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Abstract

THE ROKUSHŌ-JI: THE SIX "SUPERIORITY" TEMPLES OF HEIAN JAPAN
Doctor of Philosophy, 1999
Cary Shinji Takagaki
Department of East Asian Studies
University of Toronto

The Rokushō-ji were six temples constructed in the eastern part of the ancient capital of Kyoto from the 11th to the 12th centuries by emperors and ex-emperors during what is commonly referred to as the insei (i.e., "cloister government") period. It is accepted wisdom that these temples were not solely built because of the pious devotion of these members of the imperial family. That is, scholars have long acknowledged that they served as the ostensible proprietors of large tracts of land for the Imperial House.

With the breakdown of the ritsuryō system of government, taxable land had been reduced and, as a result, government stipends for those serving in the state bureaucracy became increasingly unstable. Consequently, those in the position to do so sought alternate forms of income and, by and large, this took the form of acquiring private landholdings. The imperial house, which under the ritsuryō system had been heavily subsidized by the state, was also left with limited resources and, perhaps more importantly, saw itself as being left out in the scramble for land (and, as a result, income) by the nobility. Since prevailing views held that it was unseemly for the emperor, as head of state, to partake directly in the amassing of land for
personal use, retired emperors would entrust their estates to religious institutions or to other members of the imperial family (e.g., imperial ladies).

However, the ability to "own" land was a concept that had developed only in the late 8th century, and it gradually led to a decentralizing of authority since, up to that time, prestige and power could be accessed only through the imperial court. Thus the phenomenon of "private" landholdings led to a shift in the balance of power from those holding positions in the state bureaucracy to autonomous household groups, or what are referred to as kenmon, who had private financial resources from their estates. The accumulation of landholdings, then, had more than economic implications: it also represented a rearticulation of land, and, accordingly, of authority and power. Therefore, although the Rokushō-ji are conspicuous examples of how the imperial house utilized temples to deal with a changing economic environment, at the same time they represent what could be said, or thought, about land and what was to be done with it.
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Introduction

East of the Kamo river in the suburbs of the ancient capital of Heian-kyō was an area known as Shirakawa, where Fujiwara Yoshifusa 藤原良房 (804-72) built a villa or detached residence (bettei). The Fujiwara sekkane, the line of the Fujiwara clan from which the regents were chosen, continued to maintain a residence there until Fujiwara Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101) presented the land this bettei (by then)

Shirakawa was actually the northern part (and Higashi-yama the southern part) of an area known as Rakutō 洛東. Shirakawa was situated in present day Kyoto's Sakyō-ku, roughly bordered by what is now Kita Shirakawa in the north, Awataguchi in the south, Higashi-yama in the east, and the Kamo river in the west. Okazaki Park 岡崎公園 is now located in what would have been central Shirakawa.

This area, which was a river basin, took its name from the fact that it was where the Shirakawa river joined the Kamo river at the end of Sanjō-dōri. The river itself took its name from the white colour of the river bed, the result of granite deposits from its source on Mount Hiei. Although sparsely populated in the eleventh century, remains from every era since the Jōmon period have been found in this district.

Yoshifusa established himself as the first regent (sesshō 摂政) who was not of royal blood when his grandson ascended the throne at the age of nine as Emperor Seiwa, thus starting the regency government (sekkkan seijō 摂関政治) which was dominated by the Fujiwara for some two hundred years.

Morozane, also known as Go-Uji Dono 後宇治殿, as well as Kyōgoku-kampaku 京極関白, was the son of Fujiwara Yorimichi 藤原頼通. He was appointed sadaijin 左大臣 (Minister of the Left) in 1069, but was excluded from public affairs by Go-Sanjō. In 1075 he was made kampaku 関白 by Shirakawa, became sesshō in 1087 to Emperor Horikawa, dajō-daijin in 1088, and kampaku again
known as the Shirakawa-dono (白河殿) was situated on to Emperor Shirakawa (1053-1129, r. 1072-86). The emperor had the temple Hosshōji (法勝寺) built on the site in 1077, and subsequently five other temples that included the character shō (勝) in their names were erected in the same area by other members of the imperial family: Sonshōji (尊勝寺) by Emperor Horikawa (Shirakawa's son) in 1102, Saishōji (最勝寺) by Emperor Toba (Shirakawa's grandson) in 1118, Enshōji (円勝寺) by Taikenmon'in Shōshi (Shirakawa's adopted daughter) in 1128, Seishōji (alternate reading Jōshō-ji) (成勝寺) by Emperor Sutoku (Shirakawa's great grandson) in 1139, and Enshōji (延勝寺) by Emperor Konoe (also a great-grandson of Shirakawa) in 1149.

Jien (慈円 1155-1225) states that these six temples, commonly known as the Rokushō-ji (六勝寺) (alternate reading, Risshō-ji or Rikushō-ji), were uji-dera (氏寺) (i.e., "clan-temples") of the Imperial House, and this view was taken by Murai Yasuhiko 村井康彦 and other scholars who saw in the Rokushō-ji the beginnings of a change in the focus of goganji 御三宮 in 1091. He left behind memoirs entitled Kyōgoku-kampakuki 京極関白記.

'See Namikai Takeshi (浪井毅), "Rokushō-ji seki no hakkutsu" 六勝寺跡の発掘, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 377 (October 1979): 93.

'Gukanshō (愚管抄), NKBT, 86:206.
or "imperial prayer-offering temples," from the state to personal concerns.  

Although this characterization of uji-dera is problematic, there is a consensus that the Rokushō-ji had a particular function within the newly established insei 院政, or what is commonly referred to as "cloister government" system. As John Whitney Hall has observed, 

The relationship of Emperors Shirakawa, Toba, Sutoku, and Konoe with Hosshōji and the other "imperial vow" temples and with the imperial residences that adjoined the temple complexes is quite revealing. Clearly the temples were not built simply as acts of piety but as ways of protecting estate income and a certain style of life. Evidently the building of new temples could serve as a coercive device to extract support from other kuge families and to justify the use of public taxes for the benefit of members of the imperial house, the religious intent giving support to the political interest. 

It is generally held that with the establishment of the insei upon the retirement of Emperor Shirakawa in 1086 and the ensuing independence of the imperial house from the control of the sekkanke, these temples, as well as the two imperial residences built near them, served as new centers for the growing administrative needs of a politically active ex-emperor.

---

6 See his chapter "Rokushō-ji to Toba-dono" 六勝寺と鳥羽殿, in Kyoto no rekishi 京都の歴史, 10 vols. (Tokyo: Gakugei shorin, 1970-76), 2:118-43.

Moreover, the Rokushō-ji are also seen as having been important in the land-amassing activities of the imperial family.

Although emperors were never free from concerns with land as a source of income, it is only at the outset of the insei period (i.e., 1086-1185) that we see the sudden accumulation of large numbers of estates for the imperial house.\(^8\) However, there was some hesitancy on the part of the emperor, as head of state, to participate directly in the accumulation of private landholdings, and it is for this reason that land was placed under the nominal control of temples, shrines, or retired imperial ladies known as nyō-in 如院.\(^9\)

\(^8\)See Okuno Takahiro 奥野高髙, "Rokushō-ji ryō ni tsuite" 六勝寺領について, Kokugakuin zasshi 国学院雑誌 57, no. 7 (December 1956): 131-47.

\(^9\)On this conflict between the "public" character of the emperor and his ability to freely own, or dispose of, "private" property, see Hashimoto Yoshihiko 橋本義彦, "Goin ni tsuite" 後院について, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 217 (June 1966): 22. See also Ishimoda Shō 石母田正, Kodai makki seijishi josetsu 古代末期政治史序説, (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1964), 361. It has been proposed that the institution of the insei itself was a means of accumulating land for the imperial family. See ibid., 366-67. Temples and shrines became the nominal holders of land for the imperial house not only because of their prestige and sacred character. Pragmatically speaking, such religious institutions had the most experience in managing and administering property as a result of grants of tax free lands early in the ritsuryō system. Moreover, they were also accustomed to managing the lands of their matsu-ji 末寺, or branch temples. See Murai Yasuhiko 村井康彦, "Shōensei no hatten to kōzō" 荘園制の発展と構造, in Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi 岩波講座日本歴史, 2d ed. (Tokyo: Iwanami Kōza, 1964), 4:44-49.
The Rokushō-ji appear to be the first in what would be some twenty-eight kigan 祈願, or "supplication" temples established by emperors, retired emperors, and nyū-in, which would ultimately control over five hundred estates. Of these, at least eighty-nine properties belonged to the Rokushō-ji, which represents about 1/100 of the presently known shōen of that time.

From the late eleventh century through the twelfth there was a rapid growth of shōen in general. With the breakdown of the ritsuryō system, taxable land had been reduced and, as a result, government stipends for those serving in the state bureaucracy become increasingly unstable. Consequently, those in a position to do so sought alternate forms of income and, by and large, this took the form of acquiring land in the form of shōen. Yet, as Thomas Keirstead observes, there is more at issue here than just an increase in tax immune estates:

What reconception of landholding, and of the realm in general, suddenly (for it happened quite rapidly) mandated the estate form and reconfigured it as a part of a new

---


11Okuno Takahiro (1956), 146.

12The ritsuryō system was a form of centralized government based on written legal codes. The first set of ritsuryō, that is, penal codes and civil rules, was the Taihō Code, which was promulgated in 702. The second, and last, complete set was the Yōrō Code, which was drafted in 718, but not enacted until 757. The ritsuryō system was at its height in the eighth century, but it slowly deteriorated after that.
system of landholding? The advent of the estate system cannot be considered apart from a general re-formation of state and society: it must be linked to a process of differentiation which recast a previously unitary realm (at least in theory) into "private" and "public" domains...  

In considering this "reconception of landholding," two difficulties are encountered; one concerns assumptions made due to widely held views as to the proprietary rights of the state, and the other concerns the criteria used for determining the differences between the categories of "private" and "public." In neither case is the situation as clear-cut as one would assume.

It is commonly held by both Japanese and Western scholars that under the ritsuryō system of government the emperor theoretically "owned" all the land in Japan; in this view, the handen 班田, or rice fields that were allotted to the peasants, were the property of the state and that they were to be temporarily cultivated by the peasants who were, in effect, tenants. However, there is some controversy as to the validity of this view.

Cornelius Kiley, citing the works of Nakada Kaoru and Niida Noboru, argues against this concept of state ownership of land. His argument is based on the observation that the allotment

---


\(^{14}\text{E.g., "...untitled groups were granted the 'use' of elements of production (primarily land) for which the state expected payment...in theory all land was considered the sovereign's property..." John W. Hall, Government and Local Power in Japan 500 to 1700: A Study Based on Bizen Province (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), 84-85.}\)
fields assigned to the peasants (i.e., kubunden 分田) were referred to as "private" lands (shiyūchi 私有地), whereas those fields not yet allotted, or that were reserved for direct utilization by the state, were referred to as "public" lands (kōyūchi 公有地); "Under the Ritsuryō land system, the kōden (public paddy fields) referred to the paddies which were rented (chinso-den) compared to the shiden (private paddy fields) which referred to the kubunden."16 According to this view, most of the arable land in Japan would have been "private" and very little, "public."17

The status of land, then, was determined by its utilization; that is, "public" meant only that the land in question was directly exploited by the state, and "private" referred to any land which was not. The grain tax on kubunden

---

15 E.g., chinso-den 賃租田. These were lands which peasants could rent from the state to cultivate over and above that allotted to them in the handen system.


could be seen as a direct form of exploitation, but it represented only a small portion of the dues imposed on peasants; the far more onerous corvée labour and tax in kind were indirect forms of exploitation of the land. Furthermore, it was not all land that fell into these categories. Residential lands (*taku宅*) and land used to grow vegetables or for silkworm cultivation, etc., (i.e., *enchī园地*) were allotted to households, but they were free from the grain tax. Moreover, these lands remained the permanent property of the households, were heritable, and could be transferred or disposed of at will. This was in contrast to *kubunden*; even though peasants were allotted *kubunden* for life, they did not possess alienable or heritable rights to them. The reason for the difference was that residential lands were considered to be without potential for development into rice fields, and it was rice fields that formed the basis of taxation. Accordingly we see that, "...in the Ōtabumi of Wakasa province, 2,217 chō of paddy were recorded, but none of uplands. This resulted because the land records made for tax purposes from the Ritsuryō period on had been concerned only with paddy; uplands were regarded only as part of the residential plots." 

---

18 However, they were subject to some minor taxes such as tax in kind. See Nagahara (1975), 275-76.

Moreover, since rice cultivation was labour intensive and required the cooperation and direction of, at the minimum, household groups, rice fields were seen as related to the interests of the community at large. Accordingly, they were not considered to be the property of individuals. Furthermore, since rice paddies were viewed primarily as a facility for producing income, that is, a means of feeding the people who were to provide taxes for the state, the government was primarily concerned with the administrative control of the land; legal concerns over tenure rights do not appear to have been an issue:

...the most important thing to note about the ritsu-ryô land-tenure system is that the state's regulation of land was part of an overall scheme to regulate population. The government's control over land simply augmented its other controls over the populace. The state regulated the use of land to provide sustenance for the peasants so that they could produce the dues which in turn supported the regime and aristocracy.  

It was the ability to limit the rights that peasants held with respect to the land, and not proprietary rights per se, that gave the state its power; "These ricefields [kubunden] were

---

20As Hall has noted, "Uji society had put its emphasis not upon the land, but upon manpower and the social requisites necessary to secure it....Land appears to have been controlled under a vague conception of communal ownership vested in the chieftain; hence there was no free acquisition or free disposal...Such a conception of landed property is obviously fundamentally different from one in which property becomes identified on what we would call economic terms." Hall (1966), 47-8. See also Kiley (1970), 7-8, 146.

21Risser, 19.
private property, but subject to many restrictions on alienability. These restrictions were, in our view, so sweeping, and of such a generalized nature as to be primarily expressions of administrative power rather than of any superior property rights in the state."²²

For Kiley,

The nature of state power over territories in general is perhaps best expressed by legal materials concerning land in its completely undeveloped state. This was, in the eyes of the law, 'public-private,' by which was meant that it might be exploited by officials on public business or by private individuals. In other words, such land was regarded as ownerless, and attempts at enclosure were regarded as derogating from the political power and jurisdiction of the authorities. Nothing could more clearly exemplify the manner in which the line was drawn between political authority and property, and it might be fair to assume, at least preliminarily, that it was this sort of power which underlay the state's authority to allot ricelands, rather than any specific property rights.²³

As a result, according to Kiley, "The legal system provided for a dividing line between 'private' and 'public' lands on the one hand, and the administrative powers of the state on the other."²⁴

Kiley further explains that the commonly held notion of state "ownership" of land "...derives, not from the actual legal materials of the time, but from generalized notions, widely held in the nineteenth century, concerning primitive communism. This

²³Ibid., 9.
²⁴Ibid., 6.
view holds that, if rights in land are very severely limited, there must be some residual 'property' held by the larger community."²⁵

This is not to say that permanent tenure of rice fields did not exist. The ritsuryō state provided temples and shrines with land that was free of so 租 (i.e., the rice tax), which became their permanent property (jiden 寺田 and shinden 神田, respectively²⁶). However, such lands represented only a part of the subsidies that the state bestowed upon them. The main source of income for subsidized institutions and individuals were fuko 封戸 (i.e., sustenance households).²⁷ As a result, permanent personal land represented a mere three and one-half percent of all the rice land in the first half of the eighth century.²⁸

This reassessment of the relation between the state and land is essential in understanding that what occurred in the early Heian period was more than just an increase in tax free estates;

²⁵Ibid., 3.


²⁷These will be discussed in the next chapter.

The explosion of estates in the twelfth century resulted not merely from the discovery of loopholes in the imperial law or a change in strategies among the elite. It did not come about because a generation of aristocrats decided (or were forced by circumstances) to become tax evaders. The explosion of estates testifies not to developments within an unchanged construction of realm, but to a fundamental reordering of space and society—to broad conceptual shifts that encouraged and underwrote the production of the estate form and legitimated its possibility.²⁹

Part of this "reordering of space and society" can be attributed to a new conception of property itself. In 743, in order to increase the number of rice fields, and thereby increase the amount of tax that could be collected, the government issued decrees giving permanent tenure rights to virgin lands opened up by individuals at their own expense.³⁰ Although anyone who petitioned the government was able to develop new rice fields after 711, it was not until 723 that developers who personally took on the expense of building new irrigation facilities in the process were guaranteed the right to cultivate such lands for three generations. Those utilizing existing water systems were only granted the lands for life. This is what is referred to as the sanse isshin no hō 三世一身法. Although developers were exempt from corvée labour and the

²⁹Keirstead, 17.

³⁰This is referred to by scholars as the konden einen shizai edict. Konden 墳田 refers to virgin lands that were developed into rice fields. See Shoku Nihongi 續 日 本 紀, fascicle 15, Tempyō 15 (743)/5/27, KT, 2:174 and also Ruiju sandaikyaku 類 聚 三 代 格, fascicle 15, Tempyō 15 (743)/5/27, KT, 25:441.
tax in kind, reclaimed land was still subject to the rice tax and such fields reverted to allotment lands after these terms expired. As a result, the effort required to develop such lands often tended to outweigh the advantages.\footnote{For the 723 edict see the entry for Yōrō 7 (723)/4/17 in \textit{Shoku Nihongi}, fascicle 9, KT, 2:96.}

Therefore, although previous land reclamation decrees had allowed exclusive cultivation rights for a limited period, that is, a maximum of three generations, under the handen system no one could hold permanent tenure rights to such lands. This changed with the edict of 743, which made the investment involved in reclamation projects far more worthwhile. Since such reclaimed lands were still subject to taxation, such an edict was of great advantage to the government for it enabled it to increase the tax base without itself having to undergo the expense of developing new rice fields.

Most scholars point to this edict to support the view that the state "owned" all the land during the ritsuryō period; if the government "gave" these tenure rights to these developers it must have originally "held" them. However, Kiley proposes that the 743 edict created, in fact, a new form of property. He argues that the powers that the state held over land under the ritsuryō system were not the same powers that the developers held over the newly developed rice fields. Thus, the state did
not simply transfer its rights over to the developers; in
effect, a new form of property had been created.\textsuperscript{32}

These newly formed \textit{konden}, although subject to taxation,
were the personal property of the developer, who had permanent
tenure rights to the lands. Moreover, they were fully alienable
and heritable; the owner could divide or dispose of them at
will. Before 743 only a very few lands enjoyed such privileges,
and they (\textit{i.e.}, \textit{jiden} and \textit{shinden}) belonged to religious
institutions. Furthermore, they were always granted to the
institutions, nd not private parties, and those institutions
could not increase such holdings on their own initiative. From
743, however, such forms of property were available to anyone
who had the resources to develop them, although development was
subject to certain limitations.

According to Kiley, this new form of land tenure treated
property as a form of personal chattel. As we have seen, due to
the nature of rice cultivation, rice fields up to that time were
not seen as the personal property of individuals, whereas
ordinary chattels, having little direct impact on the community,
were:

\begin{quote}
The edict of 743 stated in effect that reclaimed land was
to be forever treated as though it were the personal
chattel of the reclaimer. This clearly involved the
employment of a legal fiction. That is, such land might be
disposed of in the same manner as clothing, or, more to the
point, grain. This writer suspects that the underlying
assumption here was that since grain had purchased the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{32}See Kiley (1970), 7. See also Risser, 39.
labor which opened the fields, those fields were to be treated as though they were grain, rather than as real estate.\textsuperscript{33}

Since the development of virgin lands into rice paddies was labour intensive and expensive, it was, by and large, not peasants but elites and religious institutions that undertook these reclamation projects. The labour for such undertakings was bought with rice,\textsuperscript{34} and, since rice had been used to develop the lands, by extension the land itself came to be treated as a commodity similar to grain:

When rice came to be invested on a large scale in land reclamation, the state allowed the land so reclaimed, or claimed to have been reclaimed, as absolute personal property....The legal fiction categorizing such fields as private assets, as a matter of fact, made them a different sort of property from any other type of land, by means of a fictitious denial that they were land at all.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33}Kiley (1970), 8.

\textsuperscript{34}Although coins were in use at this time, they were not readily accepted by the population at large. See Shoku Nihongi, Wado 4 (711)/10/23, KT 2:46, and Ruijû sandaikyaku, fascicle 19, Enryaku 17 (798)/9/23, KT 25:600-01, and Jōgan 9 (867)/5/10, KT 25:601-02, regarding the state's concern that coins were not being utilized. Although money was not important economically at this time, rice was, and so it was utilized to purchase labour. Thus rice came to be the medium used in investments.

\textsuperscript{35}Kiley (1970), 8. With respect to this thesis, Kiley cites Tokinoya Shigeru 時野谷滋, "Denryō to konden hō" 田令と墾田法, Rekishih Kyōiku 歴史教育, 4 (1956): 5, 28-35, 50-55, and Nakada Kaoru 中田薫, "Nihon shōen no keito" 日本荘園の系統, in Hōseishi ronshū, 2:19-69. See also Iyanaga Teizō 弥永貞三, "Ritsuryōseiteki tochi shoyū" 律令制的土地所有, in Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi 岩波講座日本歴史 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1962), 3:33-78. Hosokawa Kameichi 細川亀市 also holds the view that it was the development of konden that led to the concept of private ownership of land. See his "Tōdaijiryō Echizen no kuni Kuwabara
The development of this new form of property had far reaching effects. Since, except for religious institutions, personal ownership of rice fields did not exist before 743, participation in the state bureaucracy, that is, the imperial administration, was the principle means of economic and political advancement. However, with the creation of this new form of property this means was replaced by landholdings.

The conversion of konden and other lands into shōen led to the practice of commendation (kishin 寄進), by which various forms of tax or other immunities were acquired through "commending" one's land to some powerful person or religious institution. This practice was based on a system of shiki 職 rights by which the income from the land was divided among various levels of commendation.

shō no kenkyū 東大寺領越前国 桑原庄の研究, Kokugaku zasshi 38, no. 5 (May 1932): 26-27, as cited in Thomas Hugh Mesner "Oi no Shō and Private Rights to Land in Heian Japan" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii, 1982), 16 n. 18.

36Under the ritsuryō system, members of the court were not given only fuko, but also land. The amount and form of land granted was based on the rank or government office that they held. Those lands were known, respectively, as iden 位田 and shikibunden 職分田. However, the former was taxable and granted for only the lifetime of the recipient, while the latter, given as compensation for holding government office and although free from taxation, was granted for only the term of the office.

37Interestingly, even though the original developer of a konden was considered to have absolute tenure rights, once the system of shiki rights was established no one holder of any one of these rights could make such a claim; all the various owners of shiki rights "owned" part of the land, and yet no one holder had exclusive rights to it: "For the estates which had existed
In the Heian period this system of shiki rights had effects beyond financial security. Since these rights depended on the "borrowing" of authority from the honke 本家, be that an individual of the elite class or a religious institution, anyone commending their lands came to share in that authority: "The recipient of a donation, in return for a portion of the produce, agreed to bestow his prestige on the land and intercede where necessary to shield the local notable's administration of the land from the provincial authorities."40

Privilege, then, could now be claimed without actually being a member of an elite class or powerful institution because the honke, by accepting commendation of lands, in effect agreed from the first centuries of the state land system, divisibility of land rights meant that vigorous local families could share in the profits from the estates without challenging the proprietary rights of management held by the noble or temple. One individual's possession of private rights toward land did not preclude another's holding rights to the same field." Mesner, 231.

38This was the highest level in the shiki system. It was the prestige or authority of the honke that shielded the lands from interference by provincial agents. As a rule, then, the honke were invariably high ranking nobles or prestigious religious institutions.

39"Like the older offices, shiki could serve as expressions of status, and, in a sense, the acceptance of commendation by a capital noble may be regarded as analogous to a recommendation by a high official that a lower one be promoted or given a more prestigious clan title." Kiley, (1970), 76. Thus, in some sense the shiki system could be thought of as, in Kiley's words, a "prestige distribution system." Ibid., 103. See also Risser, 171.

40Ibid., 171.
to rent it out. In the Nara period, provincial elites could not break into the inner circle of the kuge 公家 (the court nobility) and kugyō 公卿 (the highest rank of nobility) classes due to their limited access to the court and the emperor. However, since prestige in the Heian period could be acquired through the commendation process, non-courtiers and warriors were able to make claims to nobility and, eventually, even to belonging to the blood line of the imperial house. A major result of the growth of shōen, then, was the enhancement of the political power of local provincial nobility. Moreover, previous to this the Nara nobility, despite factional differences, had a common purpose in consolidating around the emperor to rule the country, which resulted in a certain degree of stability in the state; to a great extent they had a vested interest in a central government answerable to the emperor because their exclusive access to the imperial house was the source of their prestige and gave them legitimacy.

A result of the rearticulation of land after 743 and the development of the shōen and its kishin system was not only the loss of this common purpose, but also a decentralizing of authority and prestige which aided in the growth of the military classes in the subsequent Kamakura era: "The institution of konden...was an anomaly within the state structure. It furthermore opened a new area of unseemly competition among the
wealthy nobles, whose solidarity was essential to the maintenance of centralized power.\textsuperscript{41}

Therefore, with the introduction of the concept of "private" tenure rights, communal attitude towards rice fields waned. At the same time, the resulting decentralizing of prestige and authority led to a deterioration in the importance of affiliation to \textit{uji} groups as a way of gaining access to economic resources or power. In contrast, in the early stages of the \textit{ritsuryō} system, "...even if one owned land in one's own right, the taxing power of the state was so overwhelming that mere ownership was by no means a guarantee of economic security. More important than "ownership" was one's position within the political hierarchy, which involved either outright office-holding of some type, or affiliation with an \textit{uji} group, which, almost by definition, 'shared' the political prestige of the state."\textsuperscript{42}

As noted previously, with the development of \textit{shōen}, individuals could gain access to prestige and power outside the imperial administrative structure. One could now gain access to power without being a member of an \textit{uji}; in fact, "The mere holding of the same \textit{uji} name did not guarantee any sense of

\textsuperscript{41}Kiley (1970), 82-83.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., 148.
solidarity and, at times, even worked against it as the various members struggled to get control of the lion's share."\(^3\)

The breakdown of the importance of the *uji* was accompanied by dependence on smaller household groups, as opposed to the more extended *uji*, for "solidarity"; "...there was, among the court nobility of the late Heian period and later among the warriors, a distinct trend towards the replacement of non-familial political authority by the power of the household despot. This, perhaps, is the significance of the late Heian infantile *uji no chōja*, holding the rights the office represented but pretty much at the mercy of his father or grandfather."\(^4\)

The more alienable that rights to land and the decentralization of prestige grew, the less important the imperial house became. As a result of this, clans that were able to exploit this new articulation of land could gain authority and financial stability independent of the court. With the decline of the *ritsuryō* system of government the balance of power shifted to groups, or what Kuroda Toshio refers to as kinship blocs (*kenmon* 権門) such as the Fujiwara family.

According to Kuroda, *kenmon* groups were not necessarily confined to any particular geographical location or class, nor did they have to hold government position or rank; in other

\(^3\)Ibid., 155.

\(^4\)Ibid., 156.
words they were not explicitly an intrinsic part of the political system. The emergence of "private" tenure of land and immunity from state interference through the practice of *kishin* aided in the development of these autonomous groups that no longer had to rely on membership in the community of established forms of government for money or authority. The result was what Ishimoda Shō calls a kind of "despotism" which was imposed by these *kenmon*, a term he utilizes to show that they represented "private" political power with "private" interests.\(^5\)

Although acknowledging that the Fujiwara were the first of the *kenmon* to appear, Kuroda maintains that it was with the advent of the *insei* period in 1086 that *kenmon* groups such as retired emperors and the warriors increasingly became separated from the state bureaucratic structure, and their ability to accumulate *shōen* was the economic basis that allowed them to maintain such independence.\(^6\) As Kiley notes, "The increased importance of rice transactions and the emergence of *konden* represented an increase in market activity, which eventually resulted in a reconstitution of the aristocracy itself as an elite only partially integrated with the 'real' power structure." \(^7\)

\(^5\)Ishimoda (1964), 367.


\(^7\)Kiley (1970), 181.
A rearticulation in the concept of land, then, led to a decentralization of authority and the development of *kenmon* groups that were able to exert political influence outside the established political system. This change, however, also necessitated adaptation on the part of the imperial house and, as one would expect, signs of this adaptation appeared soon after the role that land held in the consciousness of elites began to change.

Although it was not until the establishment of the *insei* that there was a systematic effort on the part of the imperial family to secure some degree of independence in order to compete with *kenmon* groups, there had previously been sporadic attempts to develop autonomy. In this respect the history of the Rokushō-ji is connected to that of a group of temples that lay to the north-west of Heian-kyō.

In the "Western Mountain" (Nishiyama 西山) area of Kyoto several imperially sponsored temples began to develop in the late ninth century. The Shingon temple Ninna-ji, the first of these, was utilized by Emperor Uda upon his retirement as a retreat from the imperial palace and the influence of the Fujiwara. In the tenth and eleventh centuries four branch temples (*matsu-ji*), known as the Shien-ji, were built close by. These served as retirement residences for successive emperors, and they maintained close connections to Ninna-ji.
Ninna-ji had established the custom of appointing to the position of its "head priest" (bettō 別当) only imperial princes who had taken the tonsure (hōshinnō 法親王) in the Shingon tradition. In this way control of the temple and its various matsu-ji were kept in the hands of the imperial house, and this association gave Ninna-ji unprecedented prestige.

Later the imperial tombs of several emperors who succeeded Uda were established close by. This clustering of tombs and temples around Ninna-ji has been attributed to an attempt to create a "Buddhist World" or retreat away from the imperial court, a place where retired emperors could concentrate on their devotions without distractions. However, Emperor Uda's strained relations with the Fujiwara has also been cited as an incentive in his development of the "Western Mountain" area. In the establishment of these imperially sponsored temples, residences, and imperial tombs, Uda appears to have been attempting to consolidate the imperial family in order to raise its profile in an era when other kenmon groups were eclipsing the prestige and power of the emperor. What we see, then, is the imperial house becoming increasingly conscious of itself as a clan, or, perhaps more importantly, a kenmon group, which needed to maintain its place in the midst of competing kenmon, especially the Fujiwara.

This awareness on the part of the imperial family of its being a familial lineage with its own self-interests, and not just an institution of the state, would lead to the situation in
the insei period where it was the senior retired emperor, as patriarch of the household, and not the emperor, who held ultimate authority for the imperial house. Moreover, this awareness led to the realization that, like other kenmon groups, it too had to secure private land holdings in order to ensure its stability. Thus in the eleventh century the imperial house began to pursue actively this undertaking with the establishment of the Rokushō-ji, as well as other religious institutions.

The first of the Rokushō-ji was established by Emperor Shirakawa in 1077 and functioned in part as a residence for the emperor on his retirement. The temple was impressive in scale, including a great Buddha almost as large as the much later Kamakura daibutsu, as well as a nine-storied, eight-sided pagoda over eighty meters in height. Obviously this was not a modest structure, but one that was meant to impress, as well as rival, temples established by other clans, perhaps most conspicuously Fujiwara Michinaga's Hōjō-ji, which was undergoing restoration at the time.

It is well known that Go-Sanjō was the first emperor in some two hundred years who was not directly related to the sekkanke and, as a result, he took measures to secure independence from the influence of the Fujiwara. His son, Shirakawa, shared this purpose, and retired from the throne in order to ensure that succeeding emperors would not revert to being pawns of the sekkanke. In the forty-three years of his
retirement he held the position of senior retired emperor and became, in effect, the patriarch of the imperial family.

As a result of this conscious effort to maintain independence from the Fujiwara, the Rokushō-ji took on a significance in their location and function. The six temples were built within an area of only one square kilometer, an area which also included a residence for the retired emperors. What we see here is another example of temple clustering in the manner of Ninna-ji and its branch temples.

The establishment of the Hosshō-ji, the first of the Rokushō-ji, in that location was fortuitous, first in that other elites also began to build temples and residences in the area, resulting in so much development that it began to rival the center of the capital itself, and second in that the Rokushō-ji lay in the path of the major roads leading to eastern Japan. This meant that they were among the first structures to be seen upon entering the capital. The concentration of six temples, and especially the magnificent pagoda of Hosshō-ji, thus impressed upon anyone who entered Kyoto the grandeur and power of the imperial house.

The location was doubly fortuitous in that Shirakawa had built his Toba-dono gosho to the south of the capital, in the path of major roads leading to the western regions of Japan. Thus the first structures that anyone entering, or leaving, the
capital would see, be it from eastern or western Japan, were impressive buildings associated with the imperial house.

The Rokushō-ji were not built, however, simply to ensure that the presence of the imperial family would be felt by those entering the capital. They also became proprietors of landholdings that supported the imperial house. This took the form of lands allotted directly to the temples for their upkeep, but more importantly it took the form of lands commended to them.

Although the political powers of the imperial house had been severely limited during the Fujiwara regency period, it still maintained its place as the most prestigious institution in the country, a position that could not be usurped. Thus temples such as the Rokushō-ji, which were associated with the imperial house, were the recipients of great numbers of lands commended from a variety of provinces.

Despite the fact that elites, as well as the imperial house, were benefiting from an increase in the number of shōen, there were still various attempts made to stem unrestricted and illegal growth of these tax immune estates. The first effort to limit their spread was in 902, and it was followed by other sets of regulations in 984, 1045, and 1055. This indicates that the effect of these early attempts was limited. Although many scholars have remarked on the initial success of Go-Sanjō's edict of 1069, which regulated the growth of shōen through the
Kiroku Shôen Kenkeisho 記録荘園券契所 (i.e., the Office for the Investigation of Estate Documents⁴⁸), many of the confiscated shôen under Go-Sanjô's edict ended up being converted into chokushiden 軍旨田 (i.e., "imperial edict lands") which were, in effect, shôen in everything but name.

For Keirstead, however, the importance of this edict lay in more than just its effect on the spread of estates; "Go-Sanjô's edict...established a new discourse of landholding. Setting forth a range of possibility for valid statements/claims about land, it prescribed a systematic structure in which the estate was a necessary object."⁴⁹

In this respect Keirstead invokes Foucault's metaphor of the archive, which corresponds to the literal archive of Go-Sanjô's Kiroku Shôen Kenkeisho:

The archive is first the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events. But the archive is also that which determines that all these things do not accumulate endlessly in an amorphous mass, nor are they inscribed in an unbroken linearity;...but they are grouped together in distinct figures, composed together in accordance with multiple relations, maintained or blurred in accordance with

---

⁴⁸This is Cameron Hurst's translation of the term. See G. Cameron Hurst, Insei: Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan, 1086-1185 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), 114. It has also been translated as, the Manorial Documents Recording Office, by Reischauer. See Jean and Robert Karl Reischauer, Early Japanese History (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1937), 165.

⁴⁹Keirstead, 18.
specific regularities...It is the general system of the formation and transformation of statements.\textsuperscript{50}

Thus, for Keirstead, "...the estate system did not arise because certain (now private) holdings were withdrawn from an unaltered public realm, but as a result of a general metamorphosis in the articulation of the land."\textsuperscript{51}

The imperial family was directly affected by this new perspective of land and the resulting shift in political power, and its ability to address such changes was inextricably tied, not only to its relationship with the Fujiwara, but also to its ability to exploit this new conception land. As G. Cameron Hurst notes, "Since land control has always been one of the major determinants of political power in Japan, the imperial house, with this powerful economic base that had been established by the ex-sovereigns [i.e., imperial shōen], was able to exercise once again the political power it had enjoyed in earlier centuries."\textsuperscript{52}

Yet, as Keirstead has observed, there is more going on here than just the fact that "private" lands were eroding the "public" domain, although, on one level, this was precisely the situation. From the second half of the eleventh century through 


\textsuperscript{51}Keirstead, 17.

\textsuperscript{52}Hurst (1976), 259.
into the twelfth century, newly named administrative units for taxation such as ご 郷, ほ 保, and べつみゆ 外名, units which were not part of the ritsuryō system, began to appear and were administered by provincial officers, or zaichō kanjin 在願人 who became ごじ 郷司, ほじ 保司, and べつみゆō myōshu 別名名主 respectively. Those lands were not the private landholdings of these administrators. However, in addition to the taxes and corvée that they could claim during their terms of office, were fully recognized added taxes that they could freely impose. Moreover, as tax collection became less regulated by the central government, officials at this provincial level increasingly began to abuse their authority to accumulate personal wealth. Thus kokugaryō 国衙領, that is lands under the jurisdiction of the kokuga, or provincial office, which were subject to taxation (as opposed to shōen, that is, lands subject to either no, or only limited, forms of taxation), came to be seen in some sense as being under the personal administration of the provincial governor, who could take economic advantage of his jurisdiction for the length of his tenure.53

53This concept of privatization has been briefly discussed in various English language studies. See Jeffrey P. Mass, Warrior Government in Early Medieval Japan: A Study of the Kamakura Bakufu, Shugo, and Jitō (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 3-5; Hall (1966), 124, 220-24; and also Nagahara (1975), 269-96.

This development, however, was not just the result of corruption on the part of provincial officials. As stated previously, the ritsuryō state was less interested in legal tenure rights than it was with administrative control of the land and regulation of the populace:

The eighth century, and indeed, the entire ancient period, was one in which estatist institutions were brought to a relative minimum. In particular, "estatist" interests in land were at a minimum, except for the general dominion of the state over its territory, expressed in an administration which emphasized regulation of persons, thereby assuming a sort of responsibility for their conduct. The idea that the state was morally instructing its subjects, in this view, of course, had a distinct function, and was something more than a hypocritical sham....The idea that the emperor and state (the two being only very imperfectly distinguished) functioned for the ethical improvement of the populace was a logical extension of the implications of the system of responsibility...54

Thus, for Kiley, an essential element of the ritsuryō state was a sense of responsibility, and so the ritsuryō system "may be largely explained in terms of structural factors and economic change, and that there is no real need to suppose that the officials of the time were too naive or innocent to conduct their administration according to the norms which they had adopted."55

Although one runs the risk of appearing rather naive by suggesting that such a sense of responsibility on the part of officials would have curbed the temptation to abuse their

55Ibid., 30-31.
positions of power, it may not be unreasonable to propose that "structural factors" played a role in the deteriorating *ritsuryō* system and that a result of these "structural" changes there arose new concepts in tenure rights and a rearticulation in the concept of land.

Accordingly, if one takes this approach, the Rokushō-ji can be seen as not just institutions that managed lands for the imperial house, or as the imperial house's response to other elite groups in Heian society. These temples can also be seen to represent a response to the economic realities of the times; that is, they can be seen as representing what could be said, or thought, about land, and what could be done with it in the Heian period.
Chapter 1
State Sponsorship of Temples in Early Japan

In 685 an imperial edict ordered that a Buddhist shrine be set up in every household in all the provinces of Japan. Buddhist scriptures were also to be made available, and worship and offerings were to be made at the shrines. These edicts appear to have been part of a systematic plan on the part of Emperor Temmu to make Buddhism an integral part of state policy, a plan that included subsidized temples, the very names of which were determined, or at least authorized, by the state, thus indicating its official approval and recognition.

The concept of state supported temples is documented in one of the earliest Japanese texts, the Nihon shoki (720), in which it is stated that in 679 Emperor Temmu called for both a review of temples receiving heito 食封 (alternate reading, jikifu), that is, income from sustenance households, and the fixing of names for such temples. Under the jikifu 食封 system established in

---

1_Nihon shoki 日本書紀, Temmu 14 (685)/3/27, NKB 68:469. More than likely this referred to only official households. Nevertheless it indicates the intent to spread the practice of Buddhism throughout the country and not only in the vicinity of the capital.


3_Nihon shoki, entry for the eighth year of Emperor Temmu (679)/4/5, NKB 68:435.
the ritsuryō codes, one half of the rice tax and all the other forms of taxes (e.g., corvée, taxes in kind) of certain designated households were granted to members of the imperial family, courtiers in the imperial bureaucracy, individuals who performed some special service to the state, or religious institutions, instead of to the government. These "sustenance households" were generally referred to as fuko 封戸. These fuko, and not grants of land, were the main form of support, or compensation, assigned to temples, shrines, and individuals. For example, in 806 Tōdai-ji held 5,000 sustenance households, and Asuka temple 1,795, even though other large temples received only 100. Ex-emperor Saga (785-842) received some 2,000 fuko, while Fujiwara no Kamatari (641-69) at one point received some 15,000, and his son, Fujiwara Fuhito, held over 5,000.¹

¹This term first appears in the Nihon shoki in an entry for 646, during the reign of Emperor Kōtoku.

²Although under the ritsuryō system taxation was based on the assessment of individuals, not land, the household, or ko 戸, was the basic unit utilized for the collection of taxes. Exactly what comprised a ko, however, is a matter of controversy; was it a nuclear family, an extended family, or simply an administrative unit? For a summary of the different views see Risser, 68-70.

³See Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, "Fukugō to benpoho no shōenka" 封戸郷と便補保の莊園化, Kōza Nihon shōenshi 講座日本莊園史, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 120 (June 1958): 84.

⁴For the distribution of fuko according to rank, see Ritsuryō 律令, comps. Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞, Seki Akira 櫻見, Tsuchida Naoshige 土田直鎮, and Aoki Kazuo 青木和夫 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1976), 307-09.
Following the above mentioned review of temples ordered by Temmu, an imperial proclamation in 680 declared that, except for two or three dai-ji 大寺 (this term is discussed below)—i.e., Daikantai-ji 大官大寺, Kōfuku-ji 弘福寺, and Hōkō-ji 法興寺—the state would no longer administer temples. Moreover, those temples receiving sustenance households had the tenure of those households limited to thirty years. These measures appear to have been an attempt to reduce the financial obligations of the state, and they indicate that there was already a proliferation of state supported temples that needed to be kept in check. The reliability of the dates of these edicts, coming as they do from a work compiled over thirty-five years after the events, could be questioned. Nevertheless, what we are presented with, at least at the time of the completion of the Nihon shoki, is a tradition of state supported Buddhism promoted by Emperor Temmu.

8Hōkō-ji was originally known as Asuka-dera 飛鳥寺 and was founded in the late sixth century by Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子 (d. 626). Umako was not a member of the imperial house, but the temple was appropriated by it because of the major role it played in the spread of Buddhism in Japan.

9Nihon shoki, ninth year of Temmu (680)/4/25, NKBT 68:441. The chapter on Emperor Temmu in the Nihon shoki has only one reference to the exact nature of the subsidies given to temples: seven hundred sustenance houses and taxes of 30,000 sheaves of rice were presented to the dai-ji of the palace. See ibid., Shuchō 1 (686)/5/14, NKBT 68:477.

10See Takeuchi (1957-8), 2:512.

11For the development of state Buddhism see Tamura, 34-53.
The utilization of temples for state interests was further systemized in 741 when Emperor Shōmu ordered that one temple (kokubun-ji 国分寺) and one nunnery (kokubun-niji 国分尼寺) be built in each of the sixty-six provinces. The former were officially named konkōmyō shitennō gokoku no tera 金光明四天王護国之寺 and the latter hokke metsuzai no tera 法華滅罪之寺. These titles indicate that the former were for the protection of the state (i.e., to pray for good crops, protection against natural disasters, plagues, foreign invasions, etc.), while the latter were for the atonement of sins. These kokubun-ji were financed by the state, each being allotted fifty fuko and ten chō 町 of rice fields,\(^\text{12}\) as well as through donations made by major clans (uji 氏), and were largely completed by 780.\(^\text{13}\)

Tōdai-ji 東大寺, the head temple of the kokubun-ji system, as well as of the Kegon sect, was located in Nara and housed a large statue of Rushana 霊舍那 (Skr. Vairocana) Buddha that was completed in 752. In commissioning this statue Emperor Shōmu

---

\(^{12}\)See *Shoku Nihongi*, Tempyō 13 (741)/3/24, KT 2:164. One chō was just under 3 acres in size: "The cultivating capacity of rice land by the average family of four to six members was very limited and could hardly exceed one chō, as this special culture was most intensive and exacting; one chō per family is the historic ratio that always prevailed in Japan as the desirable average peasant holding." Asakawa Kan'ichi, *Land and Society in Medieval Japan* (Tokyo: Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, 1965), 56.

\(^{13}\)The Fujiwara made contributions of three thousand fuko to be used for the construction of Buddhist statues for the kokubun-ji. See *Shoku Nihongi*, Tempyō 13 (741)/1/15, KT 2:163.
apparently drew a parallel between the imperial presence and the Vairocana or "illuminating" Buddha who brought unity and harmony to the universe.¹⁴ It could be argued, however, that this unity was more mundanely accomplished through the kokubun-ji and the national campaign to raise resources for the Nara daibutsu, a campaign traditionally said to have been led by Gyōgi 行基, (alternate reading, Gyōki; 669-749). The Buddhist rhetoric may have been abstract, but human and material resources were being utilized in each province for a national project, the construction of locally situated temples that were appearing systematically throughout the country.

_Dai-ji 大寺_

Under the ritsuryō system temples were categorized as being either _dai-ji 大寺_ or _kokubun-ji_. In this early period the term _dai-ji_ was often used interchangably with that of _kan-ji_ 官寺, or state temple. However, strictly speaking the former word seems to have referred to particularly large and important institutions established at the instigation of the emperor, such as the "two or three great national temples" referred to at the beginning of this chapter, that is, Daikantai-ji, Kōfuku-ji, and Hōkō-ji. The number of _dai-ji_ gradually increased, and later we

¹⁴For this, as well as other political considerations in the undertaking, especially as a means of diverting clan, as well as class, rivalries to a national project, see Inoue Kaoru 井上薰, _Narachō bukkyōshi no kenkyū_ 奈良朝仏教史の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1966), 190-99.
see references to the shi dai-ji 四大寺 (the above named three temples plus Yakushi-ji 薬師寺), as well as the shichi dai-ji 七大寺 (i.e., Daian-ji 大安寺, Yakushi-ji, Gankō-ji 元興寺, Kōfuku-ji 興福寺, Tōdai-ji 東大寺, Hōryū-ji 法隆寺，and Kōfuku-ji 弘福寺), and jūichi dai-ji 十一大寺. In the Engi-shiki 延喜式, i.e., Procedures of the Engi Era, we see some seventeen dai-ji listed.

One would assume that such important institutions would warrant substantial state support. However, in 780 it became policy to limit the sustenance households of dai-ji from long term support to the length of the reign of one emperor. Earlier the Taihō Code (702) had apparently set the limit at five years. This perhaps indicates an attempt to limit the growing number of dai-ji and the financial burden they represented, as well as a decline in the prestige of such institutions.

15 Shoku Nihongi, Taihō 2 (702)/12/25, KT 2:16.

16 Formerly Daikantai-ji 大官大寺. This temple underwent three name changes--for details see Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:511. This was not unusual as it appears to have been the custom to change a temple's name upon some significant event.

17 Shoku Nihongi, Tempyō-shōhō (758)/5/8, KT 2:225.

18 Ibid., Hōki 1 (770)/4/3, KT 2:375.

19 See the section on Gembaryō 玄蕃寮, i.e., Bureau of Buddhism and Aliens, fascicle 21 of Engi-shiki, KT 26:532-47. The Engi-shiki were regulations compiled between 905 and 927 to clarify and expand on the ritsuryō codes.

20 See entry in Shoku Nihongi for Hōki 11 (780)/6/5, KT 2:461.
However, *fuko* were not the only source of income for religious institutions at this time. As noted in the introduction, both temples and shrines were also granted tax free lands, that is, *jiden* and *shinden*. Moreover, when the state introduced edicts in 743 allowing permanent land tenure to those willing to develop rice paddies from virgin land (i.e., the *konden einen shizai* edict discussed in the previous chapter), many temples, especially *dai-ji* that had the resources for such an undertaking, took advantage of this opportunity to expand their landholdings. Accordingly, we see limits placed on the number of *konden* temples that were allowed to develop; Tōdai-ji could develop four thousand *chō*, Kōfuku-ji two thousand, provincial temples one thousand, etc.  

Land, then, was another source of income for temples in addition to the *fuko* that had been allotted to them, and temples were allowed to expand their landholdings in order to supplement their incomes, especially as *fuko* terms were shortened. However, it was not only the *dai-ji* that were able to do this; smaller temples could also create *konden*, and, if situated near reclaimable land, were ideal bases from which to undertake the development projects. As a result, larger temples began to affiliate themselves with those smaller institutions and make them their "branch temples* (matsu-ji) in order to take advantage of their proximity to undeveloped lands.

---

21 See *Shoku Nihongi*, fascicle 17, Tempyō-shōho 1 (749)/7/13, KT 2:204.
In light of the reduction of fuko it was in the interests of temples to become more economically self-sufficient, and so many actually exceeded their quota of konden. Moreover, temples also began to diversify and use the newly developed areas for purposes other than rice cultivation. Thus land came to be used for growing vegetables, collecting timber, ceramic production, and even for hawking. As a result, in 799 there appeared an official complaint about not only temples, but also nobles who were developing lands with no intent of actually using them for rice cultivation.

**Jōgaku-ji 定額寺**

In its chapter on Gembaryō, the *Engi-shiki* lists three types of temples: *dai-ji*, *kokubun-ji*, and *jōgaku-ji*. The latter were privately established temples (e.g., *uji-dera*) that were later granted the designation by the government. The term first appears in *Shoku Nihongi* in the above mentioned 749 edict that placed quotas on the number of konden that temples could develop. Along with those institutions that could reclaim anywhere from 400 to 4,000 chō of konden (provincial Hokke

---


23See the official decree (*dajōkanfu 太政官符*) for Enryaku 17 (798)/12/8, in Ruiju Sandaikyaku, KT 25:497.

temples in the case of the former, and kokubun-ji in the province of Yamato in the case of the latter), jōgaku no tera 定額ノ寺, i.e., "a fixed number of temples," were allocated 100 chō each. However, the first reference to a specific temple designated by this term is not seen until 824 with respect to Takao-ji 高雄寺.

Just as the Nara era saw the number of dai-ji increase greatly, the Heian period was marked by the development of jōgaku-ji. However, these should not necessarily be associated with the jōgaku-ji of the Nara period, as the character of their subsidization had changed and by the end of the tenth century the term fell out of use with the decline of the ritsuryō

---

25 Shoku Nihongi, fascicle 17, Tempyō-shōhō 1 (749)/7/13, KT 2:204. Thus the term seems to refer to a set number of temples that were allowed to reclaim land. Support for this widely held theory as to the origin of the term is an edict banning the establishment of private temples. The reason given for the ban was to limit their number: jōgaku sho tera sono kazu yūgen 定額諸寺其數有限. See the official decree (dajōkanfu) for Enryaku 2 (783)/6/10 in Ruiju sandai kyaku, fascicle 19, KT 25:595. However, there appears to be no record as to what that set number of temples was. Although there may have been some designated figure, more than likely the term came to mean that there could not be an unrestricted number of subsidized temples.

Other theories suggest that the term refers to the set amount of subsidies allocated to such temples, the set number of monks allowed at each of these temples, or the designated name (gaku 額, or plaque set above the main gate of a temple and displaying its name) approved by the government, indicating official recognition of the temple's status. See Hiraoka Jōkai 平岡定海, Nihon jiinshi no kenkyū 日本寺院史の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981), 418-21. See also Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:510, and Kokushi daijiten, s.v. "jōgakuji" しょうがくじ.

26 I.e., "Takao-ji jōgaku to nasu" 高雄寺定額為. See the official decree (dajōkanfu) dated Tenchō 1 (824)/9/27, in Ruiju sandai kyaku, fascicle 2, KT 25:93.
system's economic infrastructure, which had supported state run temples.

Temples in the Nara era could be broadly divided into state temples (*kan-ji*, that is, *dai-ji*, or *kokubun-ji*) or private temples (*shi-ji* 私寺). Generally speaking we can define *shi-ji* as any temple established by individuals or clans, either directly or through donations (e.g., *uji-dera*). There does not seem to have been any state support involved in either their establishment or maintenance, although this was not always the case. However, private funding did not preclude the necessity for state approval or some degree of state interference into their affairs; private temples were subject to approval by the state and administered through the provincial government, and so they were, in some sense, quasi-official institutions. It may, therefore, be more useful to simply view *shi-ji* as those temples not falling into one of the categories of a *kan-ji*, that is, not a *dai-ji*, *kokubun-ji*, or *jōgaku-ji*.

An imperial edict (*mikotonori* 詔) of 716 relates that the process of establishing a private temple was to begin with the erection of a structure, a "thatched hut," or hermitage (*sōdō* 草堂). After a name for the temple was established and its approval obtained from the provincial governor, residences for monks were built and land donations obtained. The *kokushi* 国師,²⁷ along with

²⁷*Kokushi*, i.e., Provincial Masters of Buddhism (also known as *kōshi* 講師), were priests who were officials of the government placed in the provinces to supervise monks and nuns. Besides
the monks from the temple in question, would then be able to conduct religious rites and the donors, or patrons of the temple, were to manage its property and assets under the supervision of the provincial governor.  

However, in practice, the influence of the donors gradually increased until they had virtually complete control over a temple and its assets, and by the late eighth century it was recognized that there was a need to limit the growing number of private temples.  

Thus, in 783 a government decree prohibited the establishment of shi-ji, and existing temples had to affiliate themselves (i.e., become a betsu-in 别院) to a state temple or apply to be designated as either a jōgaku-ji or a gogan-ji.  

Although the designation of gogan-ji was possible even for temples established by non-aristocrats, it involved establishing some form of sponsorship or alignment with the kuge (i.e., courtier class) due to its traditional association with the imperial family. Accordingly, jōgaku-ji, which received guaranteed state subsidies, as well as certain privileges, became the category of choice.  

lecturing on sutras they would have also, along with the provincial governor, overseen appointments of administrators, been responsible for recommending repairs, watched for abuse of privileges by donors to the temples, etc.

---


29Shoku Nihongi, fascicle 37, Enryaku 2 (783)/6/10, KT 2:493.

30See the official decree (dajōkanfu) for Enryaku 2 (783)/6/10, in Ruiju sandaikyaku, fascicle 19, KT 25:595.
The designation of jōgaku-ji, therefore, was originally a way for the government to control the increasing number of private temples being built, particularly those in the provinces. Subsidization thus became a means of addressing the problem of the many institutions claiming various forms of tax exemption. Moreover, it became a means of putting especially powerful private temples under some degree of government supervision, as the temple administrators (e.g., the sangō 三綱) of jōgaku-ji were designated by provincial governors.31

Certain private temples of powerful families with resources commensurate with those temples that held the rank of a state temple were, then, chosen by provincial governors to be recommended to the court for recognition as jōgaku-ji. Along with state subsidies for repairs (made on the recommendation of the provincial governor32), and subsidies for general upkeep (tōbunryō 燈分料), they received government approval to install certain ranks of monks (e.g., jūzenji 十禪師) or yearly ordinands (nenbundosha 年分度者).33 This enhanced the prestige

31 See the official decree (dajōkanfu), in ibid., fascicle 3, Enryaku 15 (796)/3/25, KT 25:115-16.

32 See Shoku Nihonkoki 続日本後紀, fascicle 10, Shōwa 8 (841)/5/20, KT 3:120.

33 This is not to say that jōgaku-ji had exclusive privilege to these assignments of monks or that there was a uniform allotment of priests to each temple, but, rather, that the government recognized their right to install certain ranks of monks.

With regard to the subsidies see Shingishiki 新儀式 (a late 10th century compilation of court ceremonies; its compilation is
of such temples, which not only advanced Buddhist culture in the provinces by means of sculptures and scriptures, but also promoted the concept of state regulation of religious institutions.

The result was more than just control over the spread of private temples. Official recognition required certain qualifications, qualifications which, in effect, restricted the definition of temples, highlighting the lower status and illegal nature of an increasing number of private institutions not recognized by the state. With the breakdown of the ritsuryō system in the latter half of the eighth century, extra taxes, such as suiko (see below), began to be imposed. As monks were exempt from taxation and corvée labour, their numbers, especially those of self-ordained monks, increased and there ensued the establishment of modest temples, dōjō 道場 or dō 堂, which did not follow the regulations of the Sōni-ryō (Regulations for Monks and Nuns).[^34]

Although at first the designation of jōgaku-ji was a means of controlling what was seen as unrestrained growth of private temples, it later became a way of limiting the number of state temples for which the government was responsible, as its

[^34]: Although these regulations appear in the Yōrō Code of 757, earlier dates for their compilation have been proposed. See Hiraoka (1981), 421.
financial resources increasingly became strained with the deterioration of the *ritsuryō* system. Eventually, with the breakdown of the *kubunden*, it came to the point that resources in the form of forced loans (*suiko* 出舉) had to be utilized to supplement government revenues.

*Suiko* were originally loans of seed rice given to cultivators interest-free by the government to be repaid at harvest time. Later the government, in order to increase revenue, forced peasants to take out such loans regardless of need and charged interest of fifty per cent or more. Eventually provincial governors imposed their own *suiko* at interest rates of up to one hundred per cent.35 Although these forced loans were a means of increasing revenue generally, we have an example of how they were used specifically when, in 885, the governor of the province of Yamato imposed *suiko* to supplement the *tōbunryō* for Yashima-dera 八嶋寺.36

With the deterioration of the *ritsuryō* system, the government’s practice of granting *fuku* to temples began to die out and, consequently, members of the aristocracy began to make

---


36See Takeuchi (1957-8), 2:540.
contributions directly to temples. At the same time, government control of temples began to weaken. Originally, imperial inspectors (chōshūshi 朝集使) made a yearly inspection of the accounts of all jōgaku-ji, but in 825 this audit was extended to once every six years, the length of a provincial governor's term of office, and then, in 868, to once every four years when the term of a governor's office changed.  

As members of the court increasingly became sponsors of jōgaku-ji, they were able to insinuate themselves into administrative roles and began cultivating the lands of those temples as their own; in effect these jōgaku-ji were becoming personal property. In reaction to this there was promulgated in 805 an edict prohibiting retainers of the emperor from becoming donors to these temples.  

Despite this edict the practice continued, and when the founders of local uji-dera applied for their temples to be designated jōgaku-ji they also sought out the patronage of powerful courtiers in the capital, such as the Fujiwara, to supplement decreasing state subsidies. In such cases often the original local founders were eventually usurped and the temple became associated with the kuge in the capital.


39 All the lands of Jōgan-ji 貞観寺 were donated by members of the aristocracy, but in the case of Kanjin-ji 観心寺 half were from the aristocracy and half from the state. See Hiraoka (1981), 437-41.
Therefore, as jōgaku-ji turned to private resources for their upkeep, and government support and control waned, state regulation of temples gave way to clan interests and jōgaku-ji began to take on the characteristics of kigan-ji 祈願寺 (i.e., supplication temples) of the courtiers. Moreover, the distinction between jōgan-ji and gogan-ji seems to have blurred. As early as 855, Anjō-ji 安祥寺, a gogan-ji established in 851 by Fujiwara Junshirō 藤原順子, the principle consort (kōgō 皇后) of Emperor Ninmyō, was designated as a jōgaku-ji. From 855 to 905 some twelve gogan-ji in the province of Yamashiro that were founded by members of the imperial family were also designated as jōgaku-ji. Hōshō-ji 法性寺 was built in 931 by Fujiwara Tadahira 藤原忠平 as an uji-dera, and in 934 it was designated as a jōgaku-ji and allotted two yearly ordinands. However, in 948, when the retired emperor Suzaku had two temple buildings (gogan-dō 御願堂) erected on the site, the complex became known as a gogan-ji. In 969 Daigo-ji 醍醐寺 was referred to by the

---

40 A chart of these temples, their founders, and year of designation as jōgaku-ji appears in Kyoto no rekishi, 1:568. Takatori Masao, the author of this section of the text, claims that some sixty temples can be identified as being jōgaku-ji, and of those, some nineteen were in the province of Yamashiro.

41 See entry dated Tenryaku 2 (948)/4/23, in the diary of Fujiwara Morosuke 藤原師輔 (908-60), Kyūreki 九曆, ZZGR 5:230.
Sōgō 僧綱 as a gogan-ji, yet at the same time it was ranked as a jōgaku-ji. 42

Thus it appears that a temple could be considered as being both a gogan-ji and a jōgaku-ji from its inception, or could be regarded as both after its initial establishment as either one or the other (such cases of dual designation, however, appear to have occurred mostly in the province of Yamashiro). This suggests that when this practice of dual designation began there was no longer any appreciable difference between the two and, in fact, this appears to have been the case. For instance, although gogan-ji, because originally they were associated with the imperial family, were generally free from government control, such jōgaku-ji as Enjō-ji 圓成寺 and Kanjin-ji 観心寺 were also free from interference from the Sōgō and kokushi. 43

In effect, the designation of the rank of jōgaku-ji was becoming less important as the advantages of its status lessened. For example, originally the yearly allocation of ordinands to sects or temples was strictly limited in order to control the population of monks, and it was considered a privilege to be able to receive a quota of ordinands. However, as supervision of the clergy became more lax, even if a jōgaku-

---

42 See entry for Anna 2 (969)/8/17 in Daigo-ji yōsho 醍醐寺要書, ZGR 27, pt. 1:42. The Sōgō was the Office of Monastic Affairs, a government department that was staffed by government appointed monks.

43 See Hiraoka (1981), 430, 436, for details concerning these temples.
ji was designated a gogan-ji the original allotment of monks continued without any change, and so such temples stopped requesting such allotments as they no longer imparted any sense of prestige.

With the state's inability to continue financial support, its ability to control temples waned, and as the function of state temples changed, so did their status. A period of overlap of terms ensued when goganji became the rank of choice and the designation jōgaku-ji, while still imparting some status of state recognition, became less attractive, especially for smaller temples. Nevertheless, jōgaku-ji continued to appear until the ritsuryō system went into decline in the late 10th century.

Thus the ninth century saw a change in state organization of Buddhist temples in the provinces from that of the kokubun-ji system to a system that employed jōgaku-ji. But the jōgaku-ji of the tenth century were dominated by the aristocracy and the imperial family and were far less dependent on state support, which had become unreliable. The result was a trend toward economic and administrative independence, and away from government control.
Takeuchi defines gogan-ji as temples built to perform rituals for the benefit of the emperor, with the founders of such temples ranging from emperors to those not related to the imperial house. Thus gogan-ji could be established by members of the imperial family, monks, members of the kugyō, or provincial governors. Those founded by the imperial family were built by the Zōjikan (Department of Temple Building) on the order of the emperor, or an existing temple could be given the title. However, temples founded by those other than the imperial family were required, upon completion of construction, to apply to the Genbaryō to receive imperial sanction for the designation.

44Takeuchi (1957-58) 2:539. This range of patrons of gogan-ji is seen in Shingishiki, fascicle 5, GR 6:255. Temples built specifically on the request of an emperor were generally referred to as chokugan-ji 勅願寺, or chokuganjo 勅願所.

45Enryaku-ji Myōkōin 延暦寺妙香院 was established by the monk Jinzen 尋禅 (d. 990) who, in 990, petitioned to have it made a gogan-ji for the protection of the state and the benefit of the emperor (i.e., Emperor Ichijō) when he (i.e., Jinzen) fell ill. A characteristic of temples built by monks that became gogan-ji was that the administration and supervision of the temples remained in the hands of one particular lineage of master-disciples. See Hiraoka (1981), 448-49. For details concerning the succession of monks at Myōkōin see Sanmondōshaki 山門堂舍記, GR 24:496.

Fujiwara Kaneie 藤原兼家 (d. 990) was one of the kugyō who petitioned to have a temple (Shakuzen-ji 積善寺 which was originally one of his mansions) made into a gogan-ji. See Ōe Tadahira's 大江匡衡 supplication (ganmon 願文) dated Shōryaku 5 (994)/2/17, in Honchō monzui 本朝文総, fascicle 5, KT 29b:119-20. Enryaku-ji, Jōshin-ji 定心院, Shitenno-in 四天王院, Jōgan-ji 貞観寺, Gankei-ji 元慶寺, Ninna-ji, and Daigo-ji are listed
Gogan-ji were supported by the state with either fuko or chigyōkoku, i.e., provinces held in proprietorship by individuals or religious institutions\(^6\), and were also allotted yearly ordinands. However, besides the connection to the imperial family, one of the main differences between gogan-ji and jōgaku-ji is that the former were not subject to the control of the Sōgō or provincial governors; that is, they were free from government interference because the patrons of gogan-ji were generally members of the imperial family (however, as noted above, even this distinction eventually broke down). Jōgaku-ji, on the other hand, had to register with the government, but in return for the restrictions imposed by state control they received support for the maintenance of their buildings and monks.

Hiraoka divides the development of gogan-ji into 3 stages: (1) those that were named after an era (e.g. Enryaku-ji, established in Enryaku 7 [788]; Kajō-ji, established in 851, the year after the Kajō period ended; Jōgan-ji, established in Jōgan 1 [859]; Genkei-ji [alternate reading Gankei-ji] 元慶寺, established in Genkei 1 [879]; and Ninna-ji, 

\(^6\)From the tenth century the tax revenues from whole provinces could be made available to an individual or religious institution. The recipient of a chigyōkoku was known as the chigyōkoku-shu 知行国主. Originally assigned for four year terms, they eventually became hereditary. See Takeuchi (1942), 27-50.
established in Ninna 4 (888));7 (2) those named after an emperor (e.g., Daigo-ji, En'yū-ji, Kazan-in), including what are referred to as the Shien-ji 四円寺, temples that were also residences and which began to take on the characteristics of the Fujiwara uji-dera; and, finally, (3) those of the Rokushō-ji period, i.e., temples that served as gosho for the retired emperors and whose lands provided financial resources for the imperial house.

The representative temples of each of these stages can also be roughly divided into geographical areas of Heian-kyō, the first extending from Yamashina to Hieizan, the second centered in the "Western Mountain" area (i.e., in the vicinity of Ninna-ji), and the third centered in the "Eastern Mountain" area (i.e., the Shirakawa district).8

The nature of the names, that is, those associated with eras, emperors, or containing the character shō/katsu 勝 "victory/excel," in the case of the Rokushō-ji, and the tendency to cluster within a geographical location indicates the high degree of rank and exclusivity associated with this category of temple. This, however, is to be expected, as gogan-ji, even if

7 Most of these seem to have been established in the period between the building of Enryaku-ji (788) and Ninna-ji (888). Despite the fact that these temples were clearly named after era names, one must not automatically assume that all temples bearing nengō were established, or connected, to that era. As Dietrich Seckel has noted, "Since nengō normally express auspicious omens and wishes for good fortune and prosperity, these formulae may equally well be used as unspecific temple names." Dietrich Seckel, "Buddhist Temple Names in Japan," Monumenta Nipponica 40, no. 4 (Winter 1985): 381.

established by commoners, were theoretically dedicated to the wellbeing of the emperor, and by extension, the wellbeing of the state.

During the reigns of Emperor Temmu (673-86) and Jitō (687-96), chokugan-ji 勅願寺, and temples such as Yakushi-ji, which were erected at the instigation of an emperor or empress, were listed as dai-ji, and as such were granted long term fuko for their upkeep (although, as noted above, this was shortened to the reign of one emperor in 780⁴⁹). Gradually state support and regulation weakened, and with the appearance of the first of the Shien-ji (Emperor Enyū's Enyū-ji in 983), and later the Rokushō-ji, resources for the construction of gogan-ji increasingly were raised from individuals, especially provincial governors who, in doing so, hoped to obtain, or renew, their terms of office. Although gogan-ji continued to be supported by the state in the form of either fuko, chigyōkoku, or chokushiden, by the time the Rokushō-ji were established (1075-1149), lands associated with these temples increasingly came to be seen as the personal possession of the founders, that is, the imperial family. Moreover, once these lands became virtually indistinguishable from shōen, their size increased due to commendation of lands by local landowners who, in seeking security for their own lands, commended their estates to the prestigious institutions.

⁴⁹See entry in Shoku Nihongi for Hōki 11 (780)/6/5, KT 2:461.
This trend to the personalization of gogan-ji, however, could already be seen in the late tenth century in the concentration of temples to the northwest of Heian-kyō, which began when Emperor Enyū moved from the Horikawa-in (a satodairi 里内裏, i.e., provisional imperial palace) to Enyū-ji, where he died in 991. Enyū-ji was built on its site possibly because it was near the tomb of his father, and, no doubt, also because it was near Emperor Uda's Ninna-ji which served as its model. This was a place that was relatively isolated from the court and allowed for concentration on religious pursuits. Enyū's son, Emperor Ichi-jō, also established a temple, Enkyō-ji, in the area in 998, and there later followed Enjō-ji 円乗寺 which was established in 1055 by Emperor Go-Suzaku, and Enshū-ji 円宗寺, which was established by Emperor Go-Sanjō in 1070, thus completing what have come to be known as the Shien-ji.

The sites of these latter two temples were also chosen for their proximity to the tombs of previous emperors, indicating a consciousness on the part of the imperial family of its familial relationships (this is discussed further in the next chapter). Thus the official nature of gogan-ji was eclipsed by a movement towards personal interests in the tradition of the private temples (i.e., uji-dera), of the sekkanke Fujiwara which were for the spiritual and material benefit of the clan and in which prayers were offered for specific clan members. This development in the private temples of the Fujiwara and the change in nature of gogan-ji perhaps occurred because state temples were for the
benefit of the state and could not address the needs of individuals, especially in terms of rituals for the dead.

It is this change in the nature of gogan-ji that would eventually culminate in the establishment of the Rokushō-ji. However, this change does not only indicate new trends in the consciousness of "personal" interests; it also points to trends that were inextricably linked to new concerns with financial stability during a period when state support for the imperial family had become increasingly unreliable. This is a process that began with the establishment of the earliest forms of gogan-ji, and it is to one of these, Ninna-ji, that we now turn.

Before doing so, however, it is necessary to reflect briefly on the methodological approach and assumptions being made in this chapter. The above analysis has relied heavily on various primary sources in a manner that has imparted to such documents a sense of self-evident authority, a practice common in historical analysis; documents are used to reconstruct the past through what they say or hint at.\textsuperscript{50}

The caveat that the choice of facts culled from documents is hardly objective is commonplace. Similarly, the admonishment that what is derived from these documents must be understood in its proper socio-political context has become so pervasive as to have become a cliché, with the result that it is widely accepted that, "The attempt to return a thinker to his own times or to

place his texts squarely in the past has often served as a mode of abstract categorization that drastically oversimplifies the problem of historical understanding."^{51}

The problem goes beyond these hackneyed objections. In sifting through the documentary traces, terms, in fact, often recede further away from standard definitions; the distinction between jōgaku-ji and gogan-ji becomes lost when the ranks start to overlap. In seeking links, connections, shared concepts, and themes, one finds what Foucault characterizes as "...gaps, intertwined with one another, interplays of differences, distances, substitutions and transformations."^{52}

Despite an awareness of the dangers and pitfalls of this kind of analysis, the above inquiry, in its chronological examination of state sponsored temples, promotes such notions as tradition, influence, development, and evolution in its attempt to define dai-ji, jōgaku-ji, and gogan-ji. As a result, unities and relationships have been abstracted, consciously and unconsciously, from the documentary material.

However, this reflection on methodological approaches does not suggest that the relationships presented here are a fiction, but, rather, it is meant to caution that "These pre-existing forms of continuity, all these syntheses that are accepted without question, must remain in suspense. They must not be

---

^{51}Ibid., 14.

^{52}Foucault (1972), 37.
rejected definitively of course, but the tranquility with which they are accepted must be disturbed."

What we are left with, to some extent, is what Foucault calls "systems of dispersion" or "discoursive formations." That is, the terms jōgaku-ji and gogan-ji should probably be seen as much more fluid than my analysis would suggest. This is not to say that the categories did not exist; as official ranks it is highly likely that they could not have been used arbitrarily. However, excessive preoccupation with defining the terms and placing them in a historical continuity perhaps only highlights what Foucault calls the "naïveté of chronologies."

An alternate approach, one less subject to the "objective authority" of historians, may, in fact, be more useful as,

The insistence upon a more "dialogical" relation to the past as a companion and a counterpart to documented knowledge has at least two implications...First, it attests to the ways historical agents [i.e., those in the past who did not know how their actions would "turn out"] themselves are involved in attempts to make sense—or to explore the limits of sense-making—in their texts or other historical acts...Second, it questions historians' rights to the position of omniscient narrators...for historians in an important sense do not know how it all turned out. Their knowledge is limited, and their very approach to writing history is itself inserted in an ongoing process...

Yet, such an alternative still does not free us from the prevalence of what LaCapra calls, "the dominance of a documentary conception of historical understanding," a

---

53Ibid., 25.
54LaCapra, 18.
conception that informs not only the methodology of the "ongoing process," but the content of the inquiry:

This dialogical relation between the historian or the historical text and the "object" of study raises the question of the role of selection, judgement stylization, irony, parody, self-parody, and polemic in the historian's own use of language—in brief, the question of how the historian's use of language is mediated by critical factors that cannot be reduced to factual predication or direct authorial assertion about historical "reality." Significant in this respect is the manner in which the historian's approach to the "object" of study is informed or "influenced" by the methods and views of other historians or "speakers." 55

Chapter 2
The Western Mountain (Nishiyama 西山) Area

Ninna-ji 仁和寺

The construction of Ninna-ji was begun by Emperor Kōkō (830-87, r. 884-87) in 886, as a gogan-ji for peace and safety during his reign. However, he died on the 26th day of the 8th month of Ninna 3 (887), and so the temple was completed by his son who was to become the emperor Uda. In taking over the completion of the construction of the temple Uda changed its function to that of a bodai-ji 菩提寺, that is, a temple in which prayers were offered for the benefit of a deceased relative, in this case his father, whose remains were entombed nearby.¹ At first the temple was referred to as the Nishiyama Gogan-ji 西山御願寺,² but by 890 it had become known as Ninna-

¹This new characterization of the temple can be seen in an official document concerning yearly ordinands at Ninna-ji dated Kampyou 2 (890)/11/23 in Ruiju sandaikyaku, fascicle 2, KT 25:101. This new function also explains the speed with which the temple was completed; it had to be ready for the memorial service for the first year anniversary of Kōkō's death.

²Emperor Kōkō's mausoleum is known as Nochi no Tamura no Misasagi 後田邑陵 and is located one half kilometer west of Ninna-ji in Kadono no kōri 葛野郡 in the province of Yamashiro.

²See entry for Ninna 4 (888)/8/17, in Nihon kiryaku 日本紀略, fascicle 20, KT 10:532.
ji, the name being derived from the era name for the period from 885 to 889.¹

The rakkei kuyo 落慶供養 ceremony for the kondō 金堂, i.e., the main hall, which was held in 888, was presided over by Kūkai's nephew, Shinnen 真然, of the Shingon tradition.² This, along with Uda's relationship with Yakushin, which will be discussed below, was a factor in Ninna-ji becoming a major temple of the Shingon sect. However, initially it was the Tendai school that had a strong presence at the temple. The Tendai monk Yūsen 幽仙 became the first bettō of Ninna-ji in 890, a post he held for 9 years.³ He appears to have been recommended for this office by the Tendai monk Enchin 円珍 (814-91), fifth zasu of...


¹Rakkei kuyo ceremonies were services to celebrate the completion of either the construction or repair of a temple building.

²d. 891. Shinnen entered the religious life while still a child and studied with his uncle, Kūkai. The first temple he became closely associated with was the Shingon temple, Daian-ji 大安寺, in Nara.

³d. 899. Disciple of Ennin 円仁 (794-864; third zasu of Enryaku-ji). Yūsen was the son of Sakon no Shōgen 左近将監 (i.e., magistrate of the sakonefu, the inner palace guards), Fujiwara Munemichi 藤原宗道.

⁷Bettō was a title given to the head priest of Kōfuku-ji and other daiji or jōgaku-ji. Rōben 良辨 (689-773) was the first to receive this position in 752 at Tōdai-ji.
Enryaku-ji. Because Enchin held the post of gojisō, and because he had performed rites on behalf of Emperor Kōkō, the temple's original founder, he no doubt had some influence in the appointment at Ninna-ji. Moreover, under Kōkō the kondō had been developed with the Tendai tradition in mind. By having Yūsen placed at Ninna-ji, Enchin perhaps hoped to maintain a foothold for the Tendai sect in this newly established temple and, indeed, Yūsen, as a disciple of the Enryaku-ji zasu Ennin, had the yearly ordinands of Ninna-ji initiated at Enryaku-ji's kaidan (i.e., precept platform). It appears that this initial foothold was, in fact, sufficient excuse for Enryaku-ji to regard Ninna-ji as its matsu-ji, or subsidiary temple, and so it raised objections when Yūsen was transferred to Enryaku-ji in 899 by Uda and replaced with the Shingon priest Kanken 観賢 (853-925) who assumed the

---

⁶A priest who performed prayers at the seiryōden 清凉殿, the residence of the emperor, for his health and safety.


⁸jukai 受戒, "accept the precepts."

¹¹However, as ordinands of Ninna-ji, the date of the ceremony was held on the anniversary of Emperor Kōkō's death.

¹²Kanken was a disciple of Shōbō 聖寶, a fellow disciple of Yakushin (the latter two were both fourth generation disciples of Kūkai).
position of bettō of Ninna-ji in the year 900.13 Uda had taken the tonsure in 899 under the supervision of Yakushin 益信14 and made these changes in appointments on the advice of his priestly mentor. His connection to this monk traces back to Fujiwara Shukushi 藤原淑子, a lady-in-waiting at the court of Emperor Kōkō, who had been largely responsible for his upbringing; as a result of this it was said that she was closer to Uda than his own mother. She believed that Yakushin's prayers had been responsible for her recovery from an illness and this led her, in 889, to convert her husband's mountain villa into the temple Enjō-ji 圓成寺, of which Yakushin was made bettō.15

---

13See entry for Shōtai 3 (900)/2/27, in Sokenki 素縄記, ZGR 28, fascicle 848, part 2:441.

The term matsu-ji did not necessarily imply an ideological connection, or even a connection of lineage through a master and his disciples to the main temple. As noted in the previous chapter, the nature of the relation was basically one of administrative authority over the personal and material affairs of matsu-ji which, in effect, represented assets belonging to the hon-ji 本寺, or head temple. Once the latter acquired the authority to appoint bettō to a matsu-ji, it also acquired the rights to the management and supervision of the matsu-ji's lands, as well as the peasant cultivators on those lands; thus the hon-ji was able to procure various goods and labour from its branch temple. See Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄, Jisha seiryoku 寺社勢力 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980), 52-53, 154-58. See also Takeuchi (1942), 110, and also Takasaka Konomu 高坂 康 "Jiryōshōen no tokushitsu 寺領荘園の特質, Rekishigaku kenkyū 歴史学研究 7, no. 5 (May 1937): 204. This would explain why Enryaku-ji would object when Uda replaced the bettō with a monk of his own choice; the temple stood to lose some of its assets.

14Yakushin (827-906) was chōja 長者, or head priest, of the Shingon temple Tō-ji.

15Enjō-ji was located in the eastern part of Kyoto in the section of the Shirakawa area that was known as Shishigatani 鹿
Uda also favoured Yakushin with various appointments, and when he established an eight-sided structure known as the Endō-in 円堂院 in the southeast part of the Ninna-ji compound in 904 for the repose of the spirit of his father, it was Yakushin who was chosen to preside over the kuyō ceremony. Due to the Yakushin's influence, as well as Uda's patronage, the Shingon tradition within the temple grew until eventually Ninna-ji came to be characterized as a temple of that sect.

On the same day as the kuyō ceremony for the Endō-in, another was held for a rikyū (detached palace) which Uda had built in the western part of the Ninna-ji compound. This was meant for his son Atsumi Shinnō 敦実親王 (893-967), but, as he was only eleven at the time, Uda employed it as a gosho, or residence, for himself. It appears that his motives in having these structures built was to have both a chapel and some form of ro 庵 (i.e., hermitage) near the grave of his father, which, as mentioned above, lay to the southwest of the Ninna-ji compound, as an act of filial piety. According to the Ninna-ji Endōkuyō ganmon 仁和寺円堂供養願文, this appears to have been

16I.e., he was appointed dōshi 導師. Endō-in had originally been built in Ōuchiyama in 899, but was moved and rebuilt at Ninna-ji. This structure came to be not only the center of Shingon activities at Ninna-ji, but the focal point of the compound itself.
in imitation of Confucius's disciple Shiko 子貢, who built a hut near the grave of his teacher.  

It was not unusual at this time for emperors to have some form of residence near, or at, temples. Even in the Nara era emperors had temporary, simple shelters (kariya 仮室) built as rest stops near temples they visited. As the temples were usually not far from the imperial palace, these structures did not have to be elaborate, although, if the emperor needed to extend his stay in fulfillment of a vow, or if he became more devout and spent more time there, a more permanent structure was required. It goes without saying that it would not have been suitable for emperors, or ex-emperors, to live in existing residences with other monks. Thus the combination of a temple and an imperial residence (i.e., jiin 寺院) had been, to some extent, established by the time that Uda decided to move to Ninna-ji. His residence at Ninna-ji came to be known as the omuro 御室 and following Uda's death there in 931, it was used as a

---

17See Honchō bunshū 本朝文集, fascicle 32, KT 30:153. According to this account, soon others also began to build near the master's grave until there were over one hundred dwellings there. For the original source of this anecdote see Kōshi seika, dai jūshichi 孔子世家 第十七, in Shiki 史記, ed. Yoshida Kenkō 吉田賢抗, 10 vols. (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1982), 7:883. This trend to build temples, and especially residences, near tombs also indicates a change in attitude held by the Heian aristocracy toward the defilements associated with the dead.

residence by the imperial prince, Atsumi Shinnō, for whom it had originally been intended. The character muro 室 imparted some sense of a shinden 宴殿 (i.e., residence for the ex-emperor), but, at the same time, because of the circumstances of its development, as well as its Confucian connection, it also carried the connotation of both a temporary hut and a hermitage. Eventually, the term came to encompass a variety of meanings; although at first it referred to the buildings themselves, it later came to indicate the administrators of those buildings, as well as the area around Ninna-ji, and then to the imperial prince priests (i.e., the hōshinnō 法親王) who lived there. Still later it became the title of an office by which the Hirosawa branch of the Shingon sect was transmitted, an office held only by imperial princes.

Whereas the Endō-in was the center of devotional activities, the omuro was more of a residential structure. This is not to say that the latter was devoid of objects of worship, as there were various Buddhist statues, sutras, and other religious implements enshrined there, and it was also the site

---

19 See Ninna-ji omuro gyobutsu jitsuroku 仁和寺御室御物実録, in which it is referred to as "omuro karisho" 御室仮所. DNS, 1, book 6:491.

of rites for imparting merit to the soul of the late emperor Kōkō. 21

The establishment of an imperial residence at Ninna-ji, then, was not unusual in itself. However, certain circumstances in the relations between Emperor Uda and the Fujiwara family impart a significance to this temple complex that would have an influence on the development of gogan-ji, a development that would culminate in the Rokushōji, another temple complex geographically detached from the imperial palace.

Relations between Uda and the Fujiwara appear to have been rather strained, as Sugawara Michizane had united with Uda, who was not closely related to the sekkanke clan, in an attempt to restore power to the imperial house and reduce the power of the Fujiwara. Uda, on the urgings of his advisor Tachibana Hiromi, had had Fujiwara Mototsune appointed akō 阿衡, a position the latter argued was purely nominal and without any real power. As a result, Mototsune, who was also dajōdaijin, refused to attend to official matters with the result that government affairs were disrupted. Consequently Uda was forced to reinstate Mototsune as kampaku, although on the latter's death in 891 he did not have the position filled again. 22

Uda abdicated in 897, but he continued to exert a great deal of influence on his son, who succeeded as the emperor

---

21See Hiraoka (1981), 543.

22This was the so-called "Akō no fungī 阿衡の紛議, the "Controversy Over the Term 'Akō,'" of 887.
Daigo. However, Daigo, giving credence to the Fujiwara charges that Michizane was attempting to usurp the throne and replace him with his brother, Tokiyo, ordered Michizane exiled to Tsukushi in 901, where he died some two years later.

Traditional accounts hold that Uda had wanted to enter the priesthood from a young age, and there is no doubt that his religious inclinations had a great deal of influence on his attention to Ninna-ji. However, it has also been suggested that he felt acutely that Michizane's exile, and later death, had been the result of the Fujiwara influence and power that he had attempted to curb, and that his retreat to the omuro at Ninna-ji represented a physical retreat from the capital and the Fujiwara. In light of his son Tokiyo's decision to enter the priesthood and take up residence in what became known as the minami omuro after having been implicated in Michizane's alleged plot, the omuro and Ninna-ji seem to have taken on significance as not just places for religious austerities and rituals, but as symbols of a confrontation with the power of the Fujiwara. Moreover, the temple is also often seen as the

---

23This structure was also originally built for Hōshinnō Atsumi and lay in the southwest part of the Ninna-ji compound. It was later to be converted into what became known as the Kannon-in, which had its kuyō ceremony in 951.

24As is well known the Fujiwara were a large family with several different lineages. As a result, this attitude to the Fujiwara did not extend to all its members. For example, Fujiwara Akisue 藤原顕季, (1055-1123), who had no close connections to the sekkakene branch of the Fujiwara and whose mother had been Shirakawa's wet nurse, became one of ex-emperor Shirakawa's in no kinshin院の近親, or 'close associates of the
headquarters of the imperial house, from which real political power came (i.e., the influence of the ex-emperor Uda over his son Daigo), and as, in effect, a kind of in, though the institution of in no chō 広院 (the retired emperor's office) had yet to be created.

As noted above, the establishment of a residence at a temple was not unusual, and neither was it unprecedented for a residence to be converted to a temple; Saga-in 嘉峨院, a rikyū for the ex-emperor Saga 25 became Daikaku-ji 大覚寺 in 876 under his daughter's direction, 26 and Emperor Seiwa (851-81) took the tonsure and had the residence/temple complex Enkaku-ji 円覚寺 built just before his death as a place to end his days.

This trend to convert a residence or villa into a temple contrasted with the situation of earlier temples, such as Enryaku-ji (which was given that name by imperial order in 823, although it dates back to 788) and Kongōbu-ji 金剛峰寺, which was founded on Mount Koya by Kūkai in 816. That is, temples in the vicinity of the capital started to take on the character of

---

25 785-842. Although he lived for some nineteen years after his abdication in 823, he did not take the tonsure.

26 Daikakuji is situated in the hills west of Kyoto, not far from Ninna-ji. For details on the temple see Muraoka Kū 村岡空, Saga Daigaku-ji 嘉峨大覚寺, (Osaka: Shuro Shobō, 1988).
"private," rather than "state," institutions; the Buddhist institutions of the Heian period were turning their focus from the interests of the state to the personal interests of individual members of the aristocracy and the imperial house. However, although by the insei period the practice of abdication and the establishment of gogan-ji would be important factors in reinforcing the political powers of the retired emperors, during this earlier period their abdication and retirement could still be said to be largely religious in nature. Nevertheless, Uda's Ninna-ji, in following the practice of joining the functions of both a jiin and a gosho, was an important step in the development of temples that would lead to such institutions as the Rokushō-ji, as well as the Fujiwara's Hosshō-ji and Hōjō-ji.

Originally gogan-ji directly connected to the emperor were built for the well-being of the imperial family, and high ranking monks were employed in these institutions to perform various rituals for their benefit. These gogan-ji were often converted priests' residences or villas of the imperial family. With the rise of the Fujiwara family and the corresponding decline of the imperial house such practices continued, but such temples began to be utilized as retreats from the Fujiwara where emperors would spend their final years. Thus these converted villas became places for members of the imperial family to seek solace from the world, to perform Buddhist austerities, and to retire; they were no longer solely sites for prayers to be made
for their benefit. The nature of gogan-ji, then, changed and Ninna-ji was the prototype of this genre of temple that was architecturally no different from shinden (e.g., the Shien-ji, Hōshō-ji, and Hōjō-ji).

However, these new gogan-ji differed from goin (i.e. the retirement palaces of emperors);27 after the death of a royal resident, a new dimension was added to the gogan-ji as they became places to pray for the soul of that specific departed imperial family member. In effect, then, these temples took on the function of a bodai-ji.

Because gogan-ji were built under the guidance of priests, the rituals performed at them tended to be those associated with their priests' traditions. The disciples of these priests would also be called upon after his death to continue to perform prayers at the temples, ensuring continued care for the spirit of the original imperial resident. The monks' long term association with the gogan-ji led to their acquiring clerical

27"During his reign the reigning emperor would chose one of the palaces belonging to the imperial house and designate it as his retirement palace. Officials were appointed to operate it and lands allotted for its upkeep. After abdication when the now retired emperor moved there it ceased to be called a goin, and was called the ex-emperor's palace." Hurst, (1976), 99. See also ibid., 66. One of the reasons for the development of the Rokushō-ji was to create land holding institutions; that is, although resources for retirement residences were assured, increasingly any other funds for the imperial house were limited; "With the decline of edict fields due to the regulation ordinances of the early tenth century, the imperial house had developed only the goin holdings, a few fields which provided specific support for certain palaces owned by the house." Ibid., 117.

Goin will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.
positions at them and, since such positions also involved the management of the complex, the temple would gradually become associated with their sect.

Ninna-ji, however, was exceptional in that it had a retired emperor as its founder. Moreover, as Uda had been initiated into the Shingon sect and attained the rank of ajari, he actively and consciously promoted it; it had been through his efforts that Kūkai, the founder of the Shingon school in Japan, was given the posthumous name of Kōbō Daishi.\(^{28}\) Accordingly, Uda held to the esoteric (mikkyō) Buddhist tradition of strict master-student lineages, and so only Shingon priests were allowed to be appointed to the office of bettō at Ninna-ji. Moreover, beginning with his grandson, Kankū (882-970), only direct descendents of the emperor were allowed to take up that office there. The temple appears to be unique in that this office was limited to these hōshinnō (i.e., Imperial Prince Priests); no other temple insisted on bloodlines in determining candidacy for the highest office, and, as a result, Ninna-ji was to become a temple associated with high ranking Shingon priests.

The transmission of such an office within the imperial family shows that besides its function as a Shingon centre, Ninna-ji was also consciously being promoted as superior to other goganji. Moreover, the bloodlines of these imperial princes not only added to the prestige of the Shingon sect but

\(^{28}\)This active promotion of the Shingon tradition was, however, not solely due to the initiative of Uda, but can also be attributed to the influence of his teacher, Yakushin.
also enabled the princes to procure the highest positions at other major temples.29

It appears, then, that there was a conscious effort to limit the influence of the Tendai school, promote the Shingon school, and develop the Nishiyama area of the capital. These features, as well as less tolerance for access to the temple by priests of other sects, appear to have been unique to Ninna-ji. However, despite one's initial tendency to associate Ninna-ji with a particular "school," it is, in fact, problematic to characterize any temple at this time as being "sectarian" in any modern sense of the word. For all the efforts to promote it as a "Shingon" temple, the main icon at Ninna-ji remained the Mida no Sanzon 弥陀の三尊 (i.e., Amida and his two attendant bodhisattvas, Kannon and Seishi), and not a Dainichi Buddha, the central Buddha in the Shingon school. What this implies, then, is that Uda's concern for promoting Ninna-ji can be seen as being as much a means of limiting access to the elite nature of this imperial temple as it was a concern with sectarian interests.

By virtue of its prestige, Ninna-ji was to become the model for all gogan-ji and eventually it became the most important gogan-ji of the imperial family. At the same time, of course, this temple was exceptional; as its founder, Uda was able to

29Kankū, Kanchō 宽朝, Gagyō 雅慶, Seishin 済信, and other direct descendants of Uda held not only the position of bettō at Ninna-ji but, among other positions, chōja 長者 at Tō-ji, zasu at Kongōbu-ji 金剛峯寺, and bettō at Tōdai-ji.
control the temple, and its function as an omuro ("hermitage") for the ex-emperor added a distinctive element to the complex. Moreover, since the inheritance of the omuro by an imperial prince also entailed the inheritance of clerical positions, we see here a real fusion, not only institutionally, but administratively, of a gosho and a temple.

Ninna-ji, however, did not remain self-contained; not only did its bettō seek high positions at other temples, but it also began to control other temples in the Nishiyama area by becoming the head temple (hon-ji) of such institutions as Enjō-ji 円成寺 and Jōfuku-ji 淨福寺. Later, four other temples in its immediate vicinity, temples that became known as the Shien-ji, came under its control, and eventually its influence spread beyond the Nishiyama area when it took over the administrative leadership of the Rokushō-ji. As noted above, the establishment of matsu-ji represented a way of increasing a main temple's assets but, as we shall see, there was more going on than just the accumulation of resources.

The Shien-ji 四圓寺

The Shien-ji were four temples built in the Nishiyama area in the vicinity of Ninna-ji. Enyu-ji 圓融寺 was the largest in size, followed by Enshū-ji 圓宗寺, Enjō-ji 圓乘寺, and finally Enkyō-ji 圓教寺. These temples were closely associated with Ninna-ji and so, as will be seen presently, there is a
significance to their proximity to it, as well as to the imperial tomb of Emperor Murakami.

These temples became important as sites for the reading of sutras during death anniversaries of emperors and were built not only as kigan-ji 祈願寺 (i.e., temples built to fulfill some particular vow or supplication), but also as bodai-ji. Moreover, except for Enshū-ji, they also served as residences, and so were built in the shinden zukuri style, giving them the character of a goin (i.e., palace for the retired emperor). As in the case of Ninna-ji this endowed them with some degree of political significance; it must be kept in mind that despite their characterization as bodai-ji, religious activity during this period was still largely concerned with benefits for the present world and not the next. As we shall see, these factors take on an added importance when considering this group of temples as the forerunners of the Rokushō-ji.

Enyū-ji 圓融寺

This temple was established by Emperor Enyū 圓融, who waited for its completion before abdicating in 984 at the age of twenty-six. The kuyō ceremony for Enyū-ji was held on the 22nd day of the 3rd month of Eikan 1 (983) and was officiated by the

---

30 Taki Yoshinari 濁 善成, "Shien-ji, Hosshō - Hōjō-ji no kenkyū" 四園寺、法性・法成寺の研究, Shien 史苑 10, no. 3 (1936): passim.
priest Kanchō 宽朝. According to Ninna-ji shoinkeki 仁和寺諸院家記, the site of this temple was originally the zenshitsu 禅室 (i.e., residence) of the above mentioned Kanchō. Its geographical location is uncertain, but since it was originally on the site of a residence for the bettō of Ninna-ji, it must have been quite close to that temple. No traces of Enyü-ji remain, today but research indicates that it was situated on the site of what is now the pond at Ryōan-ji, which would put it just northeast of present day Ninna-ji. Possibly the site was chosen because it was close to the imperial tomb of Enyü's father, Emperor Murakami, and was to serve as a place to hold services for his spirit.

Due to the lack of documentation it is unclear how the Shien-ji were financed, but in the case of Enyü-ji we know that Emperor Enyü charged the Kii district of the province of Yamashiro with the responsibility of providing various supplies

---

31 Kanchō (936-98) was the second son of Atsumi Shinnō and a grandson of Uda. He became a priest at Ninna-ji at the age of 11 (the significance of entering the priesthood at such early ages will be discussed below), and by the time of this kuyō ceremony he had been made bettō of Ninna-ji.

32 Although this term refers to a room for Zen practice it can also be used to refer to a hōjō 方丈 (i.e., head priest's room).

33 Kyoto no rekishi, 1:576.
for the temple and had lands from it, as well as chokushiden from other Kinai provinces, allocated to support it.\textsuperscript{34}

Although it has been said that Enyü built this temple for the artless pursuit of religious affairs, it has also been suggested that, as was the case with Uda, Enyü had determined to exert political power from his retirement palace through his son, the emperor Ichijō. In fact, Enyü appears to have taken Uda and Ninna-ji as models, building this temple as a retreat from the court and close to his father's grave.

Enyü had been forced by Fujiwara Kaneie\textsuperscript{35}, to abdicate in order to make way for his brother's (i.e., Reizei) son, who was to become the emperor Kazan. Although the new crown prince was, in fact, Enyü's own son, as a result of the forced abdication it seems that Enyü became determined to check the power of the Fujiwara. This was because during his reign of fifteen years Enyü had had little political power since he had ascended the throne at the age of eleven; it was only when Ichijō became emperor that Enyü had any political influence. Although much is

\textsuperscript{34}See \textit{Heian Ibun}, 2, part 2:458, document 319.

It is assumed that the other Shien-ji depended largely on the practice of jōgō 成功, the buying of offices through donations, (a practice, that, as we shall see, was employed to finance the Rokushō-ji as well) for the actual construction of the various buildings. See Taki, 25-28. On the topic of jōgō see the chapter, "Jōgō eishaku-kô" 成功・榮爵考, in Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:587-640.

\textsuperscript{35}This was to ensure that Kaneie's grandson's position as crown prince was secure.
made of Enyü's establishment of the in no chō in 984, this does not necessarily indicate that he had institutionalized the power of the retired emperor at this time. Nevertheless, Enyü's influence from retirement appears to have been considerable and his political power greater than that of the emperor.

Within a year of his abdication Enyü received the tonsure from Kanchō at Tō-ji. Because of this master-disciple relationship with Kanchō, who, as noted above, was bettō of Ninna-ji, Enyü-ji came under the jurisdiction of Ninna-ji and, in effect, became a kind of matsu-ji of the older temple.37

Enyü-ji was built in the shinden style and was even equipped with a tsuridono 鈴殿 (pond pavilion), a feature not seen in temple complexes until then, but characteristic of contemporary Heian residential architecture.38 Thus it clearly functioned as a residence for the ex-emperor (i.e., as a kind of goin 後院), and at the end of 985 the now retired emperor Enyü moved there from the Horikawa-in.39 This contrasts with the omuro of Ninna-ji which, as noted above, was seen as a temporary

See Hurst's assessment of the importance of the term. Hurst (1976), 85-86.


38For a full account of the various structures that made up the Enyü-ji complex, see ibid., 548-49.

residence, and was not built in the style of contemporary residential mansions.

Enyü eventually died at Enyü-ji, but his remains were not interred there. They were placed in a mausoleum near the grave of his father, Murakami, which lies just west of Ninna-ji.⁴⁰

**Enkyō-ji 圓教寺**

This temple was established by Emperor Ichijō, who attended the rakkei kuyō ceremony that was held in 998 and officiated by the above mentioned Kanchō.⁴¹ It is not known what the original scale of Enkyō-ji was, although we have some idea from later

---

⁴⁰Enyü's mausoleum is known as Nochi no Murakami no Misasagi 後村上陵.

The burial customs of emperors seem to have varied. That is, although most emperors were cremated, many were not; for example, Yōzei (57th emperor), Daigo (60th), Murakami (62nd), Go-Shirakawa (77th), Go-Horikawa (86th), Shijō (87th), Go-Daigo (96th), Go-Murakami (96th), and Go-Kamayama (98th) were buried. However, whatever the form, it seems that the cremation and the interment of the bones or the body were not carried out at the late emperor's or ex-emperor's residence. Uda died at Ninna-ji, but his body was removed the night of his death to Ōuchi-yama where it was cremated the following day. His ashes were interred there, but this seems not to have been the usual practice. By and large the site of the cremation and the site of the interment of the ashes were generally separate, as in the case of Emperor Enyü, whose remains were cremated just to the north of Enyü-ji. See Fujii Toshiaki 藤井利章, *Tennō to goryō wo shiru jiten 天皇と御陵を知る事典* (Tokyo: Nihon Bungeisha), 1990. See also Ponsonby Fane, "The Imperial Mausolea of Japan," in *The Imperial House of Japan* (Kyoto: The Ponsonby Memorial Society, 1959), 369-430.

⁴¹See the entry for Chōtoku 4 (998) 1/22, in *Nihon kiryaku*, KT 11:189.
references to it of the kinds of structures that existed.42 The temple underwent many repairs and much remodeling during its existence and some sixteen years after it was destroyed by fire in 1018, there was a kuyō ceremony for its restoration.43 As no traces of the temple remain (it did not survive past the Kamakura era), its location is uncertain, but it was probably situated southeast of Ninna-ji.

In 1045 the Enkyō-ji became the repository for the ashes of Emperor Go-Suzaku, which were later (in 1055) transferred to the newly established Enjō-ji, a temple that he had begun but not completed before his death.44 In 1068 the Emperor Go-Reizei's remains were also interred at this temple45 but the remains of Ichijō were not. In the latter's case, after cremation at Nagasaka no 長坂野 in the Kitayama 北山 region, they were first placed at Enjō-ji 円成寺, but due to the inauspiciousness of the location were later moved to what became known as the Enyü-ji no Kita no Misasagi 円融寺北陵, which is just north of Enyü-ji and the site of the cremation of Ichijō's father's (i.e., Emperor

42 For discussion of the structures see Sugiyama Nobuzō 杉山信三, In no gosho to mido 院の御所と御堂 (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūsho, 1962), 25.

43 Kyoto no rekishi, 1:579. For a description of the structures in this complex see Hiraoka (1981), 552.

44 However, his tomb, the Enjō-ji no Misasagi 円乗寺陵, now lies just north of Enyü-ji.

45 Again, his present tomb, the Enkyō-ji no Misasagi 円教寺陵, actually lies to the north of Enyü-ji, along with those of Go-Suzaku and Go-Sanjō.
Enyu's) remains. In the fifth month of 1012, the first year memorial service of the death of Ichijō was held at Enkyō-ji, his gogan-ji.

The custom of holding memorial services at a temple with which one had some connection dates from the time of Empress Jitō (645-702). From the time of Enkyō-ji's establishment it functioned as both kigan-ji and bodai-ji, as was also the case with the later Shien-ji. However, by the late Heian period the functions of bodai-ji and kigan-ji would be divided between two different temples and it became customary to hold memorial services at both the imperial temple/residence where the emperor died (in which case the temple took on the characteristics of a bodai-ji), and also a temple to which he had some close connection, that is, his kigan-ji. For example, in the case of Emperor Toba (1103-56), Saishō-ji functioned as a kigan-ji, but Anrakuju-in 安楽寿院, situated in the grounds of the Toba palace where he died, served as a bodai-ji. Moreover, his remains were interred in the Toba compound under a pagoda which came to be known as the Anrakujuin no Misasagi 安楽寿院陵.

---

46 As seen from the above examples, however, the funeral and the cremation of the deceased continued to take place in separate locations.
Enjō-ji

This temple was begun by Emperor Go-Suzaku and, on his death, completed by Emperor Go-Reizei, the kuyō ceremony taking place in 1055. It was said to have been a "new structure" for Enkyō-ji, and therefore was closely connected to the latter. Its location is uncertain, but it appears to have been situated south of Ninna-ji and west of Enkyō-ji. Whatever the case, because of its relation with Enkyō-ji, it must have been close to it.

We know little about this temple other than that it was damaged by a typhoon in 1095 and destroyed by fire in 1105, after which it was not restored. Consequently it came to be known as the Yakidō, and today no trace of it remains.

Enshū-ji

This was a goganji of Emperor Go-Sanjō, who attended the rakkei kuyō on the 26th day of the 12 month of 1070. It was built not only for his own benefit but also to fulfill his filial duties to his late father, Go-Suzaku, whose remains were interred at Enkyō-ji. In 1071 there was another kuyō ceremony for the jōgyōdō 常行堂 ("Constant Practice Hall") and kanjōdō 灌

"I.e., shindō 新堂. The term is not clear but perhaps it refers to some kind of addition to Enkyō-ji."
The main icon housed in the kondō was a Dainichi Nyōrai (i.e., Birushana Buddha). This was the largest in scale of the Shien-ji, and even though its grounds included a pond with an island, Enshū-ji still was not as large as Michinaga’s Hōjō-ji.

Originally this temple was called Enmyō-ji 円明寺, but because earlier, in 992, Minamoto no Yasumitsu 源保光 (924-95) had built a temple by that name in Yamazaki 山崎, in 1071 the temple's name was changed to Enshū-ji. Its location too is uncertain, but it was perhaps situated south, or south-east, of Ninna-ji, as it was said to be close to the grave of Emperor Go-Reizei, which lies in that direction. This too was a branch temple (i.e., ko-in 子院) of Ninna-ji, and of all the temples in the Nishiyama area it could actually be seen to be the model for the Rokushō-ji in the Shirakawa district.

The construction of this temple was financed through the practice of jōgō, that is, the buying of government positions through "donations", by Minamoto Koreie 源維家, and in 1167, through the "donation" of Taira Ietō 平家遠, the pagoda was repaired. By the end of the Kamakura era, however, the temple was in ruins.

---

48 For a discussion of the structures built in this temple compound see Hiraoka (1981), 558-59. For a comparison of the buildings in each of the Shien-ji temples see ibid, 561. See also Sugiyama Nobuzō (1962), 26.
Looking at the amount of time that passed between an emperor's enthronement and the establishment of his corresponding gogan-ji in the Nishiyama district, we see a correlation between the two in the incentive of the emperor; in the case of Ninna-ji it was the death of Emperor Kōkō and the necessity on the part of Uda to erect the temple in time for death anniversary services. In the case of Go-Sanjo's Enshū-ji the motivation can be seen to be a conscious effort to rival the power of Fujiwara Yorimichi and to establish the emperor's insei seiken in an effort to bring about the fall of the sekkanke branch of the Fujiwara and reestablish imperial power. Neither Go-Sanjō's mother nor any of his direct relatives was a Fujiwara, and his efforts to break away from the influence of the Fujiwara sekkanke are well known. The antagonism between him and Fujiwara Yorimichi (who had served as sesshō and kampaku during the reigns of Emperors Ichi-jō, Go-Suzaku, and Go-Reizei) and his abdication appear to have been motivated by a desire to ensure that succession fell to princes not closely related to the Fujiwara. ⁴⁹

Enshū-ji, then, was established only three years after Go-Sanjō's accession to the throne, a relatively short period of time when compared with the establishment of the other Shien-ji and the accession to the throne of their corresponding imperial patrons. This indicates, as noted above, that gogan-ji had a

⁴⁹See Hurst (1976), 123.
practical function and, at times, some degree of political significance.

Go-Sanjō was cremated just south of Kagura ga Oka 神楽岡, and although his remains were first enshrined at Zenrin-ji 神林寺, they were later transferred to the Enshū-ji no Misasagi 円宗寺陵. This tomb is actually located just to the north of Enyū-ji, along with those of Go-Suzaku and Go-Reizei, and because accounts written only some thirty years after his death give this location, it is uncertain whether his remains were ever enshrined at Enshū-ji or if the name was applied to the tomb only because it referred to his gogan-ji.

Enshū-ji differed from the other three Shien-ji in that it became the site of a lecture series. Starting in 1072, Hokke-e 法華会 and Saishō-e 最勝会 lectures were held there; the Saishō-e was held in the kondō in the spring to pray for peace in the country and an abundant harvest, and the Hokke-e was held in the kōdō in the fall to guide the beings of the six paths. The fact that these were Tendai rituals contrasts with the Shingon nature of the other Shien-ji, and they were important for Tendai monks as a means of advancing in the clerical hierarchy. In 1082 financial funding for these two lecture series was permanently guaranteed by the court, which explains the large scale and the prestige of this particular "En" temple.

---

50 Alternate reading, Ensō-ji no Misasagi.
51 See Fujii, 158.
To participate in them. Since attendance at these lectures led to advancement in the clerical hierarchy, there was much competition among temples and organizations for seats. The lectures were moved to Kotoku-ji in 714, and in 839 monks engaged in the lectures were appointed to the Sogyo and the temple San-e Koshin. From 834 to 839, the lectures were held at Koyasan-ji. In 714, the lectures were moved to Kotoku-ji for one week beginning on the 17th day of the 10th month. This lecture series was started by the monks of Koyasan-ji. Lectures on the Visnudharmaparvata-stotra were also given at the Sattsu-ji, which was also a lecture series on the Mahayana scriptures.

The Mahayana texts were also expounded for the peace and well-being of the king. The lecture on the Visnudharmaparvata-stotra was held at the Koyasan-ji for seven days starting on the 1st of the 7th month of the year (2). The lecture on the Visnudharmaparvata-stotra, held at the Sattsu-ji, was also given for one week beginning on the 17th day of the 10th month of the year (3). The lectures on the Mahayana scriptures were also given for one week starting on the 17th day of the 10th month of the year (4). The lectures on the Visnudharmaparvata-stotra were also given for one week beginning on the 17th day of the 10th month of the year (5). The lectures on the Mahayana scriptures were also given for one week starting on the 17th day of the 10th month of the year (6).
For the *Nankyō no san dai-e* Shingon priests from the various Nara temples were employed. In the *Hokkyō no san dai-e* Tendai monks from Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji alternated from year to year in presiding over the lectures; moreover, only Tendai monks could participate, thus the name *Tendai sandai-e*. By way of these lectures Tendai monks were able to advance in the Sōgō without attending the Nara lectures, and so this can be seen to have been an attempt to procure some independence for the Tendai monks from Nara (even during the earlier *Ni-e* lectures the leading Tendai monk was appointed to the Sōgō)\(^{53}\). The *san-e*, then, signified the growing prosperity of the Tendai school and the decline of the Shingon tradition, as well as the weakening of Nara's ecclesiastical power.

With the inauguration of the *Hokke-e*, Enryaku-ji's influence permeated Enshū-ji, largely because the lecture series held there became important for the advancement of Tendai monks. Moreover, although the *kuyō* ceremony for Enshū-ji was performed by Ninna-ji's Shōshin Hōshinnō, its *gon bettō* was Shōban 勝範, *zasu* of Enryaku-ji, who was appointed due to Emperor Go-Sanjō's personal acquaintance with the priest. Thus, except for the *kanjōdō*, which was under the control of Ninna-ji, all the other structures and rituals of Enshū-ji were under the influence of

the Tendai school, unlike the three other "En" temples, which, for the most part, followed the Shingon tradition.

The Relation Between Ninna-ji and the Shien-ji

The Shien-ji had their roots not only conceptually but also administratively in Ninna-ji. The latter temple dominated the important offices of these branch temples with its own priests, thereby ensuring that they would not slip out of its control, a practice that would continue with the Rokushō-ji: Shōshin Hōshinno 性信法親王 (1005-85) was chōri 長吏54 of Enshū-ji for sixteen years, and kengyō of Hosshō-ji for ten years; Kakugyō Hōshinnō 覚行法親王 (1091-1153) succeeded Sōshin and became kengyō of both Enshū-ji and Hosshō-ji; and Kanjo 宽助 (1057-1125) was bettō of Ninna-ji as well as Enjō-ji. This monopoly of the top positions of the Shien-ji appears to have been a new method of keeping control of branch temples, and eventually the hōshinno, who were the bettō of Ninna-ji, came to dominate the major offices of other temples as well, which we shall presently see in the case of the Rokushō-ji.

Seen in this light, the physical proximity of the Shien-ji to Ninna-ji cannot have been a mere coincidence. Although it has been suggested that the clustering of these temples and imperial tombs in a specific area was an attempt to create a Buddhist

54 Chōri appears to be a generic term referring to the head of a temple. Therefore it corresponds to such positions as zasu, bettō, or kengyō.
retreat, or a "Buddhist World" isolated from the court, it may also have represented an attempt by the imperial family to strengthen its solidarity, a solidarity symbolized by the ritual protection and veneration of the graves of imperial patriarchs (i.e., former emperors) that was accomplished by erecting temples near them. This indicates not only a waning in the sense of pollution attached to the dead, but also a need to reaffirm public recognition of the status of imperial ancestors in the wake of a growing number of powerful families, or kemmon. The practice of interring the remains of emperors near the Shien-ji and the holding of death anniversary memorials at these institutions kept their memories alive, thus reaffirming the legitimacy of the status of the imperial house.

Furthermore, this concentration of structures may be seen as corresponding to an already existing example of clan solidarity incarnate; that is, temple clustering on the part of the Fujiwara to the east (Kaneie's 華厳院, Michitaka's 道隆 Shakuzen-ji 積善寺) and also south east of the imperial court (Tadahira's 忠平 Hōshō-ji, built in 925, and Michinaga's Hōjō-ji and Jōmyō-ji 净妙寺, built in 1005), which

55As suggested in Kyoto no rekishi, 1:569.

56Despite this change in function these imperial gogan-ji still maintained some sense of being "public" institutions; that is, rituals for the welfare of the state continued to be held at them. This may also have been a factor in mitigating the sense of pollution associated with the deceased at a bodai-ji.
were built as *bodai-ji* for specific Fujiwara members as well for the general wellbeing of the clan.

Thus, for the imperial house these structures to the northwest of the imperial palace represented a change in the function of temples from that of performing rituals for the state to that of performing rituals for individual imperial family members, which signalled a new concern for the imperial house in general. As we will see, the Rokushō-ji can be seen as the final stage in the development of *gogan-ji*, a stage that was dominated by concerns for these new "private" family interests.
The six temples of the Rokushō-ji were not randomly situated but, rather, grouped together in an area of approximately one square kilometer in the Shirakawa district. The main thoroughfare, Nijō-ōji 二条大路, ran into the western gate of Hosshō-ji and the other five temples, as well as the ex-emperor Shirakawa's gosho, Shirakawa Izumidono, all faced onto this road.¹

Hosshō-ji was the largest, followed by Sonshōji, Enshōji 延勝寺 (these two temples were rectangular, approximately one chō by two chō), Saishōji, Enshōji 円勝寺, and then Seishōji (these last three were relatively small, each being only one chō square).² Relatively few documents concerning the latter four temples have survived, especially when compared to the material


²One chō measured 109 meters.

³There is, however, some question as to the size of these temples. Fukuyama, using Tokugawa documents, has a slightly different distribution of the temples from Sugiyama Nobuzō and places Saishō-ji as next in size after Sonshō-ji. See Fukuyama, 439-68 and Sugiyama (1981), 108-09.
available for the first two. For example, although several references can be found concerning the selection of a site, the construction, and kuyō ceremonies of Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji, in the case of Saishō-ji, a pagoda for the temple complex had already been erected by the time we find any surviving documents concerning it.

None of the six temples seem to have survived beyond the fifteenth century. The immediate cause of their disappearance was, first, a great earthquake that hit Kyoto in 1185 and seriously damaged many structures in the Shirakawa area and second, a series of fires during the Kamakura era.

Hosshōji 法勝寺

Construction of Hosshō-ji was begun by Emperor Shirakawa in 1075, about two years after his accession to the throne. It was built in the vicinity of what is now the zoo in Okazaki Park in present day Kyoto's Sakyō-ku. Shirakawa had been involved in

---

4For a description of the earthquake see the entry for Genryaku 2 (1185)/7/9 in fascicle 42 of Gyoku'yō 玉葉, ed. Ichijima Kenkichi 市島謙吉, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1907), 3:89. See also the entry for the same date in Kikki 吉記, ZST 30:149, as well as in Sankaiki 山槐記, ZST 28:227.

5See entry for Jōkyū 1 (1219)/4/1 & 2 in Hyakurensō 百練抄, KT 11:151. It appears that some of these fires were the result of arson committed by thieves. See the entry for Jōkyū 1 (1219)/4/2 in Ninna-ji hinamiki 仁和寺日次記, ZGR 29b:341.

6The location of the temple and its archeological remains was the subject of a study in 1925 by Nishida Naojirō 西田直二郎 in the article "Hosshō-ji ishi" 法勝寺遺址, reprinted in Nishida (1961). This was followed in 1943 by Fukuyama Toshio's
many religious activities even before his decision to take the tonsure in 1096, and according to *Eiga monogatari* he had long desired to build this temple.\(^7\) However, Hosshō-ji was not just the result of Shirakawa's religious devotion; it also represented the fulfillment of his father Go-Sanjō's intent to curtail, or at least compete with, the power of the sekkankē, as seen above in the discussion of Enshū-ji. Moreover, such gogan-ji were well supported by *in no kinshin* 院の近親 (i.e., close associates of the ex-emperor\(^8\)), in part to ensure some degree of security in the face of an overwhelming Fujiwara presence. As a result, various *zuryō* 受領, who are often referred to as

---

\(^7\)See *Eiga monogatari*, fascicle 39, NKBT 76:528. Fujiwara Munetada (1062-1141) lists a number of Shirakawa's religious accomplishments including the commissioning of some 3,150 life-size and 2,930 smaller sculptures, 5,470 paintings, and the construction of twenty-one pagodas. See the entry for Tenji 4 (1127)/7/25 in *Chūyōki* 中右記, ZST 14:73. *Shirakawa hōō hachiman issaikyō kuyō ganmon* 白川法皇八幡一切経供養願文 also has a large list of his acts of devotion. See KT 29b:204-08.

Shirakawa's decision to take the tonsure appears to have been precipitated by the death of his daughter Ikuhōmonin Teishi Shinnō 郁芳門院 嬸子新王 in 1096.

\(^8\)This is Hurst's translation of the term. See Hurst (1976), 237-53. This group will be discussed in the next chapter.
provincial governors\textsuperscript{9}, competed to aid in the construction of this particular temple.\textsuperscript{10}

It appears, then, that Hosshō-ji was meant to surpass Fujiwara Michinaga's Hōjō-ji in scale and to display the power and authority of the imperial family.\textsuperscript{11} Being the most prestigious imperial gogan-ji during the insei period, it did succeed to do this to some extent; not only was it larger than Michinaga's Hōjō-ji, but its status was superior in that it became important in the procedure of obtaining promotions for monks in the Sōgō, as we shall see presently.

Although the kuyō ceremony for the Amida Hall, godaidō, hokkedō and kyōzō 経蔵\textsuperscript{12} was held in 1076, the kuyō ceremony for the temple as a whole did not take place until the next year

\textsuperscript{9}This term is also discussed in the next chapter.

\textsuperscript{10}In fact the temple is referred to as the gogan-ji of both Emperors Go-Sanjō and Shirakawa in Shoji kuyō ki 諸寺供養記. See Shiseki shūran 史籍集覧, 33 vols. (Tokyo: Kondō Kappanjo, 1900-25), 12:369. The zuryō were mainly concerned with obtaining lucrative appointments in return for supporting the temple, a practice which we have already seen with respect to the Shien-ji. See Nihon rekishi taikei 日本歴史大系, ed. Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞, 6 vols. (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1984), 1:981.

\textsuperscript{11}Hōjō-ji, well known for its opulence and beauty, was built in 1022, in part as an appeasement for Michinaga's treatment of Emperor Sanjō, but also as a place for Michinaga to spend his final days. It was destroyed by fire in 1058, and although rebuilding began the following year, the final structures were not completed until 1090. Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji were no doubt influenced by the thirty years of restoration work being done on this temple. See Sugiyama Nobuzō 杉山信三, Fujiwarashī no ujidera to sono inge 藤原氏の氏寺とその院家 (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūsho, 1968), 79.

\textsuperscript{12}Repository for scriptures.
when the kondo was completed. The later ceremony appears to have been particularly elaborate as it was attended by not only the emperor, but also his consort (i.e., chūgū). Structures continued to be built until 1084, when the jōgūdō was completed. Hosshō-ji was the largest in size of the Rokushōji (it took some ten years from the start of construction to complete the complex), and the basic model for the others.

The records of the 1077 kuyo ceremony, which are found in the Hosshō-ji kuyo ki 法勝寺供養記, list the temple's most important clerical positions in the following order; kengyō 檢校 (Ninna-ji's Nyūdō Shōshin 入道性信⁴), bettō (Onjō-ji's chōri daisōjō⁵ Kakuen 長束大僧正覺圓), gonbettō (Enryaku-ji zasu, sōjō Kakujin 僧正覺尋), and jōza 上座⁶ (Shōkei 政慶). It is clear from this document that the position of kengyō was the highest rank at Hosshō-ji and it appears that it, as well as the

---

⁴Also known as Shōshin Hōshinnō 性信法親王 (d. 1085). He was the fourth son of Emperor Sanjō and became bettō of Ninna-ji (although at Hosshō-ji the highest clerical position was that of kengyō, in the case of Ninna-ji it was bettō).

⁵(1031-98), son of Fujiwara Yorimichi 藤原顕通. Kakuen was chōri of Onjō-ji, head temple of the Jimon school of the Tendai tradition. He also became zasu of Enryaku-ji in 1077, although he had to resign from this position almost immediately due to opposition from the Sanmon school.

⁶Senior priest who supervises ceremonies and services.

⁷See Shōryaku gannen Hosshō-ji kuyo ki 承暦元年法勝寺供養記, ZGR 27a:131.
position of kengyō for all the Rokushō-ji, was filled by only imperial princes who were also head priests of Ninna-ji. Accordingly, in 1098 the position of kengyō of Hosshō-ji went to Kakugyō Hōshinnō 覚行法親王, third son of Shirakawa.¹⁸

The temple suffered some damage in 1185 from an earthquake and again in 1208 from a fire caused by lightning.¹⁹ The Jōkyō no Ran (1221) and a fire in 1342 caused further deterioration of the temple's structures.²⁰ In the late Kamakura era Hosshō-ji became a branch temple of Enryaku-ji and a kaidan was established there, thus allowing it to undergo a revival of fortunes for a short time.²¹ During the Northern and Southern Court period (1337-92) many of its structures were destroyed by fire and several of the temple's lands were lost, and after Ōnin no ran (1467-77) all traces of the complex are said to have disappeared. However, in 1535 the Emperor Go-Nara 御奈良 had weekly memorial services (nanuka nanuka no ki'nichi 七七の忌日) held for his mother at Hosshō-ji. Moreover, in the same year the bakufu apparently restored the land on which Enshō-ji 延勝寺 stood to Hosshō-ji, so some structures must have survived or

---

¹⁸See Hiraoka (1981), 644. The significance of this will be seen in the next chapter.

¹⁹Repairs were apparently made, as kuyō ceremonies were held in the fourth month of Kenryaku 3 (1212).

²⁰For details on the fire see, Nishida, 241-45. See also the chapter "Hosshō-ji no tōenjō no koto" 法勝寺の塔災上の事, in Taiheiki, fascicle 21, NKBT 35:340-41.

been rebuilt, thus enabling it to continue to carry out some of the functions of a temple.\textsuperscript{22}

In 1590 Hosshō-ji merged with the Tendai temple Saikyō-ji in Ōmi province to which a portion of its most valued possessions was transferred. A seated Amida statue from Hosshō-ji is now said to be the honzon 本尊 (i.e., the main object of worship, or icon), in Saihō-ji 方寺 in the Higashiyama district of Kyoto.\textsuperscript{23}

The name of Hosshō-ji may have been purposely picked to contrast with Michinaga's Hōjō-ji. The latter was a Jōdo temple and its well known Amida Hall was the center of its activities.\textsuperscript{24} However, in the case of Hosshō-ji the kondō was the central

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22}See entry for Temmon 4 (1535)/2/16 in Tokitsugu-kyōki 言継卿記, cited in Okuno Takahiro (1956), 132.
\begin{itemize}
\item It appears that the Nichiren sect temple Honkō-ji 本光寺 was also at some point built on the site but was later moved to another part of Kyoto. See Hayashiya Tatsusaburō 林屋 杉三郎, "Hōshōji no sōken" 法勝寺の創建, in Koten bunka no sōzō 古典文化の創造 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1964), 177.
\end{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23}See Okuno Takahiro (1956), 132. The primary source for this appears to be Yōshū fushi 雍州府志, a topography written in the Edo era. See ZZGR 8:88. Although I have found a reference connecting Hosshō-ji to Saikyō-ji--see Zenkoku jiin meikan 全国寺院名鑑, 4 vols. (Tokyo: Jiin Meikan Kankōkai, 1969-70), s.v. "Saikyō-ji" 西教寺--I have been unable to connect the honzon of Saihō-ji to the seated Amida statue of Hosshō-ji.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Michinaga appears to have been particularly fond of this building and had his bed moved there when close to death. Eventually he passed away in the hall. See Eiga monogatari, fascicle 30, NKBT 76:322; for English version, see McCullough and McCullough, 2:760. For his devotion to the construction of the temple, see fascicle 15, NKBT 75:445-47; for an English version, see McCullough and McCullough, 2:497-504.
\end{itemize}
structure and its honzon was the Birushana Buddha. The large scale of this statue (i.e., sanjō nishaku 三丈二尺, or some ten meters) led Kakujin, who served as the dōshi (i.e., chief priest), at Hosshō-ji's kuyō ceremony, to refer to the temple as the "Dai-Birushanadera" 大毘盧遮那寺. Since the honzon of Tōdai-ji was also the Birushana Buddha, which, at the time of its construction in 745 symbolized the power of the emperor as a source of unity and harmony, it has been suggested that Hosshō-ji's daibutsu, although nowhere near as large in scale as that of Tōdai-ji, was symbolic of an attempt on the part of Shirakawa to display the same icons of imperial power that had been utilized under the ritsuryō system of the Tempyō era (749-58). This was an era associated with not only the

Hayashiya states that the Amida hall of Hosshō-ji was relegated to a corner of the complex and occupied a far less important role than that of the kondō. See Hayashiya (1964), 167. This is not to say that the Amida Hall was a minor structure, for it was the largest building on the grounds and might have been meant to serve as a gosho for the ex-emperor. See Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:561. Even if it had not been meant to serve as a residence, the size of the hall was no doubt meant to rival that of Michinaga's Hōjō-ji and to symbolize the authority of the imperial family. See Nihon rekishi taikei, 1:982.

See the entry on Hosshō-ji in Kojidan 古事談, KT 18:110. Technically any Buddha statue over the height known as jōroku (i.e., 1 jō, 6 shaku, or 4.9 meters) came to be called a daibutsu. Compare the Hosshō-ji Buddha of 10 meters with the Nara daibutsu of Tōdai-ji built in 752 (15 meters), and the mid-thirteenth century Kamakura daibutsu, which stands at 11.4 meters.
prosperity of Buddhism, but also strong imperial rule. Moreover, the physical layout of Hosshō-ji, with its south gate, pagoda, kondō, and kōdō aligned in a straight line, is the same as the Asuka-style Shitenno-ji and again may have been meant to revive models representative of a time when there was a strong and active imperial presence.

The temple grounds included a pond that was fed by the Shirakawa river. This feature traces back to Enyū-ji, one of the Shien-ji, and the inclusion of a pond at this time was also partly due to the influence of Pure Land Buddhism; that is, it was an attempt to create a physical representation of the Jōdo paradise. In the middle of the pond was an island on which stood an eight-sided, nine-storied pagoda, some twenty-seven jō (over eighty meters) high, a structure of unsurpassed scale for the time. Given that the tallest pagoda existing in present day Japan is Tō-ji's five-storied tower, built in 1644, measuring

---

27See Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:563. Seen in this light, it is significant that Enshū-ji, as mentioned above, also housed as its main icon a Birushana Buddha. This will be discussed further below.

28Hayashiya (1964), 167. Although there is no archeological evidence for the layout of the temple, the arrangement of contemporary temples, as well as documentary evidence, suggests that Fukuyama's reconstruction is probably accurate. See Nakagō Toshio, "Hosshō-ji hakkaku kujūtō zōkō" 法 勝寺八角九重塔雑考, Shiseki to bijutsu 史跡と美術 51 (February 1935):4.
only some fifty-four to fifty-five meters in height, this was an impressive structure for not only the Heian era.\textsuperscript{29}

This pagoda was not completed until 1083, some six years after the 1077 kuyō ceremony for the other structures of the temple\textsuperscript{30} perhaps because Shirakawa, who was said to have been fond of elaborate structures, wanted a particularly towering symbol of his authority, and this took some time to complete.\textsuperscript{31}

\begin{marginnote}
\textsuperscript{29}Actually, the measurement of 27 jō refers to the reconstructed pagoda of 1213. No documentation exists that refers to the original's height. But since the reconstruction was on the original site there appears to be no reason that the height would have been altered substantially. Nevertheless, this figure is still problematic in that it appears to date from a fourteenth century source and cannot be verified. See Hayashiya (1964), 169. However, given that among the 8th century structures of Tōdai-ji are said to have been two seven-storied pagodas, each some 100 meters high, and given the fact that a kuyō ceremony document of Shōkoku-ji 相國寺, dated 1392, states that its pagoda was taller than that of Hosshō-ji (see Shōkoku-ji tō kuyōki 相國寺塔供養記, GR, fascicle 434, 24:358), it appears that such tall structures were, although unusual, not unheard of.
\end{marginnote}

\begin{marginnote}
\textsuperscript{30}The pagoda's kuyō ceremony was held on the first day of the 10th month of Eihō 3 (1083). See the entry for this date in Hyakurensō, fascicle 5, KT 11:38. In Kanji 5 (1091) the pagoda was damaged, and after repairs were made another kuyō ceremony was performed in Jotoku 2 (1098). A fire caused by lightning resulted in damage in 1208 and after repairs still another kuyō ceremony took place in 1213. See the entry for Kempō 1 (1213)/4/26 in Hyakurensō, fascicle 12, KT 11:145. The main solicitor for funds (i.e., kanjin 觀進) for this reconstruction was Yōsai 栗西, founder of the Rinzai school of Zen Buddhism in Japan. The pagoda's connection to Tō-ji was reinforced by the fact that Yōsai also acted as kanjin for the reconstruction of Tō-ji. After a subsequent fire in 1342, which destroyed many of the structures of the temple complex (see below), the pagoda was not rebuilt.
\end{marginnote}

\begin{marginnote}
\textsuperscript{31}The scale of both the pagoda and the complex as a whole may also have reflected Shirakawa's demanding nature with respect to the craftsmenship of the structures. On this topic see Mimi Hall Yiengpruksawat, "What's in a Name? Fujiwara
As is well known, pagodas were originally built to house relics. However, by the time the Fujiwara had come to dominate the political and cultural scene of Heian Japan these structures had lost their original function and simply come to be incorporated as part of what was considered to be fashionable in a temple/residence complex. Accordingly, the scale and design of pagodas came to reflect not the importance of the relics housed within, but the status and prestige of the temple itself.\(^{32}\)

Although at that time there were examples of nine-storied pagodas, and examples of eight-sided pagodas, this was the only one that possessed both these features. In fact, it appears that this may have been the only such example ever built in Japan, as there are no archeological remains of any other such pagoda, making it unparalleled in the history of Japanese architecture.\(^{33}\)

The pagoda then, was unique in scale not only to the Hosshō-ji temple complex, but to all of Kyoto, and represented a personal achievement of Shirakawa.\(^{34}\) An indication of this and of the structure's importance can be seen in the fact that Shirakawa was conspicuously present at its kuyō ceremony at a time when it

---


\(^{32}\)See Nakagō, 4-5.

\(^{33}\)See ibid., 1.

\(^{34}\)Over three hundred years later, in 1382, the third Ashikaga shōgun, Yoshimitsu, who also established lavish structures (e.g., Kinkaku-ji), built only a seven-storied pagoda at Shōkoku-ji 相国寺.
was rare for an emperor to attend anything other than the inauguration ceremony of the kondō.

It was said that the pagoda was visible from all parts of the capital and was the first structure seen on entering the city from the east. Since the pagoda of Tō-ji, built in 796 by Emperor Kammu, was situated at the western entrance to the city, these structures became conspicuous symbols to anyone entering the capital of the imperial house's patronage of Buddhism and its resurgence of power and authority. Thus the impression made upon all passing through Heian-kyō was that the imperial house had a strong presence in the capital and, by extension, was the major authority there.³⁵

Moreover, one cannot completely dismiss as retrospective hyperbole Hayashiya's claim that the scope and originality of the Hosshō-ji pagoda can be seen as foreshadowing not only the shift in power to the insei (as we shall see presently, Hosshō-ji and the other Rokushō-ji did serve a particular function in the changing role of the imperial family in twelfth century Japan), but also the rise of the bushi class.³⁶

³⁵See the reference to the magnificence of the pagoda in the early 13th century travel diary Kaidōki 海道記, GR 18:433. See also Namikai, 93 and Hayashiya (1964), 169.

³⁶See Hayashiya (1964), 169-70, 176. This claim is based on ties between bushi and the zuryō class, a group which largely financed this temple. The latter were generally from the lower ranks of the aristocracy and, in some cases, included heads of the newly emerging warrior class. This topic will be discussed in the next chapter.
As seen above, the clerical offices of Hosshō-ji were not limited to monks of only one school. Similarly, the religious practices observed there were not restricted but consisted of a synthesis of rituals from various schools of Buddhism. The Rokushō-ji were definitely mikkyō temples, but they were also the site of exoteric debate and Pure Land rituals. The kondō and godaidō enshrined esoteric Buddhist images and Tendai rites were performed in the Amida Hall and Hokke-dō. However, monks of all sects gathered in the kōdō to read various sutras and, as to be expected, Pure Land Buddhism figured prominently in the temple's Amida Hall, which was representative of Jōdo architecture and housed nine Amida statues. But this synthesis of various types of Buddhism was not limited to Hosshō-ji; Hōjō-ji, indeed most temples of this era, included such a mix of traditions.

Nevertheless, Takeuchi sees in the appointments to the clerical offices of the Rokushō-ji a conscious effort to go against a sectarian trend that had, in fact, been developing throughout the Heian era. In other words, he sees these appointments, along with the enshrinement of the Birushana Buddha as the main icon of the kondō, as an attempt by Shirakawa

---

37 With regard to this see Nihon rekishi taikei 1:981 and also Murai Yasuhiko 村井康彦, ed., Gosho to betsugyō 御所と別業 (Tokyo: Kodansha Shuppan Kenkyūjo, 1984), 42-43.

38 For some eighty years this was the only such structure seen in the Shirakawa district. This interest in large-scale architecture and large numbers of icons led to the first thousand-statue Kannon hall at Tokuchōjū-in in 1132. Nihon rekishi taikei, 1:982-83.
to revive the practices of the Nara period when imperial prestige was high. The six Nara schools were clearly demarcated as separate schools of the Buddhist tradition derived from China, each concentrating on certain teachings or theories. However, there was no sense of exclusion in terms of a monk's studies and, moreover, the practices and rituals among these schools were fluid. Takeuchi's argument is that it was only in the Heian era that distinctions between the various "schools" became important. Examples of this include not only the rivalry between the Tendai and Shingon schools in the case of the lecture meetings of Sonshō-ji (see next chapter), but also the rivalry between the Jimon and the Sanmon branches of the Tendai sect. This theory is not without some merit, as the Rokushō-ji, unlike Ninna-ji, which by this time had been clearly associated with the Shingon tradition, were not identified with any particular school or lineage.

This would also, to some extent, account for the temple's official, or public nature. Hosshō-ji was not only a gogan-ji of the emperor or a place for devotional rituals, such as the Tendai jōgyō-zanmai 常行三昧 meditative practice; with the kondō as its focal point, rituals for the welfare of the state

---


40Kuroda (1980), 5.

41This theory is also proposed by Kuroda. See ibid., 34.

42See entry for Jōhō 4 (1077)/12/18, in Fusōryakki 扶桑略記, fascicle 30, KT 12:319.
(i.e., *chingo kokka* 鎮護国家) were an important feature of the temple as they were in the case of the Shien-ji. This too was not necessarily unique to imperial *gogan-ji*, for as Hōjō-ji was also devoted to the well-being and preservation of the state. However, although three of Michinaga's sons-in-law and four of his grandsons became emperors, Hōjō-ji was not a *bodai-ji* for the sovereign. The *godaidō* of Hōjō-ji was clan specific, built to exorcise vengeful ghosts bearing grudges against the Fujiwara and to help Michinaga concentrate on the *nembutsu* in his final hours. The *godaidō* of Hosshō-ji, on the other hand, was built for the benefit of the institution of the imperial house and for the country as a whole.

The layout of Hosshō-ji and the use of the *shinden zukuri* architectural style of the Heian aristocracy shows the marked difference between temples of the early and the late Heian period. However, Hosshō-ji differs in more than architecture from earlier temples, such as Emperor Seiwa's Engaku-ji (established in 880 in the Rakutō district) or the *omuro* at Ninna-ji, which were, as well as being *jiin* for the offering of

---

13Hiraoka (1981), 609. The identification of Hosshō-ji with Tōdai-ji implied that, as in the case of the latter, it also had close associations with the state interests.

14Ibid., 610.

15See *Hōjō-ji kondō kuyōki* 法成寺金堂供養記 in *Honchō bunshū* 本朝文集, KT 30:188. See also ibid., 615.

16See the reference to Hosshō-ji's *kuyō* ceremony in the entry for Jōhō 4 (1077)/12/18 in *Fusōryakki*, KT 12:319, which makes no mention of the imperial family. See also ibid., 615.
prayers for the safety of the state, also retirement residences where the ex-emperors could end their days.

Shirakawa had Toba-dono built to the south of Heian-kyō in 1086 as a residence for his retirement. Furthermore, a separate gosho, known as the Shirakawa Izumidono 白河泉殿, was built just to the west of Hosshō-ji in 1090 to be used when the then ex-emperor Shirakawa visited the temple. Therefore, although Hosshō-ji could be seen with some justification as a kind of detached palace, it does not seem to have been built primarily as a residence.

As stated above, various zuryō competed to participate in the temple's construction for they received lucrative appointments as provincial governors in return for their financial support. A major contributor was Takashina Tameie 高階為家. He was instrumental in the construction of the kondō, kōdō, kairō 遠廊 (roofed corridors), nandaimon 南大門 (great south gate), shōrō 鐘樓 (alternate reading, shurō; i.e., belfry),

47See footnote 25 above in which it has been suggested that the large scale of the Amida Hall (some eleven ken, or twenty meters, square) indicates that it was intended as some form of residence. See also Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:561. As outlined in the discussion of the omuro at Ninna-ji, with the adoption of the shinden zukuri architectural style there was a close similarity between detached palaces and temples, and distinctions between the two were most likely blurred. See Nihon rekishi taikei, 1:982.

The presence of two residences in the same area, or the fact that Shirakawa built more than one gosho, is not problematic as it was not unusual for emperors and ex-emperors to have several residences. Among Shirakawa's residences were Ōi-dono, Rokujō-dono, Takamatsu-in, Muromachi-dono, Sanjō Karasuma-tei, and Kasuga-dono. See Hurst (1976), 140-42.
kyōzō, etc., and was reappointed governor of Harima as a result.\textsuperscript{48} The governor of Tamba, Fujiwara Akitsuna 藤原顕綱, donated the Amida-dō, and the godaidō was financed by Fujiwara Yoshitsuna 藤原義綱, who was subsequently appointed governor of Awa.\textsuperscript{49}

It appears that in contrast to previous practice the names of contributors were recorded in the memorials of the rakkei kuyō ceremonies. This seems to have been because these temples, as previously noted, had an overtly public function, and so the names of the donors were felt to be worthy of being recorded for posterity.\textsuperscript{50}

Emperor Shirakawa also had allotted to Hosshō-ji some 1,500 sustenance households (fuko) at the kuyō ceremony for its upkeep.\textsuperscript{51} Although Kōyasan 高野山 and other temples still received fuko, the system had largely gone out of style, and so Shirakawa's allotment may have implied a symbolic return to a type of subsidy employed in the ritsuryō system of the Nara period. Perhaps more pragmatically it was also simply a way of

\textsuperscript{48}See Eiga monogatari, NKBT 76:527.

\textsuperscript{49}For a list of other governorship appointments granted as the result of contributions, see Hayashiya (1964), 165 and Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:561.

\textsuperscript{50}Hayashiya (1964), 166. See, for example, the kuyō ceremony memorial for Hosshō-ji in ZGR 27a:125-131 (this also appears in GR 24:249-53) and for Sonshō-ji in, GR 24:254-62. The latter also appears in Chūyūki, Kōwa 4 (1102) /7/21, ZST 10:199-202.

\textsuperscript{51}The allocation of these fuko actually occurred a few days after the ceremony itself (i.e., Jōhō 4 [1077]/12/18), on the 24th day of the month. See Hayashiya (1964), 166.
ensuring public support for the temple. Takeuchi argues that this, again, was a throwback to the ritsuryō system of government and an indication of a trend on the part of Shirakawa to try to appropriate power, a trend that was also manifested in the Rokushō-ji themselves.\(^5^2\)

However, even though required to do so, many of the zuryō, secure in their governorships (in part due to the hereditary nature of these positions by the late Heian period), did not feel obliged to make these fuko contributions, because of their anachronistic nature. As a result, Takeuchi sees this allocation of fuko as a purely nominal gesture, symbolic, as was the pagoda and the sanjō nishaku Birushana Buddha, of Shirakawa's concept of his position in Heian society.\(^5^3\)

\(^5^2\)See Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:564.

\(^5^3\)According to Takeuchi it appears that the income from these sustenance households was never actually expected to be given to the temples. See ibid., 2:563. This view is based on the notorious greed of provincial governors (see the entry for Kōwa 5 [i.e., 1103]/12/21 in Chūyūki, ZST 10:311), which will be discussed in the next chapter. Although most scholars agree with his analysis of the reasons for Shirakawa's use of fuko, most consider the subsidies to have actually formed an important part of Hosshō-ji's resources and were given to it for that purpose. See Yasuda Motohisa 安田元久, Insei to heishi 院政と平氏, vol. 7 of Nihon no rekishi 日本の歴史, (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1974), 73. The issue of fuko with respect to the Rokushō-ji will be discussed in the next chapter.
The Lecture Series of Hosshō-ji

On the 6th day of the 10th month of Shōryaku (1078) a lecture series known as the Daijō-e 大乗会 was first held in the kondō of Hosshō-ji.\(^{54}\) The lecture series was initiated by Emperor Shirakawa to pray for the well being of the late and for previous, present, and retired emperors, and the first meeting was inaugurated by Hōshinnō Shōshin. This lecture series was attended regularly by the ex-emperor, as well as members of the sekkanke and other nobility. The participants were Tendai monks, alternating between those of the Jimon and Sanmon branches of the Tendai school and the monk who was picked to be kōshi 講師 (lecturer) at the meeting was automatically appointed to the post of gon-risshi 植律師 in the Sōgō.

The previously mentioned two lecture series at Enshū-ji, the Hokke-e and Saishō-e, along with Hosshō-ji's Daijō-e, were collectively referred to as the San-e 三会. When the Saishō-e was suspended the remaining two became known as the Tendai ni-e 天台二会, and the one that was held at Hosshō-ji was considered to be more important. With the resumption of Enshū-ji's Saishō-e came the establishment of what became known as the Hokkyō no san dai-e. As already mentioned, these were all imperially sponsored

\(^{54}\)This was an annual lecture on five Mahayana sutras: the Kegon gyō 華厳経, Skr. Avatamsaka-sūtra, the Daishū kyō 大集経, Skr. Mahāsannipāta-sūtra, the Daibon-hannya kyō 大品般若経, Skr. Mahā-prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra, the Hoke kyō 法経, Skr. Saddharma-pundarīka-sūtra, and the Nehan gyō 涅槃経, Skr. Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra.
lectures, and it was necessary for monks to participate in one of the meetings in order to be promoted to the Sōgō.

For Hosshō-ji, hosting one of these major imperially sponsored lecture series was not only an indication of its prestige, but also represented a potential opportunity to exert some control over the powerful Tendai school. However, this opportunity was lost as Enryaku-ji gradually took over responsibility for the appointment of monks to these meetings; in 1105 Shirakawa was forced to withdraw Chōkan 澄觀 of Miidera from the position of tandai 探題 (supervisor of debates) at the Hokke-e after protests by Enryaku-ji. The reason for this protest was that Enryaku-ji resented the fact that Shirakawa favoured the monks of the Jimon school and felt that he had arbitrarily appointed Chōkan, who was one of his kinshin, without the recommendation of the Tendai zasu. Therefore, through its great influence, as well as military strength (we will see an example of this with respect to Sonshō-ji), Enryaku-ji was eventually able to control the appointment of the tandai for the lecture series held at both Enshū-ji and Hōsshō-ji.

On the seventh day of the seventh month of Tenshō 1 (1131), the third anniversary of Shirakawa's death, another lecture series, the Hosshō-ji go-hakkō 法勝寺御八講, was inaugurated. The Kyūchū saishō-kō 宮中最勝講55 and the Sentō go-hakkō 仙洞御

55 This was established by Ex-emperor Ichijō (980-1011) in Chōhō 4 (1001). It was held every year for five days in the fifth month at the seiryōden for the peace of the state and the
八講 \(^{56}\) combined with it to became what was known as the Sankō 三講, and these lectures also became a means, besides the Tendai sandai-e, for Tendai monks to advance in the Sōgō.

Initially Shirakawa's prerogative to make appointments to key positions at these meetings and the resulting eligibility of participant monks to the Sōgō, provided him with some degree of control over the Tendai monks and greatly added to the prestige of Hosshō-ji. Tendai monks at Enryaku-ji had to participate in the ge-ango 夏安居 (summer retreat) at the temple annually for ten years, as well as attend other lectures in order to advance within its hierarchy. However, participation in the Sankō, one of which, as we have seen, was held at Hosshō-ji, appears to have been added as a requisite in this process, thereby increasing the ex-emperor's potential for control of the sect. Fujiwara monks, who previously relied only on Yuima-e lectures for promotions, also became subject to stricter procedures for advancement and had to attend either the San-e or Sankō.\(^{57}\) Moreover, since monks could not be invited to participate in

well-being of the emperor. Lectures on the Saishōō-kyō 最勝王経, Hoke-kyō, etc., were given and priests with reputations for their profound learning from Tō-ji, Kōfuku-ji, Enryaku-ji, and Onjō-ji were invited to attend.

\(^{56}\)Established by Ex-emperor Shirakawa in Eikyū 1 (1113)/7/24. It was held at the gosho of the in for the peace of the state and the well-being of the ex-emperor.

\(^{57}\)This seems to indicate some degree of weakness in the power of the Fujiwara, in that part of the prestige and authority of Kōfuku-ji, the ujidera of their house, lay in its being the seat of one of the Nankyō no san dai-e.
Buddhist discussions at the imperial palace without having attended either the Tendai san-e or the Sankō, Shirakawa had even further control over the prestige available to the clergy.\(^{58}\)

Thus, by connecting Hosshō-ji to the procedure of promotions in the Sōgō, it became an even more important institution than Kōfuku-ji with its Yuima-e, as it now came to have some degree of say over the careers of monks of both Nara and Hiei-zan.\(^{59}\)

This influence was short lived, however. As we have seen, Enryaku-ji was gradually able to acquire control over appointments to key positions at the lecture series with the result that there came to be a strong link between its monks and Hosshō-ji. As a result, as mentioned above, Hosshō-ji became a branch temple of Enryaku-ji where a kaidan was established. From this we see that Hosshō-ji, as in the case of Enshū-ji of the Shien-ji, came to develop close ties with the Tendai sect, which led to a moderating effect on the influence that the in had over the school.

---

\(^{58}\) This court invitation was known as a kōshō (alternate reading, kushō) 公請.

\(^{59}\) Hiraoka (1981), 614.
Sonshō-ji 尊勝寺

Sonshō-ji, which lay to the west of Hosshōji, was a goganji of the twenty-three year old Emperor Horikawa (1079-1107), second son of Shirakawa. Construction of the temple began in 1100 and the kuyō ceremony for its completion was held two years later in 1102. In terms of size it was next in scale to Hosshō-ji. Its precincts were rectangular, and they covered about two chō 町 (approximately six acres).

Archeological finds indicate that Sonshō-ji was built in the earlier Nara style, such as that seen at Tō-ji, unlike the other five Rokushō-ji which were in the Heian style of temple architecture, and among its structures was a 5 storied-pagoda. The center of Sonshō-ji's activities was the kanjō-dō 灌頂堂,

---

60 Sonshō-ji was completed seventeen years after Horikawa's accession to the throne and the establishment of Shirakawa's in. Much is made of the establishment of Shirakawa's in and the role of the ex-emperor in political affairs, but Shirakawa did not, in fact, appear to concern himself overly with public matters during his son's rule. Although he exerted a great deal of influence over his son he left the bulk of affairs of state to Fujiwara Morozane, Horikawa's grandfather, who had been appointed regent when Horikawa became emperor in 1086 at the age of eight. Moreover, on attaining the age of majority Horikawa himself attended to affairs of state along with Morozane and Moromichi. See Hurst (1976), 140-47.

61 See the entry for Kōwa 4 (1102)/7/21 in Chūyūki, ZST 10:199. For the choosing of the date for the beginning of construction see the entry for Kōwa 2 (1100)/3/27 in Chūyūki, ZST 15:324. The site for the temple was determined on the 30th day of the 4th month of the same year. See entry for that date in Chūyūki, ZST 15:325.

62 Namikai, 96-97.
which was used for the conferring of precepts in esoteric rites.\textsuperscript{63}

As with all the Rokushō-ji, construction of Sonshō-ji was financed by various zuryō: the original buildings—that is, the kondō, kōdō, kairō, and central gate—were built with the contributions of the governor of Tajima, Takashina Nakaakira 高階仲章; the yakushi-dō, kannon-dō, and godai-dō were contributed by the governor of Iyo, Fujiwara Kuniaki 藤原国明; and the name of Taira Masamori 平正盛 also appears as a contributor.\textsuperscript{64} What is of interest here is that all the donors to this temple were in no kinshin, a topic which will be discussed in the following chapter.\textsuperscript{65} The temple was also allotted jifu 寺封 of 1,500 sustenance households for its upkeep.\textsuperscript{66}

As with Hosshō-ji, the highest position at Sonshō-ji was that of kengyō, which was assigned to the already mentioned

\textsuperscript{63}Hiraoka (1981), 620.

\textsuperscript{64}For a complete list of contributors as found in the kuyō ceremony memorial see Chūyūki, Kōwa 4 (1102)/7/21, ZST 10:201-02. See also Ajia bunkyōshi: Nihon hen, Heian bunkyō, 232.

\textsuperscript{65}See also Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:562.

\textsuperscript{66}Chūyūki, Kōwa 4 (1102)/7/21, ZST 10:201. See also entry for the same date in Denryaku 殿暦, 5 vols., vol. 12 of Dai Nihon koki roku 大日本古記録, (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-70), 1:140. Jifu were, in effect, fuko for temples. The term first appears in 647 and they were held in perpetuity or for a fixed term. As noted above, by the Heian period such subsidies were no longer stable, and, as a result, jifu often came to be nominal in nature. It seems that in the case of Sonshō-ji, however, these 1,500 sustenance households did provide income, although, as was the custom at the time, they were later converted to shōen (this will be discussed in the next chapter).
imperial prince, Kakugyō Hōshinnō of Ninna-ji,⁶⁷ and was followed by that of jōza, which was given to ajari Jōmyō 靜命 靜命.⁶⁸

By the mid-Kamakura period it appears that the temple was in a state of disrepair, its dilapidated state being lamented by Fujiwara Sadaie 藤原 定家 (1162-1241),⁶⁹ and by 1231 fires had reduced the complex to ruins.⁷⁰

The Lecture Meetings of Sonshō-ji

Sonshō-ji also held a lecture series, being the site of the first Ketsuen kanjō-e 結縁灌頂會 in the third month of Chōji 1 (1104) when Ninna-ji ajari, Kanchi 寛智,⁷¹ was made Sonshō-ji ketsuen kanjō taizō shōkanjō ajari 尊勝寺結縁灌頂胎蔵小灌頂阿闍梨. Subsequently a Taizō ketsuen kanjō 胎蔵結縁灌頂 meeting alternated every other year with a Kongō ketsuen kanjō-e 金剛結縁灌頂會 on the 24th day of the 3rd month. The position of shōkanjō ajari 小灌頂阿闍梨 at these meetings became a

---

⁶⁷This appointment was made by Ex-emperor Shirakawa in 1102. See entry for Kōwa 4 (1102)/7/21 in Chūyūki, ZST 10:201.

⁶⁸See entry for Kōwa 2 (1102)/7/21 in ibid., ZST 10:201.

⁶⁹See the entry for Antei 1 (1227)/9/24, in his diary, Meigetsuki 明月記, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1974), 3:54.

⁷⁰See entry for Kanki 3 (1231)/8/1, in ibid., 3:307.

⁷¹Kanchin's relation to Ninna-ji must have been close, as he studied there with Shōshin Hōshinnō.
qualification for appointments to the Sōgō in the manner of monks participating in the Tendai san-e.

Although Tendai monks had the Tendai daijō-e and Go-hakkō for the promotion of their monks to the Sōgō, the Shingon monks of Tō-ji had no such venue. Accordingly, the position of ajari in the meetings at Sonshō-ji was to rotate, the first two years going to monks of Tō-ji, the next two to monks of Enryaku-ji, and the following two to monks of Onjō-ji. Therefore, among the Rokushō-ji, Hosshō-ji's Daijō-e and Go-hakkō advanced the cause of monks of the Tendai sect, but the kanjō ceremonies held at Sonshō-ji (and later also held at another of the Rokushō-ji, Saishō-ji), were for the promotion of those of the Shingon sect. However, in 1108 Ex-emperor Shirakawa, stating that Tō-ji did not have any other venue for the promotion of its monks, bypassed Onjō-ji's turn and gave the appointments to Tō-ji. Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji joined forces in the vicinity of Hosshō-ji and protested this disruption of the regular pattern. Although at first repelled by imperial forces, ultimately Shirakawa was forced to give in to the Tendai monks' demands.

---


73 i.e., kebiishi. See entry for Tennin 1 (1108)/3/23, in Chūyūki, ZST 11:339.

74 See entry for Tennin 1 (1108)/4/2 in Chūyūki, ZST 11:342. This entry laments the power of the monks and warns that the inability to stand up to them forebodes the eventual decline of the court.
As a result, Tō-ji was excluded from participating in subsequent kanjō meetings.\textsuperscript{75}

Saishō-ji 最勝寺

This temple was the gogan-ji of Emperor Toba, the first son of Horikawa and the grandson of Shirakawa. Its kuyo ceremony was held in 1118 when the emperor was fifteen and was attended by the ex-emperor Shirakawa as well as Toba. This was twelve years after Toba's accession to the throne and thirty-two years after Shirakawa's insei had been established. The temple was to the west of Hosshō-ji and east of Sonshō-ji on the site of what was a workshop in which Buddhist images installed at Hosshō-ji, as well as at other temples, were made.\textsuperscript{76}

Documents concerning the kuyo ceremonies for the various buildings do not seem to have survived, so particulars concerning Saishō-ji are scarce. The first reference to be found with regard to the temple is an entry from 1118 concerning the start of its construction. However, this entry states that a pagoda was already present on the site and that its kuyo ceremony had taken place.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75}See Hiraoka (1981), 666-72. However, in 1113 Tō-ji was able to establish its own kanjō ceremonies, which allowed advancement for its monks in the Sōgō. See ibid, 671.

\textsuperscript{76}Apparently some 300 busshi (sculptors of Buddhist images) had been employed there. See Kyoto no rekishi 2:126.

\textsuperscript{77}See entry for Gen-ei 1 (1118)/2/21 in Chūyōki, ZST 13:36. See also the entry for Gen-ei 1 (1118)/12/17 in Denryaku, 5:96.
It appears that at least some of the structures were similar to those of Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji. Furthermore, we know that it had a kondō, godaidō, yakushidō, as well as three pagodas, and that it covered an area of one chō.\(^{78}\)

In 1122 Saishō-ji also became the site of kanjō ceremonies and it became affiliated with Sonshō-ji, since the latter's priests officiated at them, and some time after 1156 Saishō-ji services were held on the anniversary of the death of the retired emperor Toba (i.e., 1156).\(^{79}\)

Little else is known about the temple. We do know, however, that the godaidō burned down in 1129, but was rebuilt the following year by the governor of Kii, Kimishige (i.e., Kii no kami Kimishige 紀伊守公重).\(^{80}\) The temple as a whole was destroyed by fire in 1219, and soon afterwards all traces of the complex disappeared.

**Enshō-ji 円勝寺**

This was a gogan-ji of Taikenmon'in Shōshi 待賢門院璋子 and the only one of the Rokushō-ji associated with a woman. It appears that it was accorded this status because at the time of its construction she was consort of the ex-emperor Toba and the

\(^{78}\) *Kyoto dai jiten* 京都大事典 (Tokyo: Tankōsha, 1984), 419.


\(^{80}\) *Kyoto no rekishi*, 2:128.
mother of the reigning Emperor Sutoku, who was then only six. Moreover, she was the adopted daughter of the senior retired emperor Shirakawa who was apparently quite fond of her.81

It was by no means unusual for retired imperial ladies to build temples at this time. During the reigns of Shirakawa, Toba, and Go-Shirakawa many gogan-ji were created and the lands assigned to them made up a large part of the imperial estates. However, some of these imperial lands were also assigned to imperial ladies who, in turn, allocated them to temples that they established. These became known as nyōin-ryō女院領 (i.e., temple holdings of imperial ladies).82 Taikenmon'in herself had other temples built to which more shōen were assigned, among them the Hōkongō-in 法金剛院, built in 1130 in the western outskirts of Kyoto in the Kadono district of Yamashiro province.

Construction of Enshō-ji started in 1125,83 but the kuyō ceremony for its completion was not held until 1128.84 This was five years after Shōshi took the name Taikenmon'in 待賢門院 (i.e., 1124), and forty-three years after Shirakawa's insei had been established. The temple covered one chō and included a


82 For other temples established by imperial ladies, see Hiraoka (1981), 601, and Hurst (1976), 270-74.

83 Namikai, 99.

kondō that housed five statues of the Buddha, a yakushidō, a godaidō, a three-storied east pagoda (higashi mitō 東御塔), a five-tiered central pagoda (nakamitō 中御塔) and a three-tiered west pagoda (nishimitō 西御塔). 85

As with the other Rokusō-ji, the actual financing of the structures fell to various zuryō. Among these were the governor of Kii province, Fujiwara no Akinaga 藤原兼長, 86 who paid for the construction of the central pagoda 87, and the governor of Noto province, Fujiwara Atsukane 藤原敦兼, who financed the east pagoda.

In 1129 the prominent positions at the temple were held as follows: the kengyō was the imperial prince Kakuhō 覚法法親王 (1091-1153), fourth son of Shirakawa, from Ninna-ji 88; the bettō was the Tendai zasu, daisōjō Gyōson 大僧正行尊 89; the gonbettō

---

85 Kyoto dai jiten, 107. The 1128 kuyō ceremony was for these as well as other structures.

86 1118-67, son of Fujiwara Akitaka 藤原兼隆.

87 See the entry for Daiji 1 (1127)/3/7, in Hyakurensō, fascicle 6, KT 11:56. Note that since the kuyō ceremony for the pagodas was in 1128, Akinaga would have been only ten years old. This, however, was in keeping with the practice, which started with the ex-emperor Shirakawa, of granting provincial governorships to children. This topic is discussed in the next chapter.

88 See the entry for Dai-ji 3 (1128)/3/13, in Ninna-ji guden 仁和寺御傳, fascicle 67, GR 5:443. Kakuhō is referred to here as Kōya Omuro 高野御室, and his position as chōri 長吏.

89 1057-1135. Gyōson was the son of Minamoto Motohira 源基平 and was associated with the Jimon branch of the Tendai school.
was Tendai zasu, sōjō Ninjitsu 僧正仁實⁹₀; and the jōza was hokkyō⁹₁ Shin'in 法橋信因.⁹²

Enshō-ji also experienced a period of decline from the mid-Kamakura period on, and soon afterward all traces of it disappeared.

**Seishō-ji 成勝寺 (alternate reading, Jōshō-ji)**

This was a gogan-ji of Emperor Sutoku 崇徳, second son of Toba and great-grandson of Shirakawa. The date of the start of its construction is unclear, but the kuyō ceremony was held on the 26th day of the 10th month of Hōen 5 (1139) and was attended by Sutoku, who was then twenty years old.⁹³ This was seventeen years after his accession to the throne (in 1123 at the age of five), and eleven years after Toba's insei had been established (i.e., 1129, the year of Shirakawa's death).

The temple occupied an area of one chō and was the smallest of the Rokushō-ji. Among the structures of the temple were a kondō, kōdō, kyōzō, and shōrō, but there are no details remaining about them. According to the Jōshō-ji nenjū sōsetchō

---


⁹¹This is an abbreviation of the title hokkyō shōnin-i 法橋上人位, the highest of the upper ranks of the clergy.


⁹³See entry for this date in Hyakurensō, fascicle 6, KT 11:61.
成勝寺年中相折帳, there was also a Kannon-dō and a godai-dō, but these could have been added later as this is a late Heian or early Kamakura document.94

This temple occupied a singular place among the Rokushō-ji in that it was the gogan-ji of Sutoku, who was exiled to Sanuki after his participation in the uprising over the issue of imperial succession, that is, Hōgen no ran (1156). To pacify the spirit of Sutoku, who had died in exile in 1164,95 the ex-emperor Go-Shirakawa conferred the name Sutoku-in on this temple in 1177, and in the same year Go-hakkō lecture meetings were held there.96 In 1186 Minamoto Yoritomo petitioned Go-Shirakawa to make repairs to the temple to ensure peace in the land and also recommended Enryaku-ji zasu Kōkan 公顯97 to the position of bettō of Hosshō-ji, Saishō-ji, Seishō-ji, and the two Enshō-ji (i.e., 延勝寺 and 円勝寺). Despite such interest by the first Kamakura shōgun, Seishō-ji was not rebuilt after a fire in Jōkyū 1 (1219), and soon afterwards all traces of it disappeared.

The first kengyō of the temple was Kakuhō Hōshinno, and the remaining major clerical positions followed the pattern of the

94See Heian ibun, 10:3920-37, document 5098.


96See entry for Jishō 治承 1 (1177)/8/25 in Gyokuyō 2:97. See also Kundoku Gyokuyō, 3:269.

97d. 1193. He was made zasu in 1190.
other Rokushō-ji; that is, of the six ajari, two were Tō-ji monks, two were from Enryaku-ji, and two from Onjō-ji.

Enshō-ji 延勝寺

This was the gogan-ji of Emperor Konoe 近衛, eighth son of Toba and great-grandson of Shirakawa. The foundation stones for the kondō, pagoda, and some other buildings were laid in 1147,98 and the kuyō ceremony for these structures was held on the 20th of the third month of 1149.99 This was when the child emperor was ten years old, eight years after his accession to the throne and some twenty years after Toba's insei had been established.

The complex was rectangular, measuring one chō from north to south and two chō from east to west. Among the structures was an Amida Hall that was built on the site of a shinden that belonged to the Konoe branch of the Fujiwara.100

Taira Tadamori 平忠盛, a kinshin who served as bettō of Shirakawa's in no chō and shitsuji bettō (chief director101) of Toba's in no chō, was instrumental in the construction of the

---

98See entry for Kyūan 3 (1147)/6/18 in Honchō seiki 本朝世紀, KT 9:549.

99See entry for this date in ibid., KT 9:637.

100See entry for Chōkan 1 (1163)/12/26, in Hyakurenshō 百練抄, KT 11:78.

101I have utilized Hurst's translation of this term. Unlike the bettō, the shitsuji bettō appear to have actually been involved in administering the affairs of the ex-emperor. See Hurst (1976), 221.
Amida Hall\textsuperscript{102} in which was enshrined a \textit{jōroku}\textsuperscript{103} \textit{kyūtai Amida} 九体阿弥陀象 statue.\textsuperscript{104}

In 1219 the pagoda and \textit{kondō} were destroyed in a fire, and in 1225 the temple was subject to arson by thieves, after which it not restored.

\textbf{Taxonomy: The Designation "Rokushō-ji"}

Namikai states that the term Rokushō-ji came into use during the Kamakura era\textsuperscript{105} and, indeed, the temples seem to have been recognized as a unit in terms of their management under a common \textit{kengyō} as early as 1163, some fourteen years after the establishment of Enshō-ji, the last of the Rokushō-ji. The earliest appearance of this term is an entry in a document dated the thirteenth day of the seventh month of Chōkan 2 (1163).\textsuperscript{106} As stated in the introduction, Jien, in his \textit{Gukanshō} (1221),

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{102}Its \textit{kuyō} ceremony was held on the 26th day of the 12th month of 1163.
    \item \textsuperscript{103}As mentioned previously, this referred to a measurement of approximately five meters, i.e., one \textit{jō} (3.03 meters) and 6 \textit{shaku} (1.82 meters).
    \item \textsuperscript{104}Kyoto dai jiten, 107.
    \item \textsuperscript{105}Namikai, 93.
    \item \textsuperscript{106}See \textit{Ninna-ji goden} 仁和寺御傳, GR 5:449. Other references to the temples in the same document are sporadic and also refer to the appointment officials. Regarding the appointment of \textit{chōri} 長吏, see Shōan 2 (1172)/1/18, (GR 5:451), and for the appointment of \textit{kengyō}, see Gennyaku 2(1185)/12/12, (GR 5:454), Empō 1(1213)/4/26, (GR 5:456), and Kemmu 4 (1337)/3/17, (GR 5:466).
\end{itemize}
clearly refers to the Rokushō-ji as *uji-dera*, or "clan temples."\(^{107}\) There is, however, some question about this characterization.

Hiraoka argues that Jien, as a member of the Fujiwara clan, thought in terms of *uji-dera* rhetoric, and thus he applied this term to the Rokushō-ji.\(^{108}\) Moreover, if the Rokushō-ji were *uji-dera*, then the emperor, or the retired emperor, would have to have been seen as the *uji no chōja* 氏長者. Yet, although it is clear from the *Kondō* kuyō *ganmon* 金堂供養願文 of Hōjō-ji that the purpose of the Fujiwara *uji-dera* was for the well-being and prosperity of the clan and its descendants,\(^{109}\) none of the *ganmon* related to Hosshō-ji express such prayers for the imperial family. Thus the basic function of Hōjō-ji and Hosshō-ji was not the same.

Moreover, *Chūyūki*, as well as other diaries and documents, clearly state that the Rokushō-ji were *shin gogan-ji* 新御願寺 of the imperial house and that they centered on Tendai and Shingon rites, not *Jōdo* rites. It is perhaps because they were modeled structurally after the shinden-styled Hōjō-ji, which was an *uji-dera*, that they became characterized as the imperial house's "clan" temples.

\(^{107}\) Gukanshō, NKBT 86:206.

\(^{108}\) Hiraoka (1981), 630.

\(^{109}\) See *Kondō* kuyō *ganmon* 金堂供養願文, dated Jian 2 (1022)/7/14, in Honchō bunshū 本朝文集, fascicle 45, KT 30:188.
Thus the Rokushō-ji should not be seen as a form of uji-dera, but, rather, as something similar to Ninna-ji. That is, although they were gogan-ji ostensibly built by reigning emperors and an imperial lady, they nevertheless had close ties to the retired emperors (in fact, given the age of the imperial patrons it is more than likely that the initiative for their establishment actually came from the ex-emperors), and served a particular function. That is, they provided a geographical focal point for the imperial house's growing sense of solidarity as a household,110 and when grouped together after their completion served as a unit which held a bloc of estates that provided financial resources in an environment where government subsidies had become increasingly unstable.111

111 Hurst (1976), 265.
Chapter 4

The Significance of the Rokushō-ji

The Site of the Rokushō-ji

Before the establishment of Hosshō-ji in 1077, the Shirakawa area was apparently undeveloped and considered to be quite far from the capital. The desolate and isolated aspect of this part of Heian-kyō can be seen in the fact that tengu were said to have inhabited the area and were not agreeable to the building of the temple.¹ Emperor Shirakawa may have chosen this site for Hosshō-ji instead of the Nishiyama district around Ninna-ji, which had up to then been the site of imperially sponsored gogan-ji (i.e., the Shien-ji), because there was no longer enough land available there. However, a more pragmatic reason may have been simply that the land had been donated to Shirakawa by Fujiwara Morozane.

After Hosshō-ji was built, Emperor Shirakawa often visited the Shirakawa area and this gave rise to the need for a gosho to be built. The tsuridono (pond pavilion) from the original

¹See Eiga monogatari, fascicle 39, NKBT 76:527-28. Apparently Fujiwara no Shōshi 彰子 (alternate reading Akiko; 988-1074, also known as Jōtō-monin 上東門院), who was chūgū of Emperor Ichijō, took up residence there for a short time precisely because it was relatively isolated and thus offered some respite from the material world. See ibid, fascicle 36, NKBT 76:436-37. However, she returned to the capital in 1047 due to, among other things, concerns about tengu, once again indicating that the area was remote and sparsely populated. See ibid, fascicle 36, NKBT 76:442-43.
Fujiwara villa in the northeast corner of the Hosshō-ji complex was left standing and utilized as a gosho (it was known as the Tsuridono Gosho 釣殿御所 or Shirakawa Gosho 白河御所) during the kuyō ceremony of 1077. It was used only temporarily and does not appear to have been meant as a permanent residence, and it was probably torn down once the Shirakawa Izumidono, which will be discussed presently, was built. Therefore, in 1095 the residence of Kakuen, bettō of Hosshō-ji, located to the west of the Rokushō-ji, was converted into a gosho.² In 1115 this gosho was rebuilt and named Shirakawa Izumidono. It too was referred to as the Shirakawa Gosho, and as Minami-dono 南殿 from 1118 when the Shirakawa Kita-dono 白河北殿 was built adjacent to it to the north.³

The fact that Shirakawa did not build a residence in the Shirakawa area until after his retirement in 1086 suggests that his visits there during his reign were probably short during his reign and the Tsuridono Gosho may have been sufficient for such stays. Moreover, it appears that the Rokushō-ji area was not the emperor's preferred choice for a retirement villa, for he had a detached residence constructed in the Toba district to the south.

²See Chūyūki, Kahō 嘉保 2 (1095)/5/10, ZST 9:262.

³See ibid, entry for Genei 1 (1118)/3/18, ZST 13:42. The Kita-dono was renovated in 1129 but was destroyed by fire in 1144. However, it was rebuilt in that same year by Taira Tadamori, which led to his being given the court rank of senior, fourth lower rank, shōshii no ge 正四位下. During Högen no ran (1156) the residence was destroyed by fire and not rebuilt.
of the capital in 1086. The Toba site was convenient since the Yodo river (Yodo-gawa 淀川) provided access to what is now Osaka Bay, and the Kamo 賀茂 and Katsura 桂 rivers provided a waterway to the capital. Also, the main road dividing Kyoto into Sakyō and Ukyō (i.e., the Suzaku 朱雀大路) extended to Toba, adding to its convenience and, finally, the scenery there was said to be excellent.4

As noted before, the construction of a second residence was not in itself unusual, but the site of the Shirakawa Izumidono near Hosshō-ji and the later development of the other Rokushō-ji nearby, suggests some greater importance to the area after Shirakawa's abdication; that is, it appears that the Shirakawa district became the center of his insei activities, whereas the Toba-dono was viewed more as a retirement villa. Accordingly, it was in a three-storied pagoda in the Toba-dono that Shirakawa's remains were interred and not at his gogan-ji, Hosshō-ji.

Attached to these various gosho were assorted midi 御堂 (a hall enshrining Buddhist icons) donated by nobles. Although gosho and midi were theoretically independent of each other, at this time they were, nevertheless, often found in the same

---

4 Toba-dono eventually consisted of a south, north, and east section, built in that order. It was over 100 chō in area, and retainers, government officials, and even commoners were said to have given up their homes that were situated on the site for the enterprise. See Murai (1984), 48.
complexes. Rikyū, or detached palaces, also often had midō on their premises and, conversely, gogan-ji often had gosho attached to them. Thus it was not unusual that Shirakawa would have made use of the Tsuridono Gosho in the Hosshō-ji compound. This fusion of temples with the residences of the aristocracy was a characteristic of this period, and it is not really possible to separate gosho from midō in such compounds.

Gradually there came to be many in established by various members of the imperial family as well as residences for those in the service of these institutions in the Shirakawa district. Thus, this area, which used to be considered a suburb of the capital, became a kind of alternate center for Heian-kyō. During the approximately seventy years of the reign of Shirakawa and his, as well as Toba's, insei there was on average a new hall built every year and a new temple about every 5 years, completely changing the look of the area.

After Emperor Toba's death in 1156, Emperor Sutoku suddenly moved from the Tanaka-dono in the Toba district to the Shirakawa area, perhaps to get away from his half-brother Go-Shirakawa so that he could carry out his intrigues to become the senior retired emperor and have his son made emperor (this was the

---

5For a list of midō donated by nobles, see ibid., 46-47. The Shirakawa Izumidono, typically, included an Amida-dō and a pagoda, both paid for by provincial governors, a topic which will be discussed presently.

6See Kyoto no rekishi, 2:139 and Nihon rekishi taikei, 1:982.
background to Hōgen no ran). A result of this was that the area became the site of various military skirmishes, and when Gien, referring to an attack on the Shirakawa Kita-dono, expresses shock that the capital had become the stage for such violence, it becomes clear that the Shirakawa district was no longer considered a suburb but a part of the capital.  

After the Kamakura period large temples were still built in the district (e.g., the Rinzai Zen temple Nanzenji 南禅寺), but as the roads between the capital and the eastern provinces ran through the Shirakawa, area buildings in the district often fell victim to the ravages of war. As a result, most of the Heian structures located there were destroyed and most were not rebuilt.

Although the start of the development of the Shirakawa area stemmed from the establishment of Hosshō-ji⁷, the Rokushō-ji cannot be held solely responsible for the build-up of that part of Kyoto for there was a gap of some twenty-five years between the construction of the first and the second of the six temples. In fact, the flurry of temple building in the area and the establishment of the Rokushō-ji was not unique to the Shirakawa

⁷Murai (1984), 50.

⁸This temple still exists and is east of present day Okazaki Park.

⁹Although there had been some building in the Shirakawa area from the beginning of the Heian period (e.g., Zenrin-ji 禅林寺, Enjō-ji 円成寺 [889], and others), it was with Hosshō-ji that development accelerated.
district; provincial governors had many statues and temples to house them built on a smaller scale throughout Japan. This was, in fact, a characteristic of Buddhist devotional activity during the insei period.10

Yasuda Motohisa claims that the large number of temples built by the imperial house, as well as aristocrats, reflects a deepening of faith in Buddhism.11 This faith was influenced, no doubt, by the belief that "making merit by making Buddhas" (zōbutsu no kudoku 造仏の功德)--or, by the same token, by making temples--would be of some help in the Age of the Decline of the Dharma (i.e., mappō 末法) which, at that time, was generally held to have begun in 1052.12 Mappō may not have inspired the temple-building splurge, but diaries and literary works of the Heian period have no shortage of accounts of fire, civil strife, famine, etc., which does much to explain a period of temple building activity which included the Rokushō-ji.

---

10See Ajia bukkyōshi: Nihon hen, Heian bukkyō, 233. For a discussion of the Jōdo related structures built in this period see "Insei ki ni okeru Jōdokyō kenchiku no seikan" 院政期における教建築の盛観, chap. 6 in Murayama Shūichi 村山修一, Jōdokyō geijutsu to Mida shinkō 浄土教芸術と弥陀信仰 (Tokyo: Shibundo, 1977), 117-52. The proliferation of Jōdō structures, even in the Rokushō-ji, does not, however, imply that this tradition overshadowed esoteric forms of Buddhism. As Kuroda notes, esoteric activity continued, and the prevalence of Jōdō practices and beliefs can be seen as a contemporary expression of esoteric beliefs. See Kuroda (1980), 42-43.


However, although the importance of the concept of mappō cannot be denied, (and, in fact, is cited as the cause of so many acts of devotion in the Heian period as to have become a cliché), Pierre Bourdieu proposes, with his discussion of another topic entirely, that such preoccupations as "making merit by making Buddhas" (or temples), "...reduces beauty, which is sometimes thought of as a Platonic Idea, endowed with an objective, transcendent existence, to no more than the projection into a metaphysical beyond of what is lacking in the here-and-now."\textsuperscript{13}

Thus the accumulation and proliferation of certain types of structures or icons becomes more than just the material manifestation of faith. As James Clifford notes, "Some sort of 'gathering' around the self and the group--the assemblage of a material 'world,' the marking-off of a subjective domain that is not 'other'--is probably universal....The inclusions in all collections reflect wider cultural rules--of rational taxonomy, of gender, of aesthetics."\textsuperscript{14}

More specific to the Heian period, Mimi Yiengpruksawan notes that "...the virtual arsenal of sculptures, paintings, and votive sutra transcriptions commissioned by members of court society...is not some aesthetic engagement with art for art's sake; it is a desperate measure to restore stability to a


fractious social climate, and one in which Pure Land ideals figure but peripherally."\(^{15}\)

Therefore, Shirakawa's elaborate Hosshō-ji may not only have been an attempt to gain merit or to recall imperial power under the long defunct ritsuryō system of government. Perhaps the grandeur and beauty of Hosshō-ji, like the concept of beauty in the late Heian period, "...in its measured proportions, and in the protocols of Pure Land praxis, was a strategy, a form of rhetoric, by which order momentarily reigned."\(^{16}\) That is, it was perhaps an attempt to restore some order in the face of decentralized imperial authority and unreliable financial resources.

**Financing the Rokushō-ji**

As seen in the discussion of the individual temples, the construction of the Rokushō-ji was financed by various zuryō, many of them *in no kinshin*. Since archeological finds at some of the six temples' sites have revealed that a variety of differently designed roof tiles were used in the same structure, it appears that the actual contributions included locally produced building materials. This is unlike the practice in temples up to, and including, the early Heian period, in which all roof tiles were of the same pattern. The use of locally patterned tiles could have been adopted to enhance the prestige

\(^{15}\)Yiengpruksawan, 450.

\(^{16}\)Ibid., 450.
of the donors whose contributions would have been in plain public view. However, this could also simply indicate improvements in the ability to transport goods during this period; technological developments in water transportation, spurred on by trade with China during the early Heian era, allowed for cheaper importation of goods to the capital from the provinces up the Yodo river from the Inland Sea.

In return for "donations" (jōgō), donors were given appointments as provincial governors, positions which, in the case of particularly prosperous provinces, could be extremely lucrative. For example, Nakahara Munemasa 中原宗政, a clerk (shutendai 主典代) of Ex-emperor Shirakawa's in no chō, was able to pass over ten others of higher rank in being assigned the governorship of the province of Izu due to his donations to Sonshō-ji.

---

17Namikai, 96.
18Ibid., 100. Although Japan discontinued sending official envoys to China in 894, merchants and monks continued to cross over to the continent.

19For a specific example of buildings and statues donated by a member of the zuryō class who was among those particularly close to the ex-emperor Shirakawa (i.e., in no kinshin), see the contributions of Fujiwara no Akisue 藤原顕季 in Ajia bukkyōshi: Nihon hen, Heian bukkyō, 233. See also a list of such contributors in Yasuda (1974), 79. These contributions by zuryō were not unique to the Rokushō-ji. For a list of contributions made to other imperial temples see Kyoto no rekishi, 2:123-25.

20This was a scribe involved with the drafting of documents and receipts. See Hurst (1976), 222.

21See entry for Tennin 1 (1108)/1/24, in Chūyūki, ZST 11:323.
The retired emperors seem to have waited for most contributions to be made voluntarily, but donations were sometimes forced on provincial governors when some essential materials or services were needed. When Minamoto Akinaka (1059-1139), governor of Harima, was late in providing for the construction of two pagodas and fences, the contribution became the responsibility of his son. In another case Takeshina Tameie was, in effect, ordered by Ex-emperor Shirakawa to contribute to the Amida-do of Sonshō-ji in 1104, and in 1138 a levy was imposed on provincial governors for the construction of the altar (dan) of Seishō-ji. Thus these "donations" were at the same time both a contribution by, and a kind of levy on, provincial governors.

---

22See entry for Kōwa (1102)/2/24, in Chūyōki, ZST 10:160. It is unclear exactly how such a "contribution" would have been made by Akinaka's son.

23The term shoka 所課, that is, a levy or assessment is used. See the entry for Chōji 1 (1104)/7/24, in Chūyōki, ZST, 10:364-65. No indication is given as to why Tameie was chosen to supply the necessary funds. He served as bettō in Shirakawa's in no chō and was one of the in no kinshin. However, he had also been a prominent contributor to Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji and, perhaps partly because of this, had been appointed to governorships in Suō, Ōmi, Harima, Bitchū, Echizen, and several other provinces. Most of these provinces were located close to the capital and had relatively high rates of productivity. Therefore, although an administrator in the office of Shirakawa's affairs, the number of governorships Tameie received, as well as the relative wealth of the provinces to which he had been appointed, may have obliged him to supply funds in times of need.

24See Heian ibun, 6:2080, document 2478.
Moreover, these "donations" were imposed not only on provincial governors, for temples were also subject to them despite the fact that religious institutions were supported by the state.\(^{25}\) The imposition of such forced contributions was perhaps seen as a temporary, or provisional, tax. Such levies were not always willingly paid, and ryōshu 領主, i.e., local land proprietors, sometimes sought exemption from payment, for the peasants on their manors were often already under the strain of other special taxes. However, these exceptions were not always forthcoming as was the case of a governor whose petition for an exemption from making such contributions was refused.\(^{26}\)

The maintenance of the Rokushō-ji was provided for by the allotment of large numbers of fuko, at least in the case of Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji.\(^{27}\) This trend to seek public funds to

---

\(^{25}\)See Heian ibun, 6:2191, documents 2593 (dated Kyūan [1148]/11/12) and 2594 (dated Kyūan [1146]/11/13) concerning a petition to be exempted from levies imposed on Daigo-ji 醍醐寺 to pay for altars for Enshō-ji 延勝寺, and 6:2224, documents 2650-51 (dated Kyūan 4 [1148]/8/11), concerning levies imposed to provide provisions for the same temple.

\(^{26}\)Kyoto no rekishi 2:126.

\(^{27}\)Yasuda (1974), 73. Due to the limited numbers of documents surviving with respect to the other Rokushō-ji, it is unclear whether they too would have been granted fuko. However, since some forty-one years had passed between the establishment of the first and the third of the temples, it is possible that the state would not have been able to grant such support to the Rokushō-ji built after those two due to the growth of shōen. Nevertheless, some scholars maintain that it was fuko, not shōen, that provided for their financial needs. See Ishii Susumu 石井進, "Insei jidai" 院政時代, in Kōza Nihonshi 講座日本史, edited by Rekishigaku Kenkyūkai 歴史学研究会 and Nihonshi Kenkyūkai 日本史研究会, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai,
support institutions was not limited to the Rokushō-ji. In 1090 Shirakawa had 600 chō of fuyuden 不輸田28 commended to Kamo Shrine 賀茂社29, and in the late eleventh century he had hō (see below) from the provinces of Tamba and Ōmi donated to the Gion Shrine. The idea may have been to avoid assigning shōen to such institutions and to keep them supported by public lands, thus helping to limit the number of estates that were lost to government taxation.30

In 1075, three years after his accession to the throne, Shirakawa revised Go-Sanjō's shōen reforms and prohibited the creation of new shōen; such proclamations appeared three more times, in 1099, 1107, and 1127.31 It appears, then, that Shirakawa, throughout his reign, was concerned with prohibiting the establishment of tax free estates. We have, for example, a case where he appears to have been personally involved with

---

28 I.e., fuyusoden 不輸租田. These were developed lands given to religious institutions or government officials where the rice tax went to the proprietor rather than the state.

29 See entry for Kanji 4 (1090)/7/13 in Hyakurensō, KT 11:40.


preventing the establishment of new shōen in the province of Wakasa 若狭国 in 1092.\(^{32}\)

On the other hand, the granting of fuko may simply have been a way of coercing public support for the imperial house.\(^{33}\) Whatever the case, the conditions resulting from the deteriorating ritsuryō system accelerated an ongoing change in Heian society in the relation between "public" and "private" interests.

The issue of how widespread the practice of allotting fuko was during this period is still open to question, but we do know that there were enough of them that their drain on resources eventually led provincial governors to petition for permission to develop what were known as ho 保. These were waste lands that were turned into arable land to create extra income. Part of the income went to the government, but since the rest went to the hoshi 保司, that is, the person who took responsibility for the

\(^{32}\) See entry for Kanji 6 (1092)\(^{5}\) in Gonijō Moromichi-ki 後二條師通記, Dai Nihon kōkiroku 大日本古記録, vol. 7, parts 1-3. (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1956-58), 2:248. However, the well known prohibition of commendations to Minamoto Yoshie 源義家 in 1091 may have been due more to the instigation of the sekkanke than to Shirakawa's initiative.

\(^{33}\) Despite dwindling public resources, there is no doubt that it was felt to be appropriate to use "public" funds for certain enterprises. Ex-emperor Shirakawa visited Kumano Shrine some nine times, and his grandson, Ex-emperor Toba fourteen times, and each of them went on excursions to Mount Koya three times, and the funds for these visits, which involved great expense, did not come from their personal resources but from the government. The expenses for such excursions, then, came from the taxes on the people. See Kuroda (1980), 42.
development and management of the ho, this position was often secured by a member of one of the kenmon or a government official, such as a chigyō kokushu 知行国主.

Since the creation of ho was mutually beneficial for the provincial governor and the hoshi, it was often members of the various kenmon or government officials other than the provincial governor who took the initiative for the land conversion. In time, a hoshi who was able to secure the cooperation of the actual cultivators of the land could, through skilful management, claim these lands as personal property and have them recognized as shōen. Although this was not always the case (some ho remained as public lands, i.e., kokuryō 国領, in which case they were managed by kokuhoshi 国保司), the majority of the Rokushō-ji fuko soon came to be converted into hō, and eventually shōen. Therefore, although Shirakawa may have been consciously trying to curb the growth of shōen by “publicly” funding the temples, the economic realities of being able to provide for the burden imposed by fuko, as well as the temptation to take advantage of the financial relief provided by ho, tended to undermine such intentions and, in effect, only

---

34 See Amino (1973), 206-11, and also, Yasuda (1974), 194-95. Since the position of hoshi was potentially lucrative there was often competition between kenmon, temples, and zuryō to obtain the position. An example of this was when the priest Kakunin 識仁 of Tōdai-ji unsuccessfully attempted, by a show of armed force in 1162, to oust the zaichiryōshu, Minamoto Toshikata 源俊方, the hoshi of Yanase 篠瀬 ho in the province of Iga, in order to procure that position for Tōdai-ji. See ibid., 195-96.
accelerated an essential change that was already taking place with regard to the state's relation to the land. This can be seen from the fact that this conversion of fuko to shōen was also taking place in another manner.

Originally, the ritsuryō codes did not include religious institutions in its distribution of fuko, but they did allow for them to receive temporary sustenance households through special imperial proclamations. As a result of such grants, temples and shrines gradually came to hold large amounts of fuko.35 However, not only were these sustenance households supposed to be temporary but, also, one half of the grain tax was to go the state, although all the other taxes were allocated to the funushi (i.e., the receiver of the fuko). This was to ensure that the sustenance households would not be regarded solely as the possession of the recipient of the fuko. Moreover, the funushi were not allowed to collect the taxes directly; this was the responsibility of local officials who then forwarded the taxes to the appropriate parties. This again was to ensure that the funushi would not consider such sustenance households as their "personal" property.36

35See Ritsuryō, 309. Although temples and shrines may have possessed shōen this was not their only source of income. Besides fuko they were also supplied with rice or other goods by the provincial authorities, and often temporary levies were imposed on peasants to build or repair temple or shrine structures. See Kuroda (1980), 14-15.

36Takeuchi, "Fukugō to benpoho no shōenka," (1958), 83.
However, starting in 714, all, not only half, of the rice tax was being sent to those funushi who were imperial princes, no doubt because of their exalted status. As a result, by 739 this practice extended to funushi in general. Moreover, from the ninth century, with the deterioration of the ritsuryō system, poorer quality goods, and eventually failure to forward goods (mishin 未進), became widespread. In 1108, when Tōdai-ji was ordered to make repairs to some of its structures, it appealed to various provincial governors stating that of the twenty provinces in which it held fuko only five were actually sending any goods, and even those provinces were not sending their full quota. By 1147 the temple noted that of the ten thousand one hundred and fifty koku of rice that it was suppose to receive from its various fuko in twenty provinces, only three hundred and twenty-five from one province, Iga, were actually remitted. In 1148, when the temple pressed the provincial governor of Suruga to remit the resources from the one hundred and fifty households of that province allotted to it, a draft horse and paper with the equivalent value of a certain portion of rice were substituted as part of the payment. However, the

37Ibid., 83.
38See Tōnan'in monjo 東南院文書, entry for Kajō 3 (1108)/9/7, in Heian ibun, 4: 1318-1319, document 1362, #2 of 4, cited in ibid., 84-85.
horse was in such poor condition that it died the day after it had been used only once.\textsuperscript{39}

The result of such unreliable fuko led to granting of binbō no hō 便補保, lands from which goods would go directly to the funushi. These were granted to replace the lost income or, alternately, to relieve the provincial governor from having to collect fuko from an ever diminishing taxable land base. However, despite such compensation, in some cases funushi simply lost their sustenance households when their share of the fuko revenues were not remitted, as in the above case of Tōdai-ji. Accordingly, in the ninth century funushi began to send their own officials directly to the areas where the fuko were located to ensure that they received their revenue.\textsuperscript{40} As noted above, the portion of rice tax that originally was supposed to have been sent to the state had long before been appropriated, and so once direct contact was established with the sustenance households the funushi, as the sole recipient of all forms of dues, made claims to their lands. Thus, the funushi agent sent to procure the dues came to replace the local state authorities and, through their skilful negotiation with local governments, such lands came to be seen as the shōen of the funushi.

\textsuperscript{39}See Tōnan’in monjo, entry for Kyūan 4 (1148)/5/16, in Heian ibun, 6:2221-22, document 2648, #2 of 2, cited in ibid., 84.

\textsuperscript{40}See Ruiju sandaikyaku, entry for Kampyō 3 (891)/5/29, KT 25:616; Kampyō 3 (891)/6/17, KT 25:616-17; and Kampyō 6 (894)/7/16, KT 25:624.
However, claims to land could also be made for other reasons; Kanzeon-ji 觀世音寺 of Chikuzen province was able to convert its fuko to shōen when it claimed that provincial governors had been attempting to impinge on the boundaries of the lands on which its fuko were situated because such boundaries had been established hundreds of years earlier and were, therefore, unclear. Such problems caused cultivators to abscond, and so the monastery appealed for freedom from government interference. Once this was granted these sustenance households gradually came to be referred to as shōen.41

Once the shōen that had developed from fuko were established, their owners were often able to expand them beyond their original borders. One method of doing so was through a practice referred to as shussaku 出作. When shōmin 荘民, the cultivators on established shōen, started to work lands beyond the borders of the estate, the shōen proprietors began to lay claims to those lands as well. Another method involved shōen in which certain areas within their boundaries did not enjoy the tax exemptions of the kanshōfu 官省符 (i.e., the central government office that gave official recognition of an owner's title to land and, as a result, the right to certain tax exemptions). If shōmin were involved in the cultivation of those lands as well, the proprietor once again could lay claim to

41Sonshōin monjo 尊勝院文書, dated Chōwa 3 (1014)/2/19, in Heian ibun, 2:647-51, document 476.
them. This practice was referred to as rōsaku 雀作. Of course both types of claims were usually disputed by the provincial governor, as such lands had clearly not been granted shōen status.  

The claims made by the funushi in these circumstances indicate that such shōen expanded on the concept of the rights of the cultivators. This perhaps reflects a principle dating back to the ninth century, when the government was actively trying to promote the development of new lands. As previously mentioned, uncultivated lands that were developed could be held by the developer for certain periods of time. However, the peasants often unable to continue working such lands for they had their own kubunden to farm. Consequently, many of these reclaimed lands soon went fallow. In response to this the government decreed that the lands would be given to others who could work them on the principle that the person who developed and was to cultivate such lands was the owner. This was to ensure that rice fields were being productive for, no matter who the cultivator was, they were still subject to taxation.

---

42 Studies of Kuroda no shō 黒田荘 in the province of Iga outline the process of this and other forms of shōen expansion. See "Kuroda akutō 黒田悪児," in Ishimoda (1957), 176-262 and also Koyama Yasunori 小山靖憲, "Shōensei keiseiki no ryōshū to nomin" 荘園制形成期の領主と農民, in Shōen no sekai 荘園の世界, ed. Inagaki Yasuhiro 稲垣泰彦 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1973), 107-38.

However, this implies further that shōen proprietors also laid claim, to some extent, to the control of the people on the estates as much as to the land itself. That is, the claims made under the practices of shussaku and rōsaku were based on the principle that the cultivating rights of the farmers "belonged" to the proprietor because the proprietor, in some sense, "owned" the workers of his shōen. This concept is, in fact, an extension of the ritsuryō system's legislation on the relation between the land and its inhabitants; that is, the state was interested foremost in the regulation of the population, not land." As Nagahara has observed, "First, nobles and temples acquired rights to receive corvée from cultivators who worked 'public' land and still paid rice taxes to the government. Next, the nobles and temples claimed the 'public' land cultivated by these cultivators. Thus, control over persons (corvée) preceded control over land."\(^45\)

Accordingly, under the ritsuryō system taxation was based on the individual, and not the land. Risser acknowledges the so 租, or what he calls a "grain tax," but argues, "This, however, was collected as if it were a head tax since land was allocated in uniform amounts among the cultivators."\(^46\)

---

\(^45\) Nagahara (1975), 270.

\(^46\) Risser, 19 n. 6. The grain tax itself amounted to only some 3% of a peasant's taxes. See Takeuchi, "Chokushidenden, shinnōshiden, kueiden, kanden" 勅旨田·親王賜田·公営田·官田, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 108 (June 1957): 89-90.
The focus of taxation is made clear in the following example; if a peasant decided to rent out his lands from year to year\(^4\), the renter would cultivate the land and take the harvest. However, the land tax (denso 田租) was levied on the renter, not on the peasant who "owned" the land. This is clear from the denryō denchō no jō 田令田長条 (rules for fields, provisions on field areas), which state that rental fees should take into account the fact that it is the renters who must pay the rice tax.\(^4\)

However, by the end of the ninth century the basis of taxation began to shift from the people to the land.\(^4\) Furōnin 浮狼人, persons not registered in the local population registers\(^5\), made control of the individual and the extraction of taxes difficult; "An alternative was to assess taxes on land rather than persons since it was immobile, could be easily surveyed, measured and accounted for. The government made the initial step

\(^4\)Actually the term "sale," hambai 販買, is used in contemporary documents. What is meant here is that the cultivation rights of the land were sold from year to year. See den ryō kōden jō 田令公田條, (rules for fields, provisions on public fields), Ryō shūge 令集解, fascicle 12, KT 23:355.


\(^4\)Takeuchi, "Chokushiden, shinnōshiden, kueiden, kanden." (1957), 90.

\(^5\)"From the very beginning, peasants resisted the control placed upon them by the ritsu-ryō system by a more direct means: absconding. They simply pulled up stakes and left the area where they were registered and where they had received allotments. People who took such action were called furōnin." Risser, 32.
toward transferring the tax base from people to land at about the same time it began to eliminate the distinction between dojin [士人, those registered in the local population registers] and rōnin [i.e., furōnin]. In the province of Kawachi in 822 the government levied a tax on land for the first time....The government now levied its taxes on the myō, a unit of cultivated land." 

With this change of emphasis the claims on land made simply because one cultivated it were no longer recognized. Accordingly, Go-Sanjō's shōen reforms of 1069 held that the practices of shussaku and rōsaku were no longer sufficient reasons to legitimate shōen expansion.

Because only legitimately documented lands were now allowed to keep their various immunities and/or tax concessions, those seeking such immunities started to look to the practice of commendation (kishin), to ensure that provincial governors would not interfere in their estates. Consequently, in the insei period there was an increase in the number of commendations made to powerful clans such as the Fujiwara or prestigious institutions, especially those associated with the imperial family, such as the temples of the Rokushō-ji.

Shirakawa's unintentional role in this change of land ownership was also to have far reaching effects in the course of the political landscape of Japan. Soon after Shirakawa abdicated

51 Ibid., 80-81.
and created his in no chō, he organized a small group of personal guards, the hokumen no bushi 北面の武士 (also known as the in no hokumen), i.e., Warriors of the Northern Quarter, a title which originated from the guard house located at the northern face of the retired emperor's gosho.\(^{52}\) These guardsmen were seen, as were the in no kinshin, as particularly close to the ex-emperor and they acted as bodyguards for him, ensuring security around the palace. In 1118, when Enryaku-ji sōhei made a forced petition at the court, the hokumen no bushi were able to muster some one thousand soldiers to the banks of the Kamogawa.\(^{53}\) These troops represented a concrete manifestation of the power that the retired emperor had been able to establish. Although some of them were kebiishi (imperial police), efu (palace guards), or zuryō, there were also among them some members of the military class who were in charge of keeping the peace at the local level on the various public lands under the supervision of the kokuga (government offices of public lands). Some of these advanced in position, eventually becoming in no kinshin and, consequently, zuryō.

However, Shirakawa also made use of military clans that lay outside of these public offices; that is, he also appealed to

---

\(^{52}\) I have employed Hurst's translation of this term. See Hurst (1976), 281-82. Most of what follows is derived from the following: Ishii, 202-04; Hashimoto Yoshihiko 橋本義彦, Heian kizoku shakai no kenkyū 平安貴族社会研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976), 106-09; and Takahashi Masaaki 高橋昌明, Kiyomori izen 清盛以前 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1984), 137-45.

\(^{53}\) Yasuda (1974), 75.
such leaders as Minamoto Yoshiie and Minamoto Yoshitsuna for their military protection.\textsuperscript{54} What we see here is a growing utilization and, consequently, recognition of a military class by Shirakawa; a military class that enforced his shōen reforms facilitated his role in the political and economic landscape of the times. This supports the observation made previously that the scale of Hosshō-ji, the first of the Rokushō-ji, foreshadowed not only the growing power of the insei, but also a shift of power to the bushi.\textsuperscript{55}

The changes brought about during the insei period raise questions about the role of the ex-emperors in the further deterioration of the ritsuryō system; that is, why they would have taken an active role in developments that would reduce their traditional sources of income. However, it must be borne in mind that their initial intent was to preserve and, in fact, to revive the policies of the ritsuryō system. The developments that followed were, in effect, only responses or accomodations to an already deteriorating ritsuryō system, and not policies initiated to undermine it.

\textsuperscript{54}See ibid., 75-76 and also Amino (1973), 178.

\textsuperscript{55}Hayashiya (1964), 176.
Economic Considerations: The Relationship Between the In and the Zuryō

Yasuda Motohisa claims that Shirakawa's insei came to hold absolute power and that although this was due partly to the prestige of the retired emperor, it was also the result of the fact that the in was able to establish some form of financial support. It is established wisdom that this support came from the prosperous zuryō, or "tax managers." 56 Whatever the case as to the nature of Shirakawa's insei, there is no doubt, as we have seen, that the zuryō were a major source of resources for the construction of the Rokushō-ji, as well the Shien-ji.

Although provincial governors originally spent their terms residing in the provinces to which they had been appointed, by the ninth century they chose to remain in the capital and sent representatives in their place. The office of the rusudokoro 留守所 (i.e., Office of the Absentee Governor), acted as the representative of the governor at the local level, and the zuryō were in charge of collecting taxes in the province. 57 The titular


57 On the topic of zuryō, see Hayashiya Tatsusaburō 林屋 辰三郎, Kodai kokka no kaitai 古代国家解体 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1955), 131-52 and 191-200; Takeuchi (1957-58), 2: 557-60; and Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, Bushi no tōjo 武士の登場, vol. 6 of Nihon no rekishi 日本の歴史 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1965), 189-95. The term zuryō is usually translated as "tax manager," but the original meaning was that the official would "accept" the government administration, or office, from his predecessor. Zuryō were also referred to as "governor" (kokushi 国司) in contemporary documents and literature.
governor, who was known as the "distant" governor (yōnin kokushi, i.e., one who resided in the capital), carried out limited duties, the position having become largely a sinecure.

Although only a certain number of provincial appointments could be made by ex-emperors, during the insei period their increasing independence from the Fujiwara and the greater prestige of the imperial house resulted in their being able to ensure, through their influence, more governorships. As these posts were lucrative, the ex-emperors assigned them to zuryo who were their close associates, that is, in no kinshin, a group whose members tended to belong to a few families who served in the private office for the management of the ex-emperor's affairs (i.e., the in no chō). In choosing a kinshin the ex-

58By the end of the Heian era the ex-emperor was able to appoint provincial governors to two or three provinces. For a discussion of these appointments, see Murata Masatoki, "Ingū gobunkoku no kenkyū", Kokushi gaku 32 (October 1937): 1-20.

59Hurst proposes that as the father, or grandfather, of the emperor the retired emperor's suggestions for appointments could not be ignored at court. See Hurst (1976), 249.

60On the topic of in no kinshin see ibid., 237-311. In the following I have also referred to four articles by Kōno Fusao, that Hurst has cited with regard to this topic: "Shirakawa-in kinshindan no ichikōsatsu: ninzuryō wo chūshin toshite" 白河院近臣の一考察—任受領を中心として, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 145 (July 1960); "Shirakawa-in kinshindan no ichikōsatsu: Fujiwara Nagazane wo chūshin toshite" 白河院近臣の一考察—藤原長実を中心として, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 152 (February 1961); "Shirakawa-in kinshindan no ichikōsatsu: Fujiwara Nagazane no chichi Akisue ni tsuite" 白河院近臣の一考察—藤原長実の父顯季について, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 155 (May 1961); and "Shirakawa, Toba ryōinseika no ninkura no kami
emperor considered not only the candidate's background, including the connection of his family to the imperial house (especially important here were those related to the ex-emperor's wet-nurse or the family of his biological mother) but also the quantity and quality of "donations" (jōgō) made to the imperial house.  

The financial condition of the zuryō strengthened as they were given these provincial appointments and, in return, the kinshin zuryō would offer financial support to the imperial house.  Thus there was a close, and almost symbiotic, relationship between the in and the zuryō. During the term of Ex-emperor Shirakawa's in the blatant nature of this relationship was apparent when provincial governorships could be bought (jōgō) for 10,000 koku of rice and 10,000 rolls of cloth, or granted to children (e.g., the appointment of Fujiwara Tadataka 藤原忠隆 to the governorship of Tamba at the age of ten

---

ni tsuite" 白河・鳥羽院政下の任内蔵頭について, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 204 (May 1965).


62Members of the zuryō class also looked to prestigious families such as the Fujiwara for advancement at court. For example, provincial governors vied with one another to contribute to Michinaga's Hōjō-ji, built in 1019. Appointment and reappointment to governorships could extend for the entire career of a member of the zuryō class, such as that of Takashina Tameie's 高階為家, which included the governorships of Suo, Mimasaka, Harima, Iyo, Ōmi, Tango, Bichū, as well as other provinces, in a career that spanned some forty years.
in 1111, \(^6^3\) and Fujiwara Akiyoshi 藤原顕能 to the governorship of Sanuki at the age of sixteen in 1112). \(^6^4\) Emperor Go-Sanjō had tried to curtail the practice of buying offices but, ironically, although Shirakawa had adopted his father's shōen reforms, he exacerbated this problem by encouraging the practice, starting with the financing of the Rokushō-ji and continuing with his building of detached palaces.

Because the legitimate income from the provinces was often not enough to provide for these jōgō as well as the taxes to be remitted to the capital, the central government did not interfere with the zuryō’s conduct in raising further funds as long its quota of taxes was met. This meant that a zuryō held a potentially very lucrative position. \(^6^5\) Eventually government

---

\(^6^3\)See Chūyūki, Tenei 2 (1111)/10/25, ZST 12:94.

\(^6^4\)Tadataka's father was the second son of Fujiwara Mototaka 藤原基隆, governor of Iyo, who had made donations for the building of a three-storied pagoda for the ex-emperor Shirakawa, as well as for Taikemon'in's Hōkongō-in. However, the relationship between the ex-emperors and the kinshin zuryō does not appear to have always been strictly a business arrangement. It seems that it could also be based on, or that it resulted in, close personal ties; when Fujiwara Kuniakira 藤原国明 died in 1105, Shirakawa was apparently so grief-stricken that he cancelled a festival. See entry for Chōji 5 (1105)/4/17, in Chūyūki, ZST 11:38.

\(^6^5\)Provincial governors were notorious for their avarice. Konjaku monogatari relates the well-known story of how a provincial governor when thrown from his horse thought first of retrieving mushrooms growing on a tree that had broken his fall down a cliff: "Now think: such was the Governor's greed that even in straits like these his first thought was for the mushrooms... You can imagine, therefore, what he was like when the opportunites for gain were easier. How people who heard this must have detested him." Marian Ury, Tales of Times Now and Past (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 179-82. For
appointments in several provinces came to be controlled by certain families, and in other cases several members of the same family would have concurrent appointments. In time, with their positions so well secured, the *kinshin zuryō* of Ex-emperor Shirakawa's *in*, while generous in their support of the imperial house, not only stopped providing support for temples and shrines, but also neglected to remit the taxes they collected.

Although it appears that many of the expenses for the management of the *insei* were supplied by the *zuryō*, this does not mean that they were necessarily involved with its management. Although *hōgandai* (supervisors), or *shutendai* (clerks) were involved with the day to day business affairs of the ex-emperor, the position of *bettō* could be purely titular, as in the case of Fujiwara Tadazane who was only twelve when appointed to that position by Shirakawa. Moreover, as Hurst

*the original, see Konjaku monogatari 今昔物語*, NKBT 26:116-19. From this tale came the adage, 'a governor can't stumble without snatching a handful of dirt.'

E.g., the above mentioned sixteen year old Akiyoshi was appointed when his father, Fujiwara Akitaka, was concurrently holding a governorship, as was the case with the ten year old Tadataka and his father, Mototaka.

See the entry for Kōwa 5 (i.e., 1103)/12/21 in Chūyūki, ZST 10:311. There is one surviving document from 988 which illustrates the various forms of overtaxing, corruption, and neglect of duties on the part of a provincial governor. This is the *Owari no kuni gunji hyakuseira no gebumi* 尾張国郡司百姓等解文, submitted by local officials and peasants to the central government calling for the dismissal of the provincial governor, Fujiwara no Motonaga 藤原元命. See Abe Takeshi 阿部猛, *Owari no kuni gebumi no kenkyū* 尾張國解文の研究 (Tokyo: Ohara Shinseisha, 1971).
has noted, in the case of bettō, duties could not have been onerous, for those appointed to this office simultaneously held other official government appointments.68

The zuryō tended to come from the lower ranking aristocracy (in fact courtiers, by virtue of their high rank, could be ineligible to become zuryō), and some were important heads of the newly rising warrior class. In no kinshin, also came from the middle to lower ranks of the aristocracy and so were limited as to how far they could advance in the bureaucracy.69 However, despite their relatively low rank these kinshin zuryō, as we have seen, were given lucrative provincial government positions; Takashina Tameakira 高階為章 held the relatively low court rank of senior, fourth rank, lower (shōshii no ge 正四位下), yet he held positions in Echigo, Tajima, Kaga, Tamba, and other provinces in succession,70 and we have already seen the number of appointments held by his father, Takashina Tameie.71

In a government increasingly controlled by the Fujiwara family, rival families, such as those making up the zuryō, were

68See Hurst (1976), 221. For a discussion of the in no chō, see ibid, 217-36.

69Such well known kinshin zuryō as Fujiwara Takatoki and Takashina Tameakira never rose to higher than shōshii no ge 正四位下, or senior fourth lower rank. Even Fujiwara Kuniakira, whose death so distressed ex-emperor Shirakawa, only attained the rank of senior fourth upper rank.

70See the entry for Kōwa 5 (1103)/12/20, in Honchō seiki, KT 9:348.

71See entry for Kajō 1 (1106)/11/16, in Chūyūki, ZST 11:150.
excluded from participation in running the state. Therefore, although zuryō may have had to buy their offices from the retired emperors, the relationship was symbiotic in that the former not only accumulated wealth, but also the power that had been denied to them by the Fujiwara with its monopoly of government positions in the capital;" This disintegrative process [i.e., the elimination of rival uji by the Fujiwara and the impairment of 'direct rule' by the emperor] provided the context in which local aristocrats and downwardly mobile capital aristocrats who moved to the provinces appropriated economic advantage and power to themselves." Thus the relationship between the zuryō and the ex-emperors was also based on the common cause of establishing independence from the Fujiwara.

The zuryō also had strong local support, as they often came from the provinces and, therefore, had close ties to local communities. As a result, they could rely on local warriors not only to collect taxes from those defaulting on dues, but also to subdue rival local families. In this way they were able to reestablish provincial authority, and it is from these military houses that the warrior class, which would dominate the Kamakura era, emerged: "With the appearance of the zuryō, a new element was added to provincial politics. These officials were often chosen from families which had little or no influence in the

---

72See Kōno Fusao 河野房男, "Inseiki no zuryōsō" 院政期受領僧, Rekishi kyōiku 歴史教育 12, no. 6 (June 1964): 54-57.

73Kiley (1970), 75.
capital, but were powerful local forces. Families such as the Daigo Genji, the Uda Genji and the Imai were of noble blood, but held power mainly in the provinces. Their sons and cousins occupied offices in the district and township administrations as well as provincial posts such as the zuryō."

But what we also see here with the practice of absent provincial governors and the ties of the zuryō with local communities, is the development of an independent, or private, aspect to provincial government. Zuryō, as noted above, to a great extent had a free hand in exploiting the tax resources of their respective provinces as long as the state received its dues. Moreover, the renewal of terms and the practice of passing positions on to one's sons gave their offices a proprietary aspect; "By the late eleventh century, the governments of provincial Japan could be said to be predominantly of a local, private character. The kokugaryō was not the same as a private estate, but the resemblance between the two was marked."75

It appears that the zuryō were favourable to shōen reform because they would benefit if there were more taxable lands; although they were not allowed to impinge on estates where immunities had been clearly established, they had the support of the court in investigating lands that did not have impeccable

74Mesner, 151-52.

75Ibid., 152. On the topic of the "private" nature of provincial governments, see Murai Yasuhiko 村井 優彦, "Kokugaryō no kozō" 国衙領の構造, Rekishiki kyōiku 歴史教育, 12, no. 6 (June 1964), 49-50, cited in Mesner 152 n. 11.
status. This, however, led to animosity from the sekkanke whose lands were being restricted because of these investigations. This, to some extent, could help to explain the willingness of zuryō to contribute to the Rokushō-ji, as they were institutions meant to rival the Fujiwara clan.

But as the shōen seiri system was abandoned and shōen were expanded, or new ones started, the income of the zuryō fell. Moreover, despite their use of military force, these provincial authorities were often not able to displace powerful local clans for long, and eventually the latter were able to reassert their authority locally. Furthermore, since the shōen reforms had clarified and legitimized the estates that were allowed to remain, local estate proprietors were able to establish strong local authority, an authority which could not be encroached upon by the zuryō. At the same time, as the imperial house accumulated shōen, and thus became more independent, it needed zuryō less.77

76 Takeuchi suggests that the edicts of 1069 were initiated in part due to requests by provincial officials to help deal with irregularities in estates. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, "Heike oyobi insei seiken to shōensei" 平家及び院政政権と荊園制, Rekishigaku kenkyū 歴史学研究 225 (November 1958): 29, cited in Mesner, 168 n. 46. However, although zuryō tended to be assiduous about shōen reforms at the beginning of their term of office, they were much less so at the end of it as they no longer had a vested interest in the jurisdiction. In fact, they often actively tried to establish their own shōen in provinces that they were leaving. Yasuda (1974), 178.

77 See Ishii, 193-96. Even though the ex-emperors who appointed the zuryō supported shōen reform, it is clear from their activities with regard to the Rokushō-ji and other institutions that they were at the same time promoting the
Administrative Considerations; The Relation Between Imperial Prince-Priests (hōshinnō 法親王) and the Rokushō-ji

From the time of Atsukata Shinnō 敦固親王 (?-926) and Atsumi Shinnō 敦実親王,78 sons of Emperor Uda, the management of Ninna-ji had been passed on successively to direct descendents of the imperial throne. As previously noted, the adherence to the strict Shingon tradition of transmission of office from master to disciple resulted in the position of bettō at Ninna-ji being limited to imperial princes. This restriction was unique among temples and appears to have been implemented in order to maintain the temple's superior status and, in fact, Ninna-ji did become the most important gogan-ji in the Heian era.

It was not, however, only the imperial family that placed its sons in temples, nor was that practice limited to Ninna-ji. From the end of the tenth century it was common for the children of aristocrats to take the tonsure and enter religious accumulation of estates for themselves. Thus, one should bear in mind with respect to such land reforms that, "The edicts strengthened the hand of the retired emperors in controlling the direction in which commendations would be made rather than in abolishing the practice altogether." Cornelius Kiley, "Estate and Property in the Late Heian Period," in Medieval Japan: Essays in Institutional History, ed. J. W. Hall & J. P. Mass (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 118. As Kuroda also suggests, the imperial house was primarily concerned with its personal agenda and not reform per se. Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄, Shōsensei shakai 荘園制社会, vol. 2 of Taikei, Nihon rekishi 体系・日本歴史 (Tokyo: Nihon Hyōronsha, 1967), 105.

78 Hōmyō, or Buddhist name, Kakushin 視真, 893-967.
establishments.\textsuperscript{79} Although some devoted themselves to study and religious practice, for many the taking of the tonsure was simply a suitable alternate lifestyle for a member of the elite class. Accordingly, they would reside in quarters separate from the regular clergy and had not only clerical, but also lay, attendants. Their training differed from that of regular monks and many, such as the hōshinnō of Ninna-ji, entered religious establishments while still children. Moreover, they were often assured of attaining the highest ranks in the clerical hierarchy due to their social standing.\textsuperscript{80}

Although Go-Sanjō had given the Tendai sect preeminence at Enshū-ji, Shirakawa, taking his cue from Uda, favoured the Shingon school. Moreover, he strove to avoid the widespread influence of the Jimon and Sanmon branches of the Tendai school by aligning with Ninna-ji. By ensconcing imperial princes there some degree of control of the Shingon sect had been achieved, and being a temple associated with imperial princes, Ninna-ji was, to some degree, excluded from interference by other temples.

As already noted, the highest position of kengyō at each of the Rokushō-ji was limited to the hōshinnō, i.e., imperial

\textsuperscript{79}See Jien's comments on the number of sons of regents who were living at Enryaku-ji, Onjō-ji, Kōfuku-ji, etc. See Gukanshō, NKBT 86:355, and an accompanying note (p. 523 n. 20), for the names of elites living at the various temples.

\textsuperscript{80}See Kuroda (1980), 43-44.
princes, of Ninna-ji. Without exception these imperial princes held this post starting with the second generation of omuro, Nyūdō Shōshin 入道性信, who became the first kengyō of Hosshō-ji in 1077. The third omuro, Kakugyō Hōshinnō 覚行法親王 inherited this position from Shōshin and became kengyō of both Sonshō-ji as well. The fourth

---

81 For instance, Kanjo 寛助 (1057-1125), son of Minamoto Morosuke 源師資, was interim bettō at Ninna-ji as well as bettō of Hosshō-ji. However, he could not be appointed kengyō of the latter temple because he was not an imperial prince. Hiraoka (1981), 645. As noted previously, the dominance of the position of kengyō can be seen in the kuyō documents of Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji. See, for example, Shōryaku gannen Hosshō-ji kuyō-ki 承暦元年法勝寺供養記, ZGR, 27a:131.

82 Although the term omuro originally referred to the residence built by the retired emperor Uda near the temple, it later came to be applied to the hōshinnō who lived there.

83 Also known as Shōshin Hōshinnō 性信法親王, or Shinmyō 師明, 1005-85, fourth son of Emperor Sanjō. He was given the title of shinno at age seven and entered the priesthood at Ninna-ji at the age of fourteen. Although he is referred to as hōshinnō he should be properly known as nyūdō, as the former term referred to a son of an emperor who was made an imperial prince after he had become a priest (only with the title of shinnō, i.e., imperial prince, was the son of an emperor eligible to be put in line for the imperial throne). The first to receive the title of hōshinnō was Kakugyō 覚行, who entered the priesthood in 1085 at age eleven, and who was made an imperial prince in 1099. See Ima kagami 今鏡, ed. Takehana Isao 竹鼻穂, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1984), 3:315-17.

84 Also known as, Nakaomuro 中御室 (posthumous name, Kakunen 覚念), 1075-1104, he was the third son of Emperor Shirakawa. See previous footnote.

85 See entry for Kōwa 4 (1102)/7/21, in Sonshō-ji's Kuyō-e 供養會, in Chōyū-ki, ZST 10:201. Here again the position of kengyō is listed as the highest in the temple.
omuro, became kengyō of Hosshō-ji and Sonshō-ji in 1114 at the age of twenty-three, and in 1139 he became kengyō of Seishō-ji. The fifth omuro, Kakushō Hōshinnō 覺性，in 1149, at age twenty, became kengyō of Ninna-ji and Enshō-ji. In 1150 he was made kengyō of Hosshō-ji and in 1159, kengyō of Sonshō-ji, Enshō-ji and Seishō-ji. By 1164 he was kengyō of all the Rokushō-ji. The sixth omuro, Shukaku Hōshinnō 守覚法親王, succeeded to the position of kengyō of the temples, and in 1185 Ex-emperor Go-Shirakawa had Dōhō Hōshinnō 道法法親王 appointed to the office.

These hōshinnō of Ninna-ji were relatively young when they were made kengyō of the Rokushō-ji, and so probably did not have much actual power or ability with respect to the affairs of the temples; the day to day management (e.g., supervision of temple lands) lay with the sangō 三綱, the three main administrative

---

66 Also known as Kōya Omuro 高野御室, 1091-1153, fourth son of Emperor Shirakawa. He entered the priesthood as a child and was made hōshinnō in 1110 at the age of nineteen.

67 Also known as Shinpō 信法, 1129-69. Kakushō was the fifth son of Emperor Toba and entered Ninna-ji at the age of seven.

88 1150-1202. Second son of Go-Shirakawa. He was adopted by Hachijōin 八条院 (personal name Shōshi 昇子) and entered Ninna-ji at age eleven. By age twelve he had become a priest, at nineteen been made kengyō of Ninna-ji, and at twenty, chōri of Hosshō-ji.

89 1166-1214. Eighth son of Emperor Go-Shirakawa. His original posthumous name was Sonshō Hōshinnō 尊性法親王 (by which he is sometimes referred), but it was later changed to Dōhō. Re. his appointment to kengyō of the Rokushō-ji, see entry for Genryaku 2 (1185)/12/12, in Ninna-ji goden 仁和寺御伝, GR 5:454.
positions in the temple, or other lesser administrators in the individual institutions. Yet, because the top offices in Ninna-ji and the Rokushō-ji were monopolized by the hōshinno who were descendents of Shirakawa, these institutions were controlled by the ex-emperors through their sons.

We have already seen how Tendai monks had managed to exclude Tō-ji from the kanjō ceremonies of Sonshō-ji. Enryaku-ji had also gradually gained control over appointments to various lecture meetings and, therefore, appointment to the Sōgō. However, although such positions as bettō of the Hosshō-ji Daijō-e and Go-hakkō went to the Enryaku-ji zasu (the prestige of the zasu actually helped to promote the lectures), it was essential that the important office of kengyō remain in the hands of the Ninna-ji hōshinno. Control of these temples was a matter of concern because of the landholdings entrusted to them; although estates were allotted to the retired emperors for their

90It appears that ability did play an important role as far as appointment to these positions was concerned. As seen in a document from the in no chō with regard to the ranks of bettō, kusō 供僧, and ajari of the Chōkōdō 長講堂, monks were required to have not only talent, but also diligence and capability for the tasks required in their appointments. If such candidates were not available the document recommends that the position remain unfilled. See Kamakura ibun, 2:9, document 580, dated Kenkyū 3 (1192)/1.

91Although the bettō or gon-bettō of the Rokushō-ji were priests from Enryaku-ji, Onjō-ji, or Tō-ji, it appears that these were simply titles given to monks who were invited to participate in rites at the temples in fulfillment of the strict requirements for yearly rituals (e.g., Hosshō-ji's Daijō-e, and Sonshō-ji's Kanjō ceremonies). They were not, therefore, entrusted with any administrative or managerial duties at the six temples.
upkeep (goinryō 御院領—see the next chapter), they did not compare with the large shōen holdings of the kuge, which were increasingly reducing taxable public lands.

As already noted, Go-Sanjō and Shirakawa were active in curbing this growth of shōen, and as part of this general policy the ex-emperors tended to align themselves with zuryō. These officials were often in no kinshin who, in theory, were opposed to the proliferation of shōen and, as noted above, were often antagonistic to the sekkanke. Since the hōshinnō, as kengyō, were responsible for the appointment of administrative and managerial positions, the retired emperors, through the hōshinnō, also incorporated in no kinshin among the administrators, such as the sangō, of the Rokushō-ji. Thus the insei could utilize the administrative element of the Rokushō-ji to establish anti-Fujiwara or anti-Taira political sentiment. Because this was the case, it was irrelevant whether the position of kengyō, the highest administrative official of the temple, was given to a minor as long as the position was held by a direct descendent of an ex-emperor.

---

92 For example, Shunkan 俊寛 (1142-79) was appointed zasu of Hosshō-ji. He was a kinshin of Go-Shirakawa's in and was involved in the Shishi-ga-tani affair related in Heike monogatari. Hiraoka (1981), 648. Jōken 靜賢, son of Fujiwara no Michinori 藤原通憲 (1106?-59; Buddhist name Shinzei 信西) was made shugyō 執行 (administrator) of Hosshō-ji. His father, Shinzei, was also a kinshin of Go-Shirakawa's in and was close to Go-Shirakawa, having great influence over him even after his retirement. He helped to renew shōen reforms and was killed during Heiji no ran. The jealousies he aroused among other kinshin of Go-Shirakawa show that there was by no means harmony among them.
Moreover, while Kakuho Hōshinnō was omuro of Ninna-ji, he also performed kuyō ceremonies for several temples that were being erected at the time of Shirakawa's and Toba's in and, as a result, was able to obtain the office of kengyō at these temples as well. Due to his rank and prestige it appears that he was able to use his influence to obtain appointments for in no kinshin to administrative positions (e.g., the sangō) at those temples. In this way the authority of the insei further spread and strengthened. Moreover, the retired emperors did not rely solely on their privilege to make clerical appointments to ensure the security of the imperial house. They also had hōshinnō invested in powerful temples such as Enryaku-ji to strengthen their political position.

Therefore, utilization of the Ninna-ji hōshinnō in key positions of the Rokushō-ji by the retired emperors Shirakawa, 3

3However, marriage bonds may also have played a role in such appointments because members of the kinshin had some influence at Ninna-ji. As can be seen by examining the genealogies of the mothers of the hōshinnō there was some intermarriage between the imperial family and the in no kinshin; e.g., the mother of Kakugyō was the daughter of Fujiwara Tsunehira 藤原経平. His son, Fujiwara Michitoshi 藤原通俊 was bettō in Shirakawa's in. Kakuhō's mother was a daughter of Minamoto Akifusa 源頼房, a kinshin of Shirakawa's in. See Hurst (1976), 243.

4For example, Go-Toba's sons Dōkaku Hōshinnō 道覚法親王 (d. 1250) and Sonkai Hōshinnō 尊快 (d. 1246), were both at Enryaku-ji. The former became zasu of the temple in 1247 and the latter attained the same position in 1221 at the age of eighteen. See Gukanshō, NKBT 86:355. For an English version, see Delmer M. Brown and Ichirō Ishida, The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the Gukanshō, An Interpretative History of Japan Written in 1219 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 237.
Toba, and Go-Shirakawa, indicates the insei's concern with control of those six temples. However, the practice of imperial princes being successively appointed to Ninna-ji as its clerical head contrasted sharply with the previous practice of what is often referred to as "dynastic shedding." This was a process by which princes were given surnames, appointed to ministerial posts, and given a stipend, a process that eliminated them from any claim to the throne and, in effect, transformed them into commoners. Now they were given the title of imperial prince, as well as high clerical rank, even though they had little or no ability (or interest) in religious matters. Jien criticized this trend, charging that it resulted in a proliferation of unskilled priests and lamented that they started schools and developed what amounted to secular relationships between themselves and their disciples.  

This practice, however, enabled the in to maintain a hereditary monopoly over key positions at certain temples, thus ensuring its control over the vast lands that these institutions had been given. Since the Rokushō-ji were under the control of the hōshinnō of Ninna-ji, who were in a stable and secure position, the six temples and their lands were ensured of remaining as a unit relatively safe from fragmentation. Moreover, interference from the sekken seiji, as well as the reigning emperor, was avoided by having the six temples built

---

95See Gukanshō, NKBT 86:355-56. For an English version, see Brown and Ishida, 237-38.
close to one of the retired emperor's gosho in the Shirakawa district. The Rokushō-ji then, were intrinsically connected to the expansion of lands for the in (or perhaps more properly, for the interests of the imperial family), which aided in ensuring stability for the insei seiken and, consequently, independence from the sekkanke.
Chapter 5

The Holdings Kōshitsu Ryō 皇室領 of the Imperial House

The first lands of the emperors were known as agata 県 and traditionally trace back to the first emperor, Jimmu. These lands tended to be established in geographically or militarily important areas, and some fifty-seven have been documented. However, as they were managed by agata nushi 県主, they were, in effect, only indirectly controlled by the emperor. Soon after, landholdings known as miyake 巌倉 appeared, and these are said to have been directly controlled by the emperors, who were able to dispose of them at will. Consequently they were sometimes given to nobles who, as a result, managed the land and the cultivators working it. It is not known in such cases whether the emperor would have received any income from these transferred miyake. In contrast to the agata, miyake were situated in areas that were particularly suited to agriculture, and, because of this the term miyake came to refer to the granaries that held the rice produced on the fields. These lands became prominent in the fifth and sixth centuries, and some sixty of them have been documented.

---

1See Takeuchi (1956), 63.

2Ibid., 63. For a detailed study of miyake, see Yajima Eiichi 矢島栄一, "Kodaishi ni okeru miyake no い" 古代史に於ける屯倉の意義, Rekishi gaku kenkyū 歴史學研究 6 no. 12 (December 1936): 2-27.
However, with the Taika Reforms of 645 both agata and miyake were abolished, and many were converted to government lands (kanden 官田). This was because all land was now regulated by the state, and financial resources for the upkeep of the imperial court were provided for within the ritsuryō codes. As noted in the Introduction, Kiley argues that what this new system of government established was administrative control over land and not proprietary rights; "...rather than 'ownership,' the source, or perhaps more properly, the mode, of authority being exercised by the state over allotted ricelands was administrative regulative power of a diffuse sort. The power to distribute lands to farmers according to a well-formulated scheme, in other words, need not be seen as a sort of 'title.'"³

Therefore, the power of the emperor lay not in the fact that all inhabitants of Japan had to regard him as their landlord but, rather, in the fact that he held, "...universal political dominion over people and territories, with the implication, of course, that his power over lands and people is unlimited. This is far too diffuse to interpret as a merely proprietary relationship."⁴

Even though the financial needs of the imperial house were provided for by the state under the ritsuryō system, it still became advantageous for it to have some "private" sources of

⁴Ibid., 5.
income, and with the blurring of the distinction between "public" expenses and those of the imperial house it became necessary to establish lands especially designated for the imperial family's upkeep. Once the ritsuryō system began to deteriorate such lands became increasingly important and grew into what came to be known generically as kintr goryō 禁裏御領, "lands of the sacred precincts" (i.e., the imperial court), or ēuchi goryō 大内御領 ("court lands"). This gave rise to what have become known as chokushiden 勅旨田, that is, landholdings created by imperial edict to generate income for the imperial house. Accordingly, the term is often translated as "imperial edict lands."

The first references to chokushiden appeared in 756,5 and in the ninth century their growth accelerated due to the imperial family's need to create an alternative source of income in light of an increasing instability in resources, such as fuko, from the government. Originally lands designated as chokushiden were largely uncultivated lands (nochī 野地), lands that had never been cultivated but were considered suitable for rice fields (kūkanchī 空閑地), or waste fields (kōhaiden 荒廃田), that is, rice paddies that had been left uncultivated, thus requiring redevelopment in order to be restored to a productive state.

5Takeuchi (1956), 64.
Such lands as these were utilized because government policy during the eighth and ninth centuries was to create new rice fields in order to increase the amount of land available for the allotment (handen) system. Accordingly, chokushiden were converted into productive fields with the use of public resources (e.g., public water systems, taxes, and labour) and managed by provincial governors. However, these were not the only examples from this time of unproductive lands being designated for personal use. We have already seen how the government implemented edicts encouraging the development of konden in order to create rice fields. Chokushiden, however, were tax free (i.e., not subject to the so) and enjoyed more security and privileges than shōen. Moreover, they were established throughout Japan and not just in the kinai region, as was the case with most shōen of the time, and by the late 9th century there were some 3,925 chō of these imperial edict fields throughout the country.

6The earliest shōen began to appear in the latter half of the 8th century as a result of the konden einen shizai edict of 743, a period when the ritsuryō system was still operating effectively. These estates had only one proprietor (normally a religious institution) and the practice of distributing shiki rights had not yet developed. Moreover, these early shōen did not possess tax exemptions. It was not until the 9th century that powerful clans and religious institutions started to make claims to various immunities which would eventually lead to the first shōen regulation measures of 902, which are cited below. See Risser, 37-51.

7See Sugawara no Michizane's 管原道真 (845-903), Ruijū kokushi 類聚國史, fascicle 156, KT 6: 119-20, for a list of grants of chokushiden.
There are two main conflicting views as to the nature of chokushiden. Ishimoda Shō asserts that these were private lands and that their tax free status and great expansion subverted the ritsuryō system's tax base. He argues that the deterioration of that system forced the imperial family to exploit this form of income producing land in order to maintain its position in the face of increasingly powerful kenmon groups. However, Takeuchi Rizō views chokushiden as basically "public" in nature. That is, since the income was directly exploited by the state to support the imperial family, they were still functioning within the ritsuryō system. Whatever the case as to their nature earlier, by 902, the government decreed, along with shōen reforms, that the development of chokushiden would be abolished:

To be prohibited: Chokushiden and also purchase of the people's lands and dwelling houses for occupation on petition to [reclaim] vacant lands and abandoned fields by the several temples, the several shrines, and persons of the fifth rank and above.

On inquiring into the aforesaid matters, we find that nowadays chokushiden exist everywhere in the several provinces, and that even when the land occupied had been abandoned, the people are robbed of the means of production. In addition to which, by establishing shō managers (shōke) they often enforce a cruel regime. Their exactions are most heavy and their threats difficult to bear...

It cannot be said, following these, that the powerful are to cultivate. That is, considering these ordinances we opine that [rules concerning] petitioning to open vacant land and personal cultivation of abandoned fields were established solely for the benefit of the farmers. Insofar as the nobility are concerned, strict prohibitions have been often repeated. However, the several temples, the several shrines, and the households of the nobility, not

---

fearing the law, vie in petitions for occupation. On the day when the officials of the province and district grant permission, it would seem that [the petitioners] would do nothing but encourage the work of reclamation and be subject to the land tax (so)\(^{10}\), but they simply further exhaust the labors of the people and impede agriculture within the province.

The Minister of the Left (Fujiwara no Tokihira, 871-909) decrees, pronouncing an Imperial Edict:

Dynasties succeed one another; the sun gives way to the moon. Throughout the entire world, the rise and fall of the myriad kings continues without end. Whenever the limited amount of arable land is reduced, this cycle is served, and then the peasants of the next dynasty can obtain land and cultivate it. From this reign forward let chokushiden be prohibited entirely, and let the people cultivate for taxes. As for peasant lands held by temples and shrines, let them all be returned to their original owners, in accordance with the public [land] certificates (kugen). In addition, should any peasant sell or confide his lands or dwelling to the nobility, he shall be sentenced to sixty strokes of the heavy rod, without possibility of monetary commutation and regardless of whether he is a native or an immigrant wanderer. Should there be any [noble] house which, in violation of this proclamation, makes purchases on reception of clientage or petitions for the occupation of vacant or abandoned fields, let the province take care to record the names of the cultivator, the signatories of the certificate [claiming ownership or permission to occupy], and the representatives ["for enclosure"], and report them to the capital immediately. It should be made clear that, in cases of violation of an edict, there can be no laxity. Officials who grant permission will be dismissed from the offices they hold.\(^{11}\)

As the above edict states, one of the reasons that these measures were taken was that the use of public labour and resources to develop chokushiden had begun to impede the ability of local farmers to cultivate their own fields. Accordingly,

\(^{10}\)Konden were still subject to the so 租, or rice tax.

\(^{11}\)Rujiū sandaikyaku, fascicle 19, Engi 2 (902)/3/13, KT 25:607-09. This translation is from Kiley, 186-90. See also Risser, 99-101, for an alternative translation of the same edict.
existing chokushiden, estimated at some 4,000 chō, were left intact, but those established after Emperor Daigo's accession to the throne in 897 reverted to "public lands" to be worked by peasants, and thereafter chokushiden were prohibited. This was not an attack on the imperial family per se, or an attempt to limit its private holdings, but part of reforms made by the government under the Minister of the Left named in the edict, Fujiwara Tokihira 藤原時平, to proscribe practices that not only interfered with the regular agricultural activities of the peasants, but also reduced the amount of land available for land allotment. Consequently, other parts of the edict deal with corrupt provincial governors, illegal shōen, and the practice of peasants commending lands illegally. Therefore, this edict was primarily an attempt to preserve the ritsuryō form of government and revive its financial base, the handen system.

As a result of the prohibition of new chokushiden, lands now allotted for the upkeep of the imperial family fell into the category of fuyusoden, lands which were already developed and where the rice tax went to the proprietor of the land rather than the government. The main source of income from these imperial lands came from jishi, that is, the rent imposed on the

12 In fact, Tokihira pointedly refrains from including the imperial family among the corrupt officials. Moreover, his reference to changing dynasties suggests that these edicts were, in fact, necessary to ensure the security of the Japanese imperial house.
farmers who tilled these lands. The terminology for these imperial lands is varied and seems to depend on which institution received the jishi; chokushiden revenues appear to have been entrusted to the kokugura-in or kuraryō 内蔵寮 (a bureau in charge of the personal property of the emperor), whereas those of in chokushiden 院勅旨田 went to the in no chō, and goin chokushiden 後院勅旨田 to goin.

In terms of the development of imperial lands chokushiden represent an important stage in the development of "private" holdings because it became the custom for in-chokushiden, that is, chokushiden of an ex-emperor, to be left to temples, shrines, or relatives after his death. However, one result of reliance on income from fuyusoden and the prohibition of new chokushiden was that after the end of the tenth century the emperor had access to very little "private" land.

In 1012, a year after Emperor Ichijō's death, the crown prince (tōgū 東宮) and empress (chūgū 中宮) were each left 100 chō of chokushiden, first rank princes and princesses (i.e., ippon no miya 一品宮) eighty chō, and his wet nurse (nyūbō 乳母) twenty chō. Although this was probably not all the lands that he had to distribute in his will, it does indicate that what

---

13 Peasants rented these lands from the government to cultivate in addition to their regular kubunden. This would allow them to supplement their income without the burden of having to develop virgin territories.

14 Takeuchi (1956), 64.
there was, was limited. According to Hurst, the number of chokushiden left to the imperial house after the reforms of 902 were not insignificant, but, nevertheless, were insufficient for two reasons: "The first was the increase of imperial progeny during the early Heian period (Kammu, Heizei and Saga were particularly prolific), and the other was the increasingly luxurious life style of the Heian court."\(^{15}\) Put simply, the cost of living went up, but the amount of income remained the same.

Moreover, even though the amount of land at the disposal of the emperors was limited, there was, nevertheless, some opposition to their disposing freely of such resources. Fujiwara Michinaga raised objections when Emperor Sanjō (r. 1012-16) tried to transfer the lands of the Sanjō-in and the Reizei-in to Teishi Naishinnō 禎子内親王, a daughter of whom he was particularly fond, and, in fact, forced the emperor to withdraw the transfer arguing that "imperial" lands should not fall into "private" hands.\(^{16}\)

Such objections to the disposal of imperial lands and the distinctions between them and "private" property resulted in ex-emperors resorting to accumulating lands under some form of official capacity or in the name of some other institution. As Hurst has noted;

\(^{15}\)Hurst (1976), 257.

\(^{16}\)The term used here for "private" lands is watakushi no ryō 私の領, as opposed to the imperial lands, ohoyakemono おはやけもの. See Ōkagami, NKBT 21:55.
Ishimoda Shō has pointed out that the retired sovereign built up the private holdings of the imperial house because the emperor was hampered by the institutional restraints of his position. This seems fair enough as far as it goes, but it does not account for the fact that virtually no imperial shōen were held in the name of the ex-emperor himself. They were nominally owned by imperial temples or retired imperial ladies. It would seem that there was still an institutional restraint working upon an ex-sovereign (importantly, one who had been emperor) as well. Somehow, direct participation in the accumulation of privately controlled lands was not an appropriate imperial activity. Even the private lands acquired by Go-Sanjō were designated chokushiden, and most imperial estates were usually termed "imperial holdings" (goryō) rather than shōen.¹⁷

It is difficult to assess how much a role "institutional restraints" would have had on elites, but in a case study of a sales document of 854, Toda Yoshimi suggests that a district official (gunji), one Sukune Sanesada of Arita gun in Kii province, sold his land holdings in the province due to his concerns over a conflict of interest between his role as a government official who, ostensibly, should be trying to uphold the ritsuryō system, and his position as an elite with personal ambitions of trying to expand and develop such private resources.¹⁸ Although this incident occurred some two hundred years before the insei period and the person in question was of a far less exalted status than that of the imperial family, it indicates that, despite the infamous avarice of provincial


governors that we have seen in the last chapter, propriety could have had a concrete impact on ambitions for personal gain among elites.

With the establishment of Go-Sanjō's Kiroku Shōen Kenkeisho in 1069, lands that did not have sufficient documentation to support their claim as shōen were confiscated and returned to the state, that is, they became "public" lands again. As we have seen, "public" lands were those utilized directly by the state, and in this case many of these confiscated lands were converted by the state into the newly revived institution of chokushiden to provide for the imperial house; thus the imperial house continued to receive public support. However, these new chokushiden, which became known as Go-Sanjō-in chokushiden御三条院勅旨田, were indistinguishable from legal shōen and, therefore, were chokushiden in name only. This once again appears to indicate an awareness of the impropriety of the imperial clan accumulating land that diverted taxes away from the state, and thus the reluctance on the part of Go-Sanjō to identify landholdings which were used to support the imperial house with shōen.

Although Go-Sanjō's shōen reforms show that he was aware of problems with the estate system, at a personal level he must have realized the importance of securing resources for the imperial house if it were to maintain any sort of independence and viability in an era of powerful kemmon. In fact, this appears to be the case, as it is from the time of his reign that
we see the start of an active policy of accumulating lands for the imperial house. Some of these estates were chokushiden, but the majority of them were commended by those seeking to protect their lands with the prestige of the retired emperors.

The shōen reforms of 1069 are often seen as a response to the need to recover revenue lost by the proliferation of illegal tax-free estates. Although, as Takeuchi claims, the reforms did allow the government to restore its lost taxes, the results of the shōen reform are open to question; there is no doubt that many landholdings were confiscated, but the fact is that shōen actually proliferated in the late Heian period, and so, "The long-term effects of the estate-limitation edicts would appear to be just the opposite of what Go-Sanjō had intended."22

However, this kind of assessment assumes that the edicts were created to eliminate shōen and restore the allotment system of land, but the results of the reforms and Go-Sanjo's land accumulating activities could just as well indicate that elimination of estates was not the goal. Rather, the goal may

---

19 Kawakami Tasuke gives evidence of this loss of revenue. See Kawakami Tasuke 川上多助, "Heianchō no shōen seisaku" 平安朝の荘園政策, Shigaku Zasshi 史學雜誌 34, no. 6 (June 1923): 408.

20 Takeuchi, "Heike oyobi insei seiken to shōensei" (1958), 31, cited in Mesner, 174 n. 65.

21 For a summary of some of the views of this debate, see Mesner, 174. See also Murai, Kodai kokka kaitai no kenkyū (1964), 387-89, cited in Mesner, 174 n. 63.

have been to ensure that estates were established by only certain groups and not others and, in fact, some see the shōen reforms as directed specifically against the Fujiwara.\(^\text{23}\)

Hurst argues that Go-Sanjō's reforms were directed against the Fujiwara sekkenke and that although Yorimichi managed to obtain exemption from estate confiscations, other Fujiwara complied with the edicts with the result that, "[sekkanke] holdings were dealt a serious blow by the estate regulations of Go-Sanjō's reign."\(^\text{24}\) Sato, however, asserts that we do not have any documentation that this was the case; "Available evidence suggests that the holdings of the Fujiwara family were not adversely affected by the edicts at this time."\(^\text{25}\)

The case, then, is far from clear, but there is no doubt that even though the Fujiwara were one of the largest holders of private estates in the Heian era many of them still supported various land reforms (e.g., Tokihira with respect to the above mentioned chokushiden edicts of 902). Takeuchi argues that although the Fujiwara did accumulate private lands, they nevertheless still identified with the government and for this reason they supported badly needed shōen reforms.\(^\text{26}\) Even at the beginning of the ninth century Fujiwara Otsugu and Fuyutsugu had

\(^{23}\)See Abe Takeshi 阿部猛, *Ritsuryō kokka kaitai katei no kenkyū* 律領国家解体過程の研究 (Tokyo: Shinseisha, 1966), 577.

\(^{24}\)Hurst (1976), 116.

\(^{25}\)Sato, 85.

\(^{26}\)See Takeuchi (1957-58), 2:371-391. See also Mesner, 162.
returned many of their fuko to alleviate financial difficulties at court, and shōen regulations issued in 984 were instigated by Fujiwara Yoshichika and Yoshinari.27 One of the reasons why these officials could afford to support such reforms was that they still held fuko as sources of income. Moreover, due to their prestige, many of their shōen had proper documentation and were, therefore, safe from confiscation.28

Ishimoda states that the insei period saw the accumulation of over one thousand imperial estates in some fifty-nine provinces.29 This is an impressive number when we compare it to the landholdings of other institutions: by the latter half of the tenth century Tōdai-ji had ninety-two shōen (although this number fell by the beginning of the thirteenth century to fifty-four); Tō-ji had only eight in the Heian era but over thirty in the following Kamakura period; and Kōyasan had no more than twenty-four in both the Heian and Kamakura periods. On the other hand, in 1070 Kōfuku-ji had over 150 shōen in the province of

27See ibid., 162.

28However, this was not always the case. See Hurst's account of the confiscation of lands belonging to Kōfuku-ji due to Yorimichi's less than stringent handling of legal documentation with respect its estates. Hurst (1976), 117.

29Ishimoda (1964), 360. Hurst has accounted for 60 provinces, and claims that the number of estates is well over this figure. See Hurst (1974), 89. Okuno cites Yajiro Kuniji's figure of 1,180 estates, but he contends that this figure is low, while Kuroda estimates that there were between 800 to 1,000 imperial estates in the twelfth century. See Okuno Takahiro 奥野高徳, "Kōshitsu goryō shōen" 皇室御領在園, Nihon rekishi 日本歴史 184 (September 1963):86 and Kuroda (1980), 51.
Yamato alone. As for the sekkenke, in the mid-thirteenth century the Konoe branch held over 150 estates, while the Kujō branch held over 100.30

Imperial estates were largely accumulated during the late Heian period and these were referred to as the sandai gokishō no chi 三代御起請の地, or, "lands pledged during the three reigns,"31 that is, during the in of ex-emperors Shirakawa (1087-1129), Toba (1129-56) and Go-Shirakawa (1158-92), a period of just over one hundred years. The practice of commendation of lands led to an increase in the size and number of shōen in general, and in the imperial estates in particular, because they offered the advantage of being singularly safe from interference by provincial officials due to their holders' prestige. In an era when kenmon groups were able to exert political power through their prestige, and not necessarily through government office, the distinctions between public and private authority became blurred. With respect to land it was not only one's ability to provide formal legal claims to a specific estate that ensured recognition of its legitimacy; "...particularistic exercise of authority by the heads of quasi-corporate familistic groups, notably the Fujiwara, were beginning to assume an

30 Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二, Nihon hōkensei seiritsu katei no kenkyū 日本封建制成立過程の研究 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961), 37. Despite these numbers the kuge of all ranks as a group still held considerably more shōen than did temples and shrines or the imperial house.

31 This is Hurst's translation of the term. See Hurst (1974), 88.
importance almost equal to that of the state organization itself. Under such a regime, symmetrical uniformity in law became much less important."

As a result, "Almost all proprietary authority was somehow colored by claims to public or quasi-public authority." This explains the proliferation of imperial landholdings: the imperial house was one of the most prestigious institutions of the time and, although lacking direct political power, was still one of the most important "authorities" in the land. Even without explicit political power the imperial house still managed to exert great influence and prestige; "The court retained some real power, but, more important, it remained a center of prestige distribution among competitors for status. This was a position not really capable of direct usurpation." 

According to Ishii by the beginning of the 13th century in the province of Noto (present day Ishikawa-ken) over seventy per

---

32Kiley (1970), 22.

33Ibid., 22. As noted above, such authority did not necessarily have to possess political power per se; an authority, such as that of the ex-emperors, "...is a focal point for the distribution of prestige and the legitimization of administrative authority, but is not a party to competition for the acquisition of real power...As can be seen from The Tale of Genji, the primacy of the court came to be founded on a 'rule of taste' rather than on administrative power." Ibid., 27-28.

34Ibid., 56. One cannot underestimate the power that such prestige could have. One has only to look at the example of Minamoto Yoshitomo (1123-60), who gave his father up for execution when the latter found himself on the losing side of a dispute over imperial succession. In this case the former's family ties took second place to that of the interests of the imperial house.
cent of the rice fields had been converted into shōen, and of those, three quarters had been converted during the period of Toba's insei.\textsuperscript{35} Amino Yoshihiko notes that in the province of Wakasa (present day Fukui-ken) during the Bunei era (1264-74), about fifty percent of the shōen had been established by the in of either Toba or Go-Shirakawa.\textsuperscript{36} Although these are just two provinces, they indicate the accelerated rate of new shōen production during this period.

In the late twelfth century Go-Shirakawa continued to accumulate shōen for gogan-ji to assure resources for the insei, for the imperial family remained uneasy as to their fate in light of the Minamoto's efforts to unify the country after the fall of the Taira. The ex-emperor furthered the process of amassing land by converting provinces to chigyōkoku 知行国.\textsuperscript{37} With the increasing number of lands accumulated, as well as concerns about providing for the various members of the imperial

\textsuperscript{35}See Ishii, 209.

\textsuperscript{36}See Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦, "Wakasakuni ni okeru shōensei no keisei" 若狭国における荘園制の形成, in Shōensei to buke shakai 荘園制と武家社会, ed. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1969), 142.

\textsuperscript{37}Hiraoka (1981), 651. Go-Shirakawa accumulated a large number of holdings for the temple Chōkōdō 長講堂. They became known as Chōkōdō-ryō 長講堂領 and were passed down as a major financial resource for the imperial house (see below). Although aware of the problems brought about by tax-exempt lands (in 1156, he too had issued ordinances against illegal shōen), Go-Shirakawa apparently had no qualms about amassing such lands for the imperial house, perhaps because he felt that the imperial house was, in effect, the government.
family and their residences, land came to be divided among shrines, temples, and imperial ladies (nyoin-ryō). As Okuno puts it, there came into being a policy of "cloaking" lands behind religion and women.\textsuperscript{38}

However, the impropriety of the imperial house holding property does not appear to have been the only reason for distributing lands in such a manner. Hurst has proposed that they were spread among temples and imperial ladies to ensure some degree of safety from possible confiscation during times of political unrest; that is, distributing the imperial estates over several proprietors rather than keeping them under only one, or only a few, reduced the risk of losing all the imperial house's lands if confiscation did take place.\textsuperscript{39}

We see, then, that there was a direct cause for the proliferation of gogan-ji during the insei period: they ensured the security of what had became extremely stable and large land holdings from confiscation by the Fujiwara, Taira, or Minamoto, landholdings so secure that they would form the economic basis for Go-Toba's Jōkyū no ran (1221) and Go-Daigo's Genkō no ran (1326). The Rokushō-ji in effect provided a cover, under the guise of chokuganji, for this appropriation of lands.

\textsuperscript{38}Okuno (1963), 80.

\textsuperscript{39}Hurst (1974), 87.
Imperial Temple Holdings

The Shien-ji and the Rokushô-ji were all designated as gogan-ji, or supplication temples, to which imperial lands could be allocated, or to which elites could donate, or commend, lands. Although Takeuchi does not dismiss the sincere religious commitment of the ex-emperors as a factor, he does not see the establishment of these temples as simply acts of devotion.40 As Hurst has noted, the imperial house did not have a monopoly on faith and many in Heian society, not just members of the imperial family, became priests or nuns, or took up residence in temples.41 Yet, unlike the imperial house, the sekkanke did not turn over all of its lands to its clan temples (uji-dera).42

40 Takeuchi, "Inchô seiken no seikaku: kôshitsu ryô saiken no imi" (1956), 66-67.

41 Hurst (1976), 261. We have seen how other elites commended lands to various temples and shrines, among them those of the imperial family, and by the Kamakura era such religious institutions had accumulated huge land holdings; in Kyushu they accounted for some 60% of all arable land, in the province of Awaji temple lands accounted for 47%, and shrine lands 16% of cultivated lands, while in the Kinai region they accounted for between 80 and 90% of the land. However, there is no doubt that in many cases this was done in order to share in, or "borrow," the prestige and authority of powerful religious institutions.

42 This is not to say that the Fujiwara did not commend lands to its ujidera; they did so in the case of such institutions as Kôfuku-ji and Kasuga jinja. However, the prestige of the Fujiwara, due to their gaiseki 外戚 (i.e., maternal relationship to emperors) allowed them to be honke in their own right, and they did not appear to have been hindered by social or institutional restraints in amassing shôen under their own name. Moreover, they were powerful enough not to need such "borrowed" prestige. Why then would they have commended land to temples and shrines? In part this was a means of maintaining a connection to these religious institutions; that is, to align themselves with, and secure the cooperation of, these institutions which were, in
Moreover, "That these well-endowed temples of the imperial house were of virtually no importance in the history of Japanese religion emphasizes once again that they were largely social and economic assets for the house and comfortable, even luxurious, residences to which the ex-sovereigns, retired imperial ladies, and other imperial house members could retreat."\(^{13}\)

The Rokushō-ji appear to have been the first in this tradition of endowing religious institutions with imperial lands and some twenty-eight other temples followed, resulting in total holdings of over 500 estates.\(^{4}\) Temple building, then, became one means of furthering the imperial family's ambitions and power.

**The Lands of the Rokushō-ji**

As mentioned previously, many of the lands of the Rokushō-ji resulted from conversion of *fuko* to *shōen*, but, as also noted, many more were donated by members of the *zuryō* class to further their advancement or commended by those eager to find a *honke* powerful enough to limit interference from provincial governors.\(^5\)

\(^{4}\)Hurst (1974), 87-88.

\(^{13}\)Kuroda (1975), 78 and Kuroda (1980), 51-52.

\(^{5}\)We know, for instance, that Fujiwara Takatoki 藤原隆時, the governor of Ōmi, Minamoto Chūnagon Kuninobu 源中納言国信, Minamoto Arikata Ason 源有賢朝臣, and Kunai Tayū Fujiwara Morosue 宮内大輔藤原師季 were among those who commended lands
It is unclear exactly how many estates belonged to the Rokushō-ji, but the research of Okunō Takahiro has documented at least eighty-six46 and to this Abe Takeshi has added some seventeen more, for a total of one hundred and three.47 Since Shimizu Masatake has established there were over 5,600 shōen throughout the country,48 this represents a significant bloc of landholdings.

The question of the actual "head" proprietorship of the Rokushō-ji lands is not clear; that is, who exactly was designated as the honke 本家 and who was the ryōke 領家? Generally though, the ex-emperor in effect, if not in name, held the position of honke, and the individual temples took on the role of the ryōke.49 For instance, although estates were donated to the individual temples, ultimately control of the lands seems to Sonshō-ji. See entry for Kōwa 5 (1103)/10/12, in Denryaku, 1:242-43.

46See Okuno Takahiro (1956), 131-47. The landholdings he has identified have been summarized in charts in Kokushi daijiten, s.v. "rokushō-ji ryō" 六勝寺領.


48See Shimizu Masatake 清水正健, Shōen shiryō 荒園史料, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1965). Although originally published in 1933, this is still a standard work that has identified the major shōen in the approximately eight hundred years (i.e., 8th-16th centuries) of their history. More recent works have added to this list and have been able to locate their geographical locations. See Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, ed., Shōen bumpuzu 荒園分布図, 2 vols. (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1975).

49Kuroda (1980), 51.
to have been largely in the hands of Ex-emperor Shirakawa during
the period of his insei. Thus we see that Emperor Horikawa
instructed kurōdō 割人 (secretary) Fujiwara no Tamefusa 藤原為
房 to send land titles and other relevent documents concerning
Sonshō-ji to Shirakawa at his request so that they could be
placed under the management of the "honji" 本寺 (i.e., Hosshō-
ji). 50

On the other hand, the day to day management of the lands
seems to have fallen to the bettō or the shugyō 執行 of the
individual temples. In the case of commended lands there were no
administrative rights involved; these would have been in the
hands of one of the commenders and the actual management of the
lands on the level of cultivation would have been the
responsibility of the myōshu 名主52, shōkan 荘官53, or gesu 下司. 54

Some idea of the relations between the estates and the

50 See entry for Kajō 1 (1106)/10/21-22 in Eishōki 永昌記,
ZST 8:58. See also Okuno Takahiro (1956), 138.

51 Alternate reading shigyō or shikkō.

52 The person responsible for the myō, which was the basic
unit of land for taxation. This was an untitled position. Duties
would have included collecting and allocating taxes.

53 Local shōen officials, often resident managers.

54 Alternate reading, geshi. A local administrator appointed
by the proprietor, or the commender himself. The term refers to
management rights over the estate.

For a discussion of control of commended lands by temples,
see Asakawa Kanichi 朝河貫一, "Chūsei Nihon no jiinryō" 中世日本の寺院領, Rekishi Chiri 歴史地里 35, no. 3 (March 1920): 224.
temples can be surmised by examining one of the few well documented examples that have survived with respect to this, the case of the Shidorosō 質侭庄, an estate belonging to Enshō-ji, in the Haibara district (Haibara kōri 榊原郡) of Tōtōmi province.\(^55\)

Originally this was an estate of Ōe Hirosuke 大江広資. However, in order to ensure his claims to the land he commended the estate to Fujiwara Nagaie 藤原長家, the sixth son of Fujiwara Michinaga, some time during the Chōryaku era (1037-40). In this case Nagaie of the powerful Fujiwara clan became the main proprietor (honke 本家) and Hirosuke the central proprietor, or ryōke 領家. Because Hirosuke's son had no male heir the ryōke shiki rights were eventually left to Fujiwara Nagazane 藤原永実 and the honke shiki inherited by Fujiwara Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062-1141). However, in 1112, to cover the expenses of having some sutras copied, Munetada sold his honke shiki rights to Nagazane who was therefore able to pass on both honke and ryōke shiki rights to his son, Fujiwara Naganori 藤原永範. In 1128, concerns over the threat of confiscation by the provincial governor of Tōtōmi, Minamoto Mototoshi 源基俊, prompted Naganori to commend the estate to Taikenmon'in's newly established Enshō-ji which, accordingly, became the new honke. Immediately there

---

\(^55\) The following is drawn from Yasuda Motohisa 安田元久, Shōen 荘園 (Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1993), 152-53.
was an investigation of the estate by Taikenmon'in's *in no chō*, which resulted in formal recognition of its tax-free status and a survey which estimated rice paddies of 209 *chō* and other fields of 126 *chō*. Later, during the early Kamakura era, this commendation to Enshō-ji, a particularly powerful *honke*, proved useful in having an abusive *jitō* exiled from the province and in 1190 in having *jitō shiki*, and the office of *jitō* itself, eliminated from the estate.

We know that the six temples of the Rokushō-ji came to be regarded as a unit as early as 1163, largely through the appointment of imperial princes, i.e., *hōshinnō*, to the position of *kengyō*. Accordingly, their lands also came to be regarded as representing a single block, all of them under the management of Ex-emperor Go-Shirakawa, and later transferred to the ex-emperor Go-Toba. However, after Jōkyū no Ran (1221), the Kamakura bakufu confiscated the Rokushō-ji estates. Having deposed the four year old reigning emperor, Chūkyō, and banished the three ex-emperors, Go-Toba, Juntoku, and Tsuchimikado, it then set about the process of determining the imperial succession. In doing so it followed precedent by continuing the practice of having an ex-emperor head the imperial family. The result was that Prince Morisada 守貞親王56, who had never been emperor, was designated the "retired emperor," and given the name Go-Takakura-In 御高倉院, and his son was made emperor with the name Go-Horikawa. The

---

56(1179-1223), second son of Emperor Takakura 高倉.
bakufu then handed control of the Rokushō-ji estates and other lands to Go-Takakura In. He, in turn, transferred a large proportion of the estates to the emperor Shijō. These were then passed on to Emperor Go-Saga, and then to Emperor Kameyama, who transferred the lands to Takaharu Shinnō, who was to become Emperor Go-Daigo.

The Rokushō-ji were by no means the largest holders of imperial estates. Among those that were, however, was the Chōkōdō-ryō, a temple established by Go-Shirakawa in 1185 as a residence for his retirement. He apparently lived at this temple for some thirty years and a particularly large number of holdings were assigned to it, holdings that came to be referred to as the Chōkōdō-ryō. These were particularly extensive and eventually numbered over 180 estates in forty-two provinces. The yearly income from these holdings appears to

57 E.g. the Hachijō-in-ryō 八条院領, the holdings of Princess Shōshi (also known as, Hachijō-in 八条院, 1137-1211), born to Toba and his consort Bifukumon'in. This became one of the largest imperial landholdings with some 230 estates. See Hurst (1976), 163.

58 This is according to an account in the 14th century Baishōron. See Baishōron genishū 梅松論源威集, ed. Yashiro Kazuo 矢代和夫, and Kami Hiroshi 加実宏, Shinsen Nihon koten bunko 新撰日本古典文庫 vol. 3, ed. Mori Hideto 森秀人 (Tokyo: Gendai Shichōsha, 1975), 45. For an English version, see Shuzo Uyenaka, "A Study of Baishōron: A Source for the Ideology of Imperial Loyalism in Medieval Japan" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1979), 107-108. Hurst notes that Okuno Takahiro has documented...
have been enormous, including 100 ryō of gold dust, 5,384 koku of rice, 1,216 rolls (hiki 歩) of silk, 4,274 spools (ryō 両) of thread, as well as other local products.\(^5\)

In this case the honke appears to have been Chōkōdō itself, and from documents concerning ninety of its estates we have a concrete example of how its revenues were utilized for the ex-emperor.\(^6\) Each province was assigned certain days within certain months to provide specific goods or services; for instance, on the first three days of the new year Fukiya no shō 萩屋荘 in Settsu province was responsible for remitting five bamboo curtains, five tatami, two hanging curtains (noren), and some seventy-five grams of sand which was to used for a special ceremony. In the third month it was again to provide sand. It was also responsible for sending seven men to act as guards for thirty days at the gate facing Abura no kōji 油小路 in the sixth month, and for ten days at the Shisoku 四足 gate in the seventh month. In such a manner every day of the year was provided for

\(^5\)This appears to have been a relatively large amount. Compare this with the case of Tōdai-ji at the beginning of the Heian era. Although it had an yearly income of 9,000 koku of rice derived from some ninety-two estates, 3,000 koku were required for personnel expenses, and building maintenance ran from a minimum of 1,500 to as much as 4,000 koku a year. See Nagahara (1961), 37.

with food, goods, and services from the temple's various estates, and so all of Go-Shirakawa's needs were met when he resided at the Chôkôdô.

Go-Shirakawa eventually transferred the Chôkôdô-ryô to his sixth daughter, Senyômon'in 宣陽門院 (1181-1252). Due to the participation of Masanari Shinnô 雅成親王 in the Jôkyô Incident, the lands were confiscated by the Kamakura bakufu but later returned to Takatsukasa-in 鷹司院, from which they passed to Emperor Go-Fukakusa. After the split of the imperial house into the Daikaku-ji and Jimyô-in lines in 1260, they became the main financial resource of the latter. However, during the period of the Northern and Southern Courts (1337-92), the holdings were taken over by provincial warriors and by 1413 had been reduced to only some twenty estates. By the time of the Ōnin War (1467-77) the Chôkôdô-ryô were completely dispersed.

Goinryô 後院領

Another major institution that allowed for the imperial family to possess and transfer lands to its descendents were goin, or retirement palaces. Originally these functioned as a temporary residence for the emperor to be used in case of fire at the main palace or when repairs had to be made to it. This

---

61 See Kokushi daijiten, s.v. "kôshitsu ryô" 皇室領.

62 There are references to a "retirement palace" for the empress dowager, Kôtaigô goin 皇太后後院, in 836, and one for the emperor's grandmother, Taikôtaigô goin 太皇太后後院, in 837,
was the original function of Reizei-in 冷泉院 and Suzaku-in 朱雀院 and, accordingly, Emperor Montoku moved to Reizei-in 冷泉院 in 854 when the dairi needed repairs, as did Emperor Murakami when the dairi burned down in 960.

By the reigns of Emperors Enyū (r. 970-84) and Ichi-jō (r. 987-1011), using goin for such purposes had gone out of practice and instead emperors would stay at the residences of courtiers, especially the sekkanke. As a result, these private residences also came to be referred to as goin. However, it appears that there was a distinction made between these private residences and such retirement palaces as Reizei-in. When Ichi-jō moved to Fujiwara Michinaga's Higashi Sanjō-in 東三条院 after a fire at the imperial palace he shortened the ceremonies accompanying the emperor's transfer of residence for it was not what could properly be called a goin in the manner of Reizei-in.  

In the Nara era emperors appear to have stayed in their palaces upon retirement, but from the time of Emperor Heizei (r. 806-09) they left the main palace and established a separate retirement residence. Reizei-in and Suzaku-in were used in

---


64The practice was for the emperor to designate a retirement palace while he was still on the throne. It was only during this period that it was referred to as a goin. After the emperor retired it became known as the ex-emperor's palace (gosho).
this fashion by several ex-emperors, the former by Yōzei and Reizei and the latter by Kōkō, Uda, Daigo, and Suzaku. Emperor Enyū (r. 969-84) used Horikawa goin 堀河後院 as his retirement palace, but as it was originally a private residence of a courtier, it, again, did not rank as high as such palaces as Reizei-in.

Emperors Kazan (r. 984-86), Sanjō (1011-16), and Go-Sanjō (1068-72), however, did not establish goin during their reigns. It appears that the use of goin as a retirement palace declined, as had the practice of using it as a temporary residence. With the start of the insei period, however, the practice was revived by Shirakawa when he built Toba-dono in 1086. This became his main residence (honjo 本所) and he moved back and forth between it, the capital, and the Shirakawa district where he had built the first of the Rokushō-ji.

The goin were originally supported by the state and the first instance of this appears in 835 when one hundred chō of kūkanchi from the province of Bizen were allotted as goin chokushiden. Gradually these lands increased, and over time goin and the lands assigned to them came to be seen as the

Although Reizei-in and Suzaku-in are the most well known, other goin include Shijō-in 四条院, Ishihara-in 石原院, and Gojō-in 五条院.

personal possessions of the emperor or ex-emperor. In 1016 we see references to goin and other possessions being passed on to the new emperor Go-Ichijō from the retiring emperor Sanjō and by the 12th century the various goin, their lands, and other possessions were being transferred to successive emperors as heritable property of the imperial house.

It was, however, still recognized that the concept of "private" property, which could be disposed of at the will of the ex-emperor, was in conflict with the "public" nature of his role. But the physical separation of goin from the imperial palace seems to have been a mitigating factor, and so it was from these sites that the personal affairs of the emperors (e.g., property, as well as personal possessions) were managed. In effect it became a kind of administration center which eventually would also be in charge of transferring property to the emperor's successors or of the disposing of lands.

With Shirakawa and the establishment of his insei the goin started to administer property of both the emperor and the ex-

---

66 For instance, in no kinshin, Taira Tadamori 田原忠盛, was given goin lands in the province of Hizen by Ex-emperor Toba. See Hashimoto (1966), 23.

67 See entry for Chōwa 5 (1016)/4/7, in Sakeiki 狭経記, ZST 6:17.

68 See Hashimoto (1966), 22.

69 Shōyūki lists among the articles stolen from Reizei-in, silk and cloth. See Shōyūki Chōwa 5 (1016)/5/26, ZST bekkan 1:442. Other documents mention jewels and gold being stolen in this incident.
emperor, and it was recognized that, in fact, the goin was now the administration of the retired emperor; thus the goin and its lands became lands of the in (inryō 隈領) and were administered by the insei (in no chō 隈庁). Therefore, we find that as ex-emperors became more concerned with the decline of the ritsuryō system there was an increase in the landholdings of the goin as these became another important financial resource. Accordingly, by the time Shirakawa established Hosshō-ji in 1077, the goin-ryō holdings of the imperial house were not insignificant. Nevertheless, they did not come close to the number of shōen held by powerful kemmon and, consequently, the imperial family sought alternate sources of income to keep up with the kinship blocs.

The goin-ryō of Go-Shirakawa eventually ran to over 1,966 chō, although much of this what were referred to as kūkanchi, (i.e., land that had never been developed, but had the potential to be turned into rice fields) or kōhaiden (i.e., fields that had been developed for rice cultivation, but that had to be redeveloped because they had been lying fallow too long). After the Hōgen Incident of 1156 the lands of Fujiwara Yorinaga, who had allied himself with Emperor Sutoku, were confiscated, and of these some forty-two estates were incorporated into Go-Shirakawa's holdings as goin-ryō. As with other types of

---

70See Chūyūki, Kanjō 2 (1107)/7/24, ZST 11:239.
imperial landholdings, goin-ryō had largely disappeared through confiscation from the end of the Kamakura era to the Northern and Southern Courts period.

**Estates of Imperial Ladies (nyō-in ryō 女院領)**

The estates assigned to imperial ladies were created largely during the tenure of the latter two of the sandai, that is, during the insei of Toba and Go-Shirakawa. Toba's lands were divided among his consorts Taikenmon'in 待賢門院 and Bifukumon'in 美福門院, and his daughters Jōzaimon'in 上西門院, and Hachijō-in. These nyō-in ryō were not only a means of providing financial support for the imperial ladies, but, as already noted, were also a means of distributing imperial estates among various proprietors to lessen losses in case of confiscation.

The general pattern for the estates was that a temple would be established by an imperial lady and lands donated to it. As in the case of the Rokushō-ji, often a provincial governor (i.e., one of the zuryō), or some other member of the elite class, would pay for the actual building of the temple and commend lands to it. Moreover, when the retired emperor died his lands would be divided among the various nyō-in, the idea being to divide the inheritance, a custom followed by other elite families in the Heian period.

Among the temples of retired imperial ladies, those possessing the largest land holdings were Taikenmon'in,
Jōzaimon' in, Bifukumon' in, Hachijō' in, Kenshunmon' in, Impumon' in, Shichijō' in, and Muromachi' in, and Muromachi' in, Shichijō' in, and Muromachi' in,昭慶門院.
Hachijō-in was the daughter of Toba and Bifukumon-in, and the estates of the Hachijō-nyōin were the largest, but by no means the only group of estates created during Toba's in. In the first half of the 13th century it had 221 estates and of these seventy-nine were under its direct control, forty-eight under Anrakuju-in, and twenty-six under Kankikō-in. The greater part of these holdings were accumulated during Toba's in.
Anraku-ji was built for Bifukumon-in within the grounds of the Toba detached palace. At the time of its establishment it held about forty-three estates in some twenty-eight provinces. Four of these were established in Yamashiro province during Shirakawa's in and were under the direct control of the temple, but the other thirty-nine were established through commendation during Toba's in.
This is, of course, only the barest outline of an important and complex topic. It would require a separate study to adequately examine the relationship between these women, their estates, and the institution of the retired emperors. However, for the purposes of this study, they are presented, as in the case of the treatment of shrines that follows, only to illustrate the variety of institutions that were entrusted with imperial landholdings.
Imperial Lands Assigned to Shrines

Imperial lands were also distributed among shrines. Although some of these lands were no doubt utilized for their upkeep, many of them were assigned to the shrines to ensure a certain degree of safety from confiscation. Accordingly we find among the shrine estates several lands that belonged to the ex-emperors and imperial ladies. The greater part of these contributions appear to have dated from the time of Go-Shirakawa's in. He established both Imahie-sha 新日吉社 and Imakumano-sha 新熊野社 in 1160. The former came to have some nine estates in seven provinces, and the latter some twenty-eight estates in nineteen provinces.

The Fate of Holdings of the Imperial House

By the Kamakura era imperial landholdings were considerable, and after Jōkyū no Ran (1221) the Kamakura Bakufu is said to have confiscated some 3,000 imperial estates. The Bakufu restored many imperial lands to the retired emperor Go-

---

72 For a chart of the various shrines and the imperial institutions from which their lands came, see Kokushi daijiten, s.v. "kōshitsu ryō" 皇室領.

73 Imahie Shrine was located just to the east of Hōjū-ji 法住寺 at which Go-Shirakawa had a gosho. Imakumano Shrine was also situated close by.

74 See Takeuchi (1956), 68.

75 See Okuno Takahiro (1963), 86. See also his article s.v. "kōshitsu ryō" 皇室領, in Kokushi daijiten.
Takakura-in, and, as was the case with the Rokushō-ji lands, they passed from Emperor Shijō to Go-Saga, to Kameyama, and then to Go-Fukakusa. With the split of the imperial line into the Jimyō-in and Daikaku-ji lines, the latter, starting with Emperor Kameyama, managed the holdings of the Shichijō-in, Hachijō-in, and half those of Muromachi-in, for a total of some 380 estates. These were passed down to Emperor Go-Uda, and then to Takaharu Shinnō, who was to become the emperor Go-Daigo. The Jimyō-in line had the Chōkōdō-ryō as the center of its financial support, but it also controlled Ex-emperor Go-Fukakusa's lands, as well as those of Hōkongō-in and the other half of the holdings of Muromachi-in, for a total of some 250 estates.

During the period of the Northern and Southern Courts the latter had lost its lands and the former's holdings were severely reduced (as noted above, the Chōkōdō-ryō consisted of only some twenty estates). By the Warring States Period imperial landholdings were down to some sixty estates and the income from them was rather meagre. In fact, the revenues that the imperial house derived from its few remaining estates fell to the point that in 1571 Oda Nobunaga had to advance some 520 koku of rice to the court. In 1574 some eleven go 郷 from Yamashiro province were made part of the imperial landholdings, and in the following year over 290 koku of rice were derived from them. Soon after, another two estates were assigned to the imperial house, and although Toyotomi Hideyoshi also established estates
for their support, imperial landholdings during the period of Nobunaga and Hideyoshi remained relatively modest.

**Conclusion**

We have seen, then, that a sharp increase in the number of imperial estates took place in the late Heian period, that is, from the time of Toba's in. Earlier the retired emperor Shirakawa attempted to increase imperial holdings by converting lands to chokushiden, or granting fuko, that is, by reverting to the forms of support that had been employed when the ritsuryō system of government was in effect. However, these chokushiden and fuko were not the same as those employed during the 8th and 9th centuries. Go-Sanjō's confiscated shōen were chokushiden in name only; in effect they differed little from the shōen of the late Heian period. It seems that no matter how much the retired emperors of the inset period attempted to resurrect the institutions of the ritsuryō period, economic conditions no longer allowed for them to function in the same way; powerful local clans and the land managers (i.e., ryōshu) of shōen were not about to give up their authority or income to return to the handen system. Accordingly, despite Ex-emperor Shirakawa's attempts to return to an idealized system of strong imperial rule, he was finally resigned to the reality of the shōen system and the necessity of generating income on his own initiative.
Chapter 6
Conclusion

Sakamoto Tarō has characterized the Japanese imperial system as one that was relatively "flexible" in its ability to adapt to its changing role in Japan's political environment; it was able to survive whether or not it had any real political power because it did not hold on to the concept that it had to rule. The state, in turn, continued to support the imperial house because of this flexibility; that is, the imperial house was able to adapt to its constantly changing role and was compliant in doing so. Sakamoto contrasts his view of the imperial system with that of Ishii Ryōsuke, who holds that essentially the imperial house was powerless, even from its inception, which forced it to be "flexible." Thus for Ishii the imperial house was adaptable from necessity, whereas for Sakamoto its adaptability was the institution's essential nature.¹

Of course, the issue of the imperial house and its relation to power, especially during the insei period, has hardly been settled. Theories as to the nature of the insei are varied and have undergone much revision. One of the most widespread is that

¹See Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎, review of Tennō; Tenno töji no shiteki kaimai 天皇−天皇統治の史的解明, by Ishii Ryōsuke 石井良助, Shigaku zasshi 史學雑誌 59, no. 10 (October 1950): 69.
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Go-Sanjō, and later Shirakawa, actively pursued a path to take power into their own hands after some two centuries of sekkanke rule. This follows the views proposed by Imakagami, Gukanshō, and Zokuko jidan 続古事談.² Yet, according to Wada Hidematsu, it was only by chance that power fell to the retired emperors; they did not actively seek to take over the affairs of state.³ Along these lines Hayashiya Tatsusaburō suggests that the sekkanke had slowly been losing power and, as a result, it naturally fell to the insei; it was almost inevitable that it should do so and was not just chance. According to this theory, the in was, in effect, supplementary to the kinshin who were, in fact, more vital to this shift in power.⁴ There is also the thesis that Go-Sanjō abdicated primarily to ensure the succession of his son Sanehito to the position of crown prince and so was not primarily concerned with appropriating power per se.⁵

²See Yasuda (1974), 84.
³See Wada Hidematsu 和田英松, "Insei ni tsuite" 院政について, Kokushi gaku 国史学 10 (February 1932): 1-16.
⁴See "Insei no seiritsu ni tsuite" 院政の成立に就いて, in Hayashiya (1955), 177-90. Hayashiya's theory, though problematic, was important for making scholars reevaluate the relations among and roles of the sekkanke, in no kinshin, and insei.
Whatever the case as to its relations to power, there is no doubt that during the insei period the imperial house became increasingly concerned with its financial stability, and in this it proved to be, to use Sakamoto's term, extremely "flexible." That is, it adapted well to a reconception of land that other kenmon had successfully exploited.

As we have seen, in the Heian period the very concept of "land as chattel," to borrow a phrase from Kiley, resulting from the konden edicts of 743, fundamentally changed the way elites viewed land and their relation to it. This led to a scramble for land, which became the pursuit of any individual or institution in a position to do so, including the imperial house. One result of this, namely, the ability of individuals to access income and power outside the normal channels of court and state bureaucracy, was an abandonment of commitment to a strong central government and, consequently, the development of kenmon groups. Unstable government support and the success of these groups led the imperial house in the direction of adapting to the kenmon model. By and large this involved the ability to retain an autonomous identity independent of the established political system, and essential to this was access to secure financial resources. The imperial house sought to address this concern by accumulating private lands through such institutions as the Rokushō-ji.

A consequence of this fundamental change in the concept of landholding was a shift to "individual," or "personal" concerns,
as commitment to central government was no longer mandatory for financial or political advancement. One cannot dismiss as exaggeration, then, Keirstead's observation of the shōen system as being "...linked to a process of differentiation which recast a previously unitary realm (at least in theory) into "private' and "public" domains...,"\(^6\) or his view that the phenomenon of shōen led to "...a fundamental reordering of space and society..."\(^7\)

One would have assumed that this new preoccupation with personal proprietary rights would have threatened to undermine the sole inalienable resource of the imperial house, its unassailable position as the most prestigious institution in the land; "Personal property in land of the kon*den* variety simply did not exist at this earlier time [i.e. prior to the kon*den* einen shizai edict of 743], so that participation in the administration of the emperor was unparalleled as a means of economic advancement, and the loyalty of the aristocrats to the court was, in that respect, virtually undistracted....The decline of the court's power was accompanied by a distinct shift of emphasis from bureaucratic office to estate holding as the basis of political authority."\(^8\)

\(^{6}\)Keirstead, 16.

\(^{7}\)Ibid., 17.

\(^{8}\)Kiley (1970), 143.
However, the imperial house managed to maintain an unassailable position in the social fabric of premodern Japanese society;

The imperial institution acted... as a symbolic embodiment of commonly held value sentiments of the Japanese. However, it also acted as the focal point of the administration during the ancient period [i.e., the seventh to the late tenth centuries], whereas its administrative powers were severely limited during the medieval era [i.e., the tenth to the fourteenth centuries]. The same may be said of the central organization itself. As a body, it was held in reverential awe by the medieval Japanese, but was denied much real power. Perhaps the same phenomenon can be adduced as the reason why the old codes were never repealed or revised, but allowed to die slowly. They represented the organizational structure of the court, which seemed to become even more sacred as it receded from the center of administration.³

One major result of this new concern for personal property was that the imperial house began to cultivate a consciousness of itself as a kenmon group, rather than as a state institution. This was manifested in the clustering of imperially sponsored temples, gosho, and imperial tombs in the Nishiyama region near Ninna-ji and later in the Shirakawa district with the Rokushō-ji. This seems to have represented an attempt to create not only conceptual but also geographic focal points for the profile of the imperial house, a profile which otherwise would have been far too diffuse.

Yet, at a time when the ex-emperors were most aggressively accumulating land for the sake of the imperial house as a kenmon group, and not as a state institution, Shirakawa was exacting public funds in the form of fuko and jōgō for the establishment

³Ibid., 23-24.
of the Rokushō-ji and other institutions. Moreover, as stated above, when he and Toba visited shrines and temples, it was public funds that were utilized to cover expenses, not the private resources of the imperial house. Before we dismiss this as a case of simple opportunism we should bear in mind that no matter how much the imperial family thought of itself as a household, it nevertheless maintained an awareness of its role as a "public" institution. As we have seen, the Rokushō-ji were not uji-dera; the ganmon of Hosshō-ji did not explicitly express prayers for individuals of the imperial family, and although the Shien-ji functioned as both kigan-ji and bodai-ji for their imperial patrons, they nevertheless also maintained a public character.

Perhaps what is really at issue here is our views as to what constitutes "public" and "private" concerns and interests. As Hurst has noted, "While this practice, known as jōgō, is condemned by modern scholars as blatant corruption, it was openly accepted and quite common in the Heian period."10 As stated before, it was the impropriety of emperors being actively involved in the accumulation of land that led to their placing estates under the nominal control of temples, shrines, or nyō-in. At the same time, the Fujiwara, one of the largest landholders in the country, nevertheless supported shōen reforms. Would blatant opportunists be so circumspect as the ex-emperors? Was it possible to pursue tax-exempt lands for

10Hurst (1976), 134 n. 18.
personal resources and still claim to serve the best interests of the state, as in the case of the Fujiwara? To seek an answer to these apparent contradictions in some form of all-encompassing view of self, land, and "private" and "public" concerns may be to impose an order on Heian society that did not exist (or, perhaps more to the point, did not matter). Perhaps what one should be looking for here is what Foucault calls, "discursive regularities":

The question posed by language analysis of some discursive fact or other is always; according to what rules has a particular statement been made, and consequently according to what rules could other similar statements be made? The description of the events of discourse pose a quite different question: how is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?\(^{11}\)

In the analysis of the development of the Rokushō-ji one is faced with discursive and disjointed events; the link that I have made among Ninna-ji, the Shien-ji, and the Rokushō-ji is neither direct nor contiguous. One cannot convincingly hypothesize a consolidated agenda of autonomy, either economic or political, for the imperial family spanning some two centuries from the reign of Emperor Uda to that of Shirakawa. The establishment of lecture meetings held at the imperial vow temples in no way represents a clear course of action on the part of the retired emperors. The question of the entity of the "Rokushō-ji" itself is problematic; the establishment of the temples spanned some seventy-two years and the insei of three ex-emperors. There was a gap of twenty-five years between the

\(^{11}\)Foucault, 27.
first and the second of the temples. The term itself does not appear until the Kamakura period.

The evidence indicates that the emperors seem to have addressed certain issues only as needs presented themselves, that they were responding to certain conditions, rather than initiating them. The view that the insei was a new form of government created by the retired emperors to seize power may, in part, have to do with the fact that kenmon groups in general were seen to have been concerned with "private" interests, not only with respect to finances, but also with respect to political power.¹²

Whatever the case may have been with respect to the ex-emperors' political power, there is no doubt that as "clan" patriarchs they held great influence over the imperial house. The Rokushō-ji were ostensibly established by different emperors (except for Enshō-ji 円勝寺), but in all cases there was an ex-emperor who was actively involved in accumulating land behind the throne (i.e., the retired emperors Shirakawa, Toba, and Go-Shirakawa). The influence of the ex-emperors with respect to the establishment of the Rokushō-ji is most conspicuous in the case of Saishō-ji and Enshō-ji 延勝寺 whose imperial patrons were fifteen and ten years old respectively. Moreover, we have seen that the administrative control of the lands of the Rokushō-ji were also controlled by the ex-emperors through the Ninna-ji

hōshinnō who, again, were relatively young when appointed kengyō of the six temples. What we see, then, is a pattern of control through the patriarch of the family, and not the head of state (i.e., the emperor), that is, through what Kiley refers to as a "household despot," and this is in keeping with the household lineage consciousness that developed with the establishment of kenmon groups and the decentralizing of authority due to a new conception of property tenure.¹³

It is perhaps this image of the "household despot" that in part accounts for the view that the insei wielded great power. One has only to see how Ex-emperor Shirakawa is characterized in such works as Gempei seisui-ki and Eiga monogatari: "Retired Emperor Shirakawa is said to have remarked, 'Three things refuse to obey my will: the waters of the Kamo River, the fall of the backgammon dice, and the monks of Enryakuji temple.'"¹⁴ It was also said that Shirakawa, intending to donate a complete collection of the Buddhist scriptures copied in gold to Hosshō-ji, was forced to cancel his trip to the temple three times due to heavy rains. When, on his fourth attempt, it again began to

¹³Kiley (1970), 156.

pour, he stopped up the rain in a vessel. Thus it was said that even the forces of nature bowed to his authority.\textsuperscript{15}

Yet, there is enough evidence to question this view of the ex-emperor's power. As Hurst notes, "On at least three occasions—in 1088, 1092, and 1093—associates of the ex-sovereign were banished for improper actions. It seems unlikely that a man portrayed as the dictatorial ruler of the land would allow his associates to be treated in this fashion."\textsuperscript{16}

However, this is not to say that the imperial house had no power in the insei period. As noted above, despite its gradual loss of real political power it managed to hold on to its prestige, and this gave it the authority needed to be the recipient of choice for kishin. Yet it was not prestige alone that accounted for this authority. It was because it still held some real power (e.g., its ability to make provincial appointments and its influence at a politically active court), that it was able to gain access to resources. In fact, one could argue that without these vestiges of effective power the imperial house would not have been able to attract commendation of lands. Moreover, it could also be argued that it was precisely because the imperial house still had some vestiges of political power that it was forced to seek financial resources; the little remaining power it had would have been lost had it

\textsuperscript{15}Gempei seisuiki 源平盛衰記, 2 vols. (Tokyo: Yūhōdō Shoten, 1912), fascicle 2, 1:48-49.

\textsuperscript{16}Hurst (1974), 73 n. 41.
not participated in the accumulation of land, especially in view of the rise to power of kenmon groups. Once the imperial house lost all power, that is, after the Sengoku period, it lost not only the impetus but also the means to seek resources, and relied entirely on the support of military governments for its existence.

It appears, then, that without some effective political power the prestige system was not enough to ensure security of property, and thus the shift to the judicial process, rather than prestige, as authority; "Ancient law in Japan, that is, the code system, put relatively little explicit stress on the judicial resolution of conflicts of estate interest, whereas, during the medieval period, this was the primary focus of legal concern."17

Indeed, the imperial house seems to have been well aware of its power and its relation to others in positions of power. The Rokushō-ji and the Toba-dono were built by the retired emperors in some respects with a strong consciousness of their relationship to the sekkanke; the Toba-dono was located halfway between Fujiwara Yorimichi's Byōdō-in at Uji and the capital, and its scope in many ways was an attempt to rival the imperial palace. The Rokushō-ji were highly visible from the eastern approach to the capital, and the Toba-dono when approaching it from the western provinces; these two complexes were among the first structures to be seen when entering the capital, the great

height of Hosshō-ji's pagoda displaying the soaring power of the imperial house and the elaborate extensive structures of the Toba-dono symbolizing its spread throughout the land. In one sense they symbolically represented the institution of the insei and made clear just who was guarding the capital, namely, the emperor, and by extension, the country.  

That there was the lack of continuity in events, or a consolidated agenda on the part of the imperial house, is, as I have proposed above, not to say that there is no "subject," that is, nothing connecting the group of six temples that were built within an area of some two square kilometers in the Shirakawa district. It is, however, to suggest that in such an inquiry a "full" account may not be forthcoming. Although one could argue for the scarcity of documentary and archeological resources to explain away "gaps" in this research, one could just as well question our need to so, to provide, as Foucault puts it, "a privileged shelter for the sovereignty of consciousness":

As if, in that field where we had become used to seeking origins, to pushing back further and further the line of antecedents, to reconstituting traditions, to following evolutive curves, to projecting teleologies, and to having constant recourse to metaphors of life, we felt a particular repugnance to conceiving of difference, to describing separations and dispersions, to dissociating the reassuring form of the identical.  

\[18\] Gomi, 83.  

\[19\] Foucault, 12.
This does not preclude the possibility of tracing antecedents or "evolutive curves" in the history of the Rokushō-ji and their relation to the in, or to abnegate responsibility for doing so. It is hoped, however, that in avoiding a course of inquiry which aims for a "total history" of uninterrupted continuities, one can avoid drawing superficially attractive, but perhaps untenable, conclusions, or oversimplifying for the sake of bringing coherence to complex terms or concepts. This is particularly the case with regard to the subject of this paper in that there is little consensus as to the most fundamental concepts with which it deals.20

In such a line of inquiry primary source documents, although limited in the case of the Rokushō-ji, also become subject to scrutiny and cannot be viewed without some degree of discretion. This goes beyond, for example, an inquiry into Jien's agenda when he characterizes the Rokushō-ji as "uji-dera," as,

Now, through a mutation that is not of very recent origin, but which has still not come to an end, history has altered its position in relation to the document: it has taken as its primary task, not the interpretation of the document, nor the attempt to decide whether it is telling the truth or what is its expressive value, but to work on it from within and to develop it....The document, then, is no longer for history an inert material through which it tries to reconstitute what men have done or said...history is now

20For example, the characterization of the Rokushō-ji which differs between Takeuchi Rizō, Murai Yasuhiko and Hiraoka Jōkai, the debate over how the insei developed and functioned (e.g., the views of Wada Hidematsu, Hayashiya Tatsusaburō, Ishimoda Shō, and Yasuda Motohisa, discussed above), and the issue of shōen, about which there appear to be as many theories as there are questions.
trying to define within the documentary material itself unities, totalities, series, relations.\textsuperscript{21}

This is not to condone indulgence in rampant subjectiveness or relativism. It is, however, to recognize that the categories and divisions presented must be viewed in a context, and that the limitations of that context, and our ability to interpret that context, be recognized:

We must also question those divisions or groupings with which we have become so familiar....We are not even sure of ourselves when we use these distinctions in our own world of discourse, let alone when we are analysing groups of statements which, when first formulated, were distributed, divided, and characterized in a quite different way....divisions—whether our own, or those contemporary with the discourse under examination—are always themselves reflexive categories, principles of classification, normative rules, institutionalized types: they, in turn, are facts of discourse that deserve to be analysed beside others; of course, they also have complex relations with each other, but they are not intrinsic, autochthonous, and universally recognizable characteristics.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21}Foucault, 6-7.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 22.
Bibliography

Abbreviations

DNS = *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai 東京大學出版會, 1901-.


NKBT = *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten 岩波書店, 1957-.


Primary Sources


*Daigo-ji yōsho* 醍醐寺要書. In ZGR (vol. 27, pt. 1).


Engi-shiki 延喜式。In KT (vol. 26).

Enshō-ji juyō jugan 圓勝寺供養呪願。In Honchō zoku monzui (KT vol. 29b:200-02).

Fusōryakki 扶桑略記。In KT (vol. 12).


Hōjō-ji kondō kuyōki 法成寺金堂供養記。In Honchō bunshū 本朝文集 (KT vol. 30:188).

Honchō bunshū 本朝文集。In KT (vol. 30).

Honchō monzui 本朝文粹。In KT (vol. 29b).

Honchō seiki 本朝世紀。In KT (vol. 9).

Honchō zoku monzui 本朝続文粹。In KT (vol. 29b).

Hyakurensō 百練抄。In KT (vol. 11).


Kikki 吉記. In ZST (vols. 29-30)

Kojidan 古事談. In KT (vol. 18).


Kyūreki 九曆. In ZZGR (vol. 5:227-41).


Nihon kiryaku 日本書紀. In KT (vol. 10).

Nihon sandai jitsuroku 日本書三代実録. In KT (vol. 4).

Nihon shoki 日本書紀. In NKBT (vol. 68).


Ninna-ji goden 仁和寺御伝. GR (vol. 5).

Ninna-ji hinamiki 仁和寺日次記 (also known as Ninna-ji onhinamiki 仁和寺御日次記). In ZGR (vol 29b:329-44).


Ruijū kokushi 類聚国史. In KT (vol. 6).

Ryō shūge 令集解. In KT (vol. 23).

Ruiju sandaikyaku 類聚三代格. In KT (vol. 25).

Sa'keiki 狭經記. In ZST (vol. 6).


Shingishiki 新儀式. In GR (vol. 6).

Shirakawa hōō hachiman issaikyō kuyō ganmon 白川法皇八幡一切經供養願文. In KT (vol. 29b:204-8).


Shoku Nihongi 続日本紀. In KT (vol. 2).

Shoku Nihonkōki 続日本後紀. In KT (vol. 3).

Shōryaku gannen Hosshō-ji kuyōki 承暦元年法勝寺供養記. In ZGR (vol. 27a:125-31).

Shōyūki 小右記. 3 vols. In ZST (bekkan 別巻).


Yōshū fushi 撮州府志. In ZZGR (vol. 8).

Secondary Sources


Kawakami Tasuke 川上多助. "Heianchō no shōen seisaku" 平安朝の荘園政策. Shigaku Zasshi 史学雑誌 34, no. 6 (June 1923): 403-23.


____. "Inseiki no zuryōsō" 院政期の受領僧. Rekishi kyōiku 歴史教育 12, no. 6 (June 1964), 51-61.


---


---


---


---


