁴ Ibid., pp.49-50.

³⁵ Ibid., p.61

³⁶ Ibid., pp.53-57

³⁷ Ibid., pp.76-78.

³⁸ Ibid.. pp.83-84.

³⁹ Ibid., pp.85-88.

⁴⁰ Ibid. , p34.

⁴¹ 尾崎秀夫「教皇インノケンティウス４世の政治理論における教皇権と世俗権」『史林』77、1994 年、32-63 頁。

⁴² Tierney, op. cit., p.187.

⁴³ 沈才彬『東アジアのなかの日本史 13 巻　天皇と中国皇帝』1990 年、六興出版、108-111 頁。

⁴⁴ 森田悌「平安時代の神社」山中裕、鈴木一雄編『平安時代の信仰と生活』至文堂、1992 年、35-39 頁。

⁴⁵ 同上、41 頁。

⁴⁶ 兵藤裕巳「信仰における寺社」桜井好朗編『大系　仏教と日本人１　神と仏─仏教受容と神仏習合の世界』1985 年、春秋社、105-106 頁。

⁴⁷ 井上清『日本の歴史　上』岩波書店、1963 年、89-91 頁。

⁴⁸ 村井康彦『教養人の日本史２』社会思想社、1966 年、78-79 頁。

⁴⁹ 森田悌「公家と神道」下出積與、圭室文雄編『講座神道２　神道の展開』桜楓社、1991 年、23-30 頁。

⁵⁰ 黒田俊雄「中世寺社勢力論」朝尾直弘他編『講座日本史６』岩波書店、1975 年、263-267 頁。

⁵¹ 村井、上掲書、98-99 頁。

⁵² 佐藤弘夫『日本中世の国家と仏教』吉川弘文館、1987 年、7-18 頁。

⁵³ 佐藤弘夫「旧仏教と鎌倉新仏教の関係をどうみるか」峰岸純夫編『争点日本の歴史４　中世編』新人物往来社、1991 年、91-102 頁。

⁵⁴ 平雅行『日本中世の社会と仏教』塙書房、1992 年、459-462 頁。

⁵⁵ 笠松宏『日本中世法史論』東京大学出版会、1979 年、252 頁。

⁵⁶ 森田、上掲書、37-42 頁。

⁵⁷ I.S.Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198*, Cambridge, 1990, pp.262-263.

⁵⁸ 今谷明『武家と天皇』岩波書店、1993 年、14-20 頁。

⁵⁹ 同上、168-171 頁。