

General Discussion

Timothy Kern :

The time schedule is quite tight. We would like to start the general discussion and concluding discussion. And today, we have Professor Vande Walle as the chair. When you make your comments, please be precise and short, so that we will have as much time as possible for discussion.

Willy Vande Walle :

So, this is the last part of the symposium. For the past 5 days, thank you very much for your participation and cooperation in the symposium, and thank you for your patience and perseverance. I am sure that you are quite tired by now, but I hope that you have saved some of your forces in order to have a good exchange in the final and concluding discussion.

The topic was “Courtiers and Warriors in a comparative and historical perspective,” and the theme that we have discussed has been quite an extensive one. We touched upon several subthemes: civil society and warrior society; kingship and rituals; what is aristocracy?; feudalism and bureaucracy; ideology, religion and culture. And on these sub themes, we heard informative and interesting presentations, comments and discussions. Our symposium has been quite significant and in order to put all the ideas and comments in order, we would now like to have a thorough general discussion. In this position of chair, I would like to propose some issues for discussion.

One point is aristocracy. Can aristocrats exist prior to the existence of a state system? Or can aristocrats exist only when a state system or kingship exist? Prior to the emergence of the state, social order was quite unstable. Take Japan. As Ienaga Saburô said, population was very limited, the living standard, i.e. the level of technical development was quite low. Exchange between people was limited to a very narrow scope, and contact with people whom you did not know, or contact between people who lived in neighboring villages was very rare. But as agriculture advanced and productivity rised, the average lifespan extended and population increased, the frequency of exchanges increased and extended over several villages, and further expanded over a whole region. In such a situation, the division of labor progressed, and people who had military power, who had strong military power, emerged.

And this military power determined the existence of power relationships or vertical relationships of power.

In terms of military power, everybody is equal; people who win today may lose tomorrow. The vertical power or the lord - vassal relationship based upon military power was quite unstable. It is possible that you will be challenged at any time. So, in order to provide a firm foundation to that order, non-military elements had to be introduced. The military wanted to stabilize their mutual relationships; therefore, they made promises, contracts, pledges, or pacts to establish the lord/vassal relationship. And in the course of development, leaders or lords emerged and loyalty was beautified and considered as a virtue. However, that loyalty more or less depended upon the sincerity of the individual, so that people wanted something that provided a more powerful constraint. This they found in the establishment of rules and regulations, and laws and codes. Regardless of the loyalty of individuals, the universal binding power was found in the codes and the laws and this enabled the leader to acquire the status of ruler or monarch. At any rate, besides the military power something transcending the military power emerged. In the process warriors acquired the status of warrior aristocrats.

The question at which point and based upon what element the warrior is transformed into a warrior aristocrat appears to be linked to the question at which point in time the state emerged. At least that is one question that I would like to raise here. Is the aristocracy, contingent upon the existence of kingship? Do they consider themselves as aristocrats or was there some state that existed and was the position of the aristocrats approved by the monarch or the leader? There were certainly warriors even before the contours of stately organization existed, but could there be a warrior aristocracy before the existence of the semblance of a state structure? This is another issue that I would like to raise here.

Korea, China and the Middle East were touched upon in the presentations and in each of these presentations, the aristocratic element was explored and the characteristics of such aristocratic elements were presented. This was one issue that I think we want to discuss and I would like to focus now on this issue and invite some comments from the floor.

Atsushi Egawa :

As for the question the chairperson mentioned, “did aristocrats exist prior to the existence of the state?”, I believe that the aristocrats did not necessarily receive privileges within the legal context. In other words, when a certain state structure emerged, there already existed certain groups, which had privileges, which were inherited from their ancestors and they were the original form of aristocrats. And when kingship emerged, the aristocrats, who existed prior to that, became the rivals of the king. Therefore, the kings had to make groups to support themselves. So, these activities or trends generated new power groups, which were formed under the kingship side by the side to the existing groups. It was possible that a dual aristocracy emerged. And of course, these two groups sometimes combined or the new one replaced the old one. Therefore, strong kingship, which gave privileges to the aristocrats, is not necessarily the basis or premise for the existence of the aristocrats.

Vande Walle : Any other comments?

Vande Walle :

Earlier kingship or the king was mentioned. Kingship, vis-à-vis the aristocracy, these two are closely related, which is not to be doubted, and when it comes to the matter of the legitimacy of kingship, its features were discussed on the second day. On the second day, one presentation was made on the Byzantine Emperor and his titles. Then, two forms were acknowledged according to one presentation. One form is the election of the monarch from among equals, people in an equal position. In the case of the election from among equals, what is the fundamental basis for the legitimacy? In that case, the successor is not guaranteed because the monarch had to be elected every time, so the monarch strove to turn the primitive state structure into as a patrimonial state. In other words, he wanted his heirs to inherit and succeed to the privilege and the power of the monarchy. In that case legitimacy had to be confirmed through a set of rituals and ceremonies. Ritual and kingship have a close relationship. Ritual was most important for kingship. The ritual of the vassals paying their respect to the king in the Zhou age in China, or the accession ceremony of the Byzantine emperor, all prove the importance of rituals and ceremonies.

For the Tokugawa Bakufu, whose legitimacy was ever ambiguous, ritual was even more important. Therefore the Tokugawa Bakufu did not hesitate to make enormous

expenditures for rituals performed by the Court. The legitimacy of the title of monarch, whether absolute monarch or republican-style monarch, is often found in the supranatural - the emperor of a Chinese dynasty is one typical example. During the symposium, we did not touch upon the kingship in India or Southeast Asian countries. I believe that these countries have a different type of kingship, because they have a Buddhist or at least an Indian concept of kingship, called in Sanskrit Cakravartin (Japanese Tenrin-ô), which is a universal monarch. But unlike in China, that title was not inherited. It was bestowed upon an individual because of his mysterious relation with the Buddha. Unfortunately, the kingship in India or Southeast Asian countries was not dealt with in any of the presentations this week, but at any rate, the legitimacy of kingship was one significant and important point that we discussed and we found that approval of that legitimacy was made through rituals and ceremonies.

Any other comments regarding rituals?

Kazuhiko Kasaya :

Sorry to interrupt, but I would like to return to an earlier point, that concerning the aristocrats. On the second day, during one of the presentations one person remarked, "By what titles did they call each other?" Or what did kings call themselves or what did vassals call the king or what did the king call the vassals and what did aristocrats call themselves? So, I think that when looking at cultures from a comparative perspective, this is an important point to look into. Of course, we cannot immediately come up with an answer here, but at the next opportunity that we organize an international forum, I would like to try to make a comparison. So, when you return to your own countries in your own culture, verify how those categories that I mentioned were called. And one or two years later, when we have another conference like this, we can discuss this topic. So far my request.

Vande Walle :

I intended to bring up the question of titles further on, but, indeed, it is necessary to investigate that matter further. I recall from the presentation on Byzantine, that the ruler first called himself "imperator" (emperor), subsequently "Basileus" and then "Autocrat" or "Despot". These titles seem to have a connotation of autocratic rule, as we understand them today. In the case of the Eastern world, for example, the Tenno or Emperor of Japan in pre-modern Japan, what did he call himself? Or

in the case of the Shogun, what did shoguns call themselves. Or from the vassal's point of view, what did they call the emperor or the shogun? It is a very important issue what to call their lord, master or ruler. If they made a mistake, it could have grave consequences. Therefore, this is part of the significant role of rituals. Therefore, this is an important point when we want to characterize the power and authority of a ruler in history. Any other comments? Yes.

Hiroshi Mitani :

If I may make some comments to that, what the rulers called themselves or what their vassals called them, depended on the context. That means that in different situations, they used different names. For example, the Tokugawa Shogun Ieyoshi is quoted as having called himself 'ore'. The shogun said, "Is it all right not having me (ore)?" when he heard the opinion from attendants that he should appoint Tokugawa Nariaki, the Daimyo of the Mito domain as regent. Thus, even the shogun used a vulgar word in a conversation with close aids. Although 'ore' is a sort of lower-class level way of calling oneself. But in official rituals he referred to himself with completely different terms. We must be careful about the situational nature of names.

Vande Walle :

Well, in the case of England, we see subjects calling the king first "My lord," then "Your highness," and subsequently "Your majesty", gradually increasing the degree of solemnity. But in the early days, the semantics of "My lord" may have been much more weighty than they are for us. What sort of connotations did the word have for the contemporaries? We casually use, "My lord" but back in those days, the expression, "My lord" may have had much more meaning, because "My lord" was also used for God, Jesus Christ, as well. Therefore, with regard to the semantics, perhaps it is premature to produce any conclusion, but I think that we have a good basis for comparative research here.

Yes, please.

Anthony Pollard :

You wanted a comment on English usage. It was earlier remarked that it depended on the circumstances and the medium of communication, which varied all the time. The form of "My lord" is a conventional form of address that is used in correspondence, which is used to identify someone of a certain status. Very frequently, even

the king was just addressed as “Sire”. It was derived from the French. I cannot myself go into this, because I don’t know the whole working out of these different cultural rituals, but I would agree that it is indeed a very complex issue. One point that I might make in respect to the wider discussion is that the king of England made himself an emperor in 1535. He did this as part of his revolutionary act in declaring unilaterally that he was no longer subject to the Bishop of Rome, the Pope, and that henceforth, he would be the head of the Church of England and in the position of Pope. The title Emperor in Western Europe had always been used to signify that there was no earthly power between the ruler and God. So, in some respects, of course, that is rather like the Emperor in Japan. It is interesting, by the way, that England was an Empire long before there was a British Empire. I wondered though, if I may be so bold, since the topic of this conference is “Warriors and Courtiers”, if I am correct in observing that there seems to be a fundamental difference between Japanese society and Western European society. If I have understood it correctly, there is a distinction drawn between warrior and courtier in Japanese society. And as far as I can grasp, perhaps also in other Eastern Asian political bodies. Whereas, of course, in Western Europe, I think it would be right to say there was not one political unit where that distinction was drawn. It’s true, indeed, to the end of the Ancien Regime in every country. And I think that might make a very distinctive difference between the two worlds, which didn’t really collide until the 19th century. I leave it at that.

Richard Kaeuper:

I am happy to hear you make that comment because I was wondering how applicable the courtier versus warrior distinction was for European historians. I know for China, Korea, Japan, it fits like a hand in a glove. But it may not work in the same way in old societies in Europe.

Pollard:

Perhaps one of my fellow European participants might comment.

Kaeuper:

I think basically what we heard from Professor Sasser the other morning is right: there was an increasing administrative use of people who are not essentially warriors alongside the old warrior aristocracy. In the 12th century, famous clerics such as Oderic Vitalis, complain about men raised from the dust and made officials in the

court of Henry II Plantagenêt. Yet the distinction blurs and the great lords (who were military men) remain significant in government. Even the royal household clerks (who are minor clerics) tended to direct military groups. The real parallel to the Japanese case, I think, is the higher clerics in the administration, because they are not warriors at all. But I think as a generalization, the difference between Europe and Japan is largely true and very important.

Vande Walle :

Well, I think that this is a correct assessment. In the case of Europe, we see a gradual shift from warrior to aristocrat or from landowning gentry to urban aristocracy, lords of the palace etc., but in the case of Japan, the warriors' class and courtiers did exist simultaneously.

Kasaya :

Just a small comment, so that there be no misunderstanding. In Medieval Japan too the clerics did play an important role, not only the courtiers. The clerics, or monks were not only involved in religion, but also in the political and financial administration. Notably Zen clerics, acted as the secretaries of the Shogun, drawing up diplomatic letters, compiling drafts for laws etc. The Buddhist priests or clerics, did exist as a group alongside the warriors and the aristocrats.

Mitani :

In the case of Japan, rather than talking of a dichotomy, we should conceptualize it as a trichotomy. So, there are three groups. The Buddhist monks, the warriors and the courtiers. In the Choson Dynasty, perhaps the distinction ran between military officers and civilian officers and China was quite similar. In the case of Europe, the line of division was different, it was the clerics versus secular aristocrats. If we use these categories, we could cover all cases.

Vande Walle :

About the warrior class in Japan, in the Muromachi era, there were shugo daimyo, and in the Warring States period, we see the emergence of the Sengoku daimyo. However, in the Edo period, the bureaucratic system is extended by the Bakufu and centralized control is strengthened, even though the system retains many aspects of feudalism with the Daimyo. The Daimyo had a kind of officials' role as a bureaucrat, because they spent many days in Edo, which is the Shogun's capital. So, in

a sense the high-ranking warriors in the Edo era could be described as military aristocrats or even a kind of courtiers. So, here is another question. Do we have to go on regarding them as warriors? Could we not say that they had been transformed into a kind of aristocracy?

Yves Sassier:

I would like to make a comment on the role of the aristocracy in France in the 13th century. I would just like to point out that the entourage of the king was not very professionalized, as they combined several functions. There is the example of Phillippe de Beaumanoir, who was both a legal expert, a judge and minister, as well as a protector of the Court. He was in charge of garrisons as well as a leader of a group of nine. So, he was a knight of the king, he was a king's man. So, within this group of King's men as they were known, there was no specialization. So, at the court then, the entourage of the king consisted both of a secular group and a clerical group, like this, who were in charge of justice. So, they functioned as court of justice.

The clerics existed in order to give a sacred guarantee to the judgment. For example, I think of the example of la cour de l'Echiquier (Supreme Court) of Normandy. Although there were originally aristocrats of Normandy sitting on the bench, from that time on they became increasingly absent. There were actually only lawyers there, and many among those lawyers were clerics, and they were the ones who passed judgment. Therefore, there was a kind of amalgamation here, one group needing the other and engaging in the same kind of activity.

Vande Walle :

This too is a good example that testifies to the role of the clergy. About half of the judges of the Court are clerics. Yes, please.

Egawa :

Well, earlier on there were some comments, stating that there was only a warrior class in Western Europe and I would like to disagree somewhat. And I may be making a very bold argument, but to me it seems that the cleric classes in Europe, the role they played was quite similar to the role played by Japanese Kuge (courtiers). That is my argument.

Please allow me to add a little further to my comment. Kuge, Japanese courtiers,

were especially needed at the time of rituals. In the Medieval era in Europe, when an important ritual was conducted, almost all of them were conducted by the clergy. They were the professionals for the performance of rituals in Europe. Needless to say, the clerics did not have their own lineages. In that sense, in terms of their social situation, they were quite different from Japanese Kuge courtiers. But when it comes to the roles they played, I find many similarities between the clerics in Europe and the Kuge courtiers in Japan.

Mitani :

Now you are comparing the roles of warriors and clerics in the Medieval era. But, when it comes to the early modern period, in Japan we see some differences. In the Edo era, when warriors became a full-fledged aristocracy, courtiers, Kuge, survived despite their diminished role in the center of the power. This is very interesting. The unique character of Japanese history is that it allows the survival of old elements despite severe competition from newer ones. Japanese government did not try to eradicate the old elements. But in other countries, the new system of government tried to eliminate the old elements, as e.g. the Choson dynasty in Korea tried to eliminate Buddhism totally, adopting Zhu Xi's Neo-Confucianism. It is a very difficult but interesting theoretical problem: why in Japan the new system did not eradicate the older elements, but let them survive, albeit in a greatly reduced area.

Pollard :

If I may briefly comment on that earlier, very interesting topic. Yes, the role of the clerics. I think that perhaps we have a terminological difficulty here; that we have missed the point about what is meant by the word 'courtier' in the discourse of Japanese history. There is no doubt in the mind of Western historians that a courtier is one who attends the king, who is in the 'curia', and as my colleagues have said, there are many different people there and there are many tensions that go along with being there. But if we are to say that the courtiers as understood in Japanese society are the equivalent of our clergy, then I think there is a very interesting, and completely new discussion that could take place.

On Ikeda :

I know this is the third symposium on the same theme of "Courtiers and Warriors" but for me, this is my first occasion to attend the symposium, although I read the proceedings of the previous two. We have seen the scroll painting from the

Choson Dynasty preserved in the Yômei Bunko, In that painting the civilian officials are at a higher level than the military, although both are divided into three ranks. There were 12 successful civilian candidates and 38 or 39 military ones, three times more. When we see the Japanese feudal society in the Tokugawa age, along with the Shogun, there were about 300 or so Daimyo, while the Hatamoto and other high-ranking samurai numbered about several thousand.

In the Korean peninsula, in terms of numbers civilians were overwhelmed by the military officials. In that sense, both in the island country of Japan and the Korean peninsula, we had a society where the military officials needed to outnumber the civilians officials. In continental China, on the other hand, I can say that there was a civilian supremacy in the contingents of the official examinations. So, civilian supremacy, civilian predominance was a feature of a continental nation. The relative weight of courtiers and, warriors, is fundamentally different on the continent and in an island or peninsular context. And I think there is a fundamental difference between a continental state and an island state or peninsular state. This seems to be a general phenomenon, but the problem is how we must interpret this difference.

As for the role of religion, Christianity was prevalent in Western Europe, while in Japan, Buddhism prevailed and to some extent Shinto, although its role was secondary. In China, continental China, although religion existed, the importance of religions was much lower than the role played by Confucianism. And in that sense, we see a major difference between these societies.

Vande Walle :

Thank you very much for your comment. As for China, yes, you're right. Military officials were regarded as lower than the civilian officials. But China had always foreign tribes living within or near its borders, and usually, the military officials were not recruited from among the Han people, but rather from among the tribes, who were half sinicized. China was an empire, and as such it could not always live in peace. China required military capability, but the majority group which is the Han people, preferred the civilian positions, while entrusting the military profession to non-Han peoples.

In the case of Korea, and Japan, there were no or very few other populations, and, that may be the reason why the Japanese and the Koreans had to take on the

military duties themselves, and that may be at the root of the difference. The difference in the make-up of the populace may be the reason for the different percentages between the civilian officials and the military officials in the three countries concerned.

Ikeda :

Yes, I agree with you. Continental China, geographically, is a huge and vast area and it embraces many different minority peoples. The warrior type duties were mainly carried out by peoples other than the Han, while the Han majority group took up the civilian roles.

Vande Walle :

Thank you very much. Any further comments? Dr. Guo, please.

Guo Qiyong:

As Professor Ikeda confirmed, you are right about the role played by the military officials. Another important aspect is that during the Han Dynasty, the many military officials had a high level of intellectual knowledge and they played an important role in the central government. That is a fact that we cannot deny. However, rather than the relative ranking of civilian versus military officials, we need to consider the basic institutional differences.

In China, the military officials were numerous too and they sometimes revolted, but generally the central government managed to control these military officials.

When we look at Chinese history, the typical slavery did not exist unlike in ancient Greece and Rome. Neither did China experience a period of feudalism as in Medieval Europe. If we look at the land policy in China, during the Zhou Dynasty, we see that the system of *jingtianzhi* was adopted. This ancient production system subsequently was transformed into the small-scale farmer economy or the landowner economy.

Jingtianzhi is the name of the land policy during Zhou times. Aristocrats monopolized the land in the countryside. They divided a piece of land into nine equal portions like the character “well” (*jing*). The eight surrounding portions were allotted as private land to eight families, while the central portion was cultivated jointly by the eight families as public land. The income from the public land would be offered up to the lord to be used for religious activities such as ancestor worship and public utility.

When we investigate the structures of the society and the ruling class of the Zhou Dynasty, they show in the concept *qingsui* that there was a clear distinction between the castle (place in which aristocrats live), and the fields (place in which humble farmers live) .

Of course, in the Zhou dynasty, the relationship was structured along the lines of enfeoffment: the monarch enfeoffed the different ranks of vassals in according with their closeness of blood relationship. Coming into the Qin and Han Dynasty, this relation was transformed into the relation between emperor and local government officials. That is, the old system of enfeoffed land was converted into the centralized system of commanderies and prefectures. There is a strong vertical relationship extending from the center to the periphery, and the warrior class never formed an independent and distinctive class.

Vande Walle :

Thank you very much. Professor Tanii, please.

Toshihito Tanii :

This is a symposium on the comparative study of civilization, so we have to consider first the criteria on which we base our comparative study. In the course of this symposium from Monday on, I have come to realize how important these criteria are. The idea of comparing courtiers and the warriors, is inspired by a distinction typical in Japanese history, but for people who are studying the history of other countries like myself, who study China, it seems clear that we should include in the comparison the notion of kingship or royal family. And if we include the European point of view, we should also add the clergy, an idea raised by Professor Yamaori on the first day at the reception. So, these 4 elements have to be included in the comparison to compare different countries and different ages. And the inclusion of these 4 elements will probably enable us to make a more adequate comparison between civilizations. I for one now realize how strong the power was of the emperor at certain times in Chinese history

Vande Walle : Thank you very much.

Kasaya :

Would you please elaborate a little more on the idea of the royal family or the kingship?

Tanii :

Well, listening to the presentations at this symposium, I came to realize this for the first time, so I have nothing structured to say here yet. But most impressive to myself was Dr. Uwayokote's presentation and especially the point he made that it is not just sword-bearing people who are called warriors, but that only the ones who were acknowledged thus by the emperor or the king were called warriors. In that way I saw to what extent the warrior status is subject to rules and regulations. However, I cannot say yet how then we can define the warrior more specifically. I am sorry I cannot answer your question more adequately yet.

Vande Walle :

In relation to this, any other comments? Dr. Kang.

Kang Hugh H. W.:

Professor Ikeda, I think that your comments contained some points that were not true to historical fact. In that connection I would like to say something about Korea. In ancient times those who had the power were the royal family. The people with real power were royals, they were those who were called *shinkotsu*, as I mentioned in my presentation. They came from families with an old lineage. Those people like other people in other ranks, had originally been warriors in ancient times, and they went on to create principalities and expanded their territory. In that process they adopted a Chinese style of governing system, comparable to the *Ritsuryo* system in Japan. When they introduced Chinese culture, -I think we can compare it to the Japanese case-, when they tried to introduce Chinese culture, the clergy played an important role. Indian Buddhism was introduced into China, and was assimilated in Chinese culture, and subsequently it was transferred to Korea. Together with Buddhism came Chinese culture. I think that can also be said in the case of Japan. The priests were the only intellectuals and it was through the priests that the Chinese *Ritsuryo* system was introduced to Choson. Along with it came Confucianism. And therefore, more and more Confucians were educated. And so, as the unified state came to maturity in Choson, the role played by the Buddhist priests, was taken over by the Confucians. And the Confucians established a state, similar to the pattern of China, where warriors were less needed than civilian officials, who were being trained in ever greater number.

So, they trained and educated civilian officials and as a result, the educational organization and systems necessary to train these civilian officials, especially the

Kakyo or state examination system, has played an important role. And the result was that the civilian officials played an important role there, while the prestige of the warriors declined. And, of course, there were rebellions by the warriors, such as those referred to by Prof. Schultz in his presentation, but they were limited to a certain age, but this does not detract from the general picture of Chosoun history, where the general trend is one of a shift from warriors in ancient times to a society dominated by civilian officials in the modern era.

In the case of Choson, it was a completely civilian society controlled by the civilian officer, not a warrior society. The number of military officials may be superior in the *Yômei Bunko* painting, but the contingent of civilian officials was 33 men. Of course, there are variations from time to time, and there may be more warriors in number. The number of warriors was 38, which is more than that of the civilian officials, which was 33. But seen from an overall viewpoint, The examination system was introduced from China, fully adopted in the 11th century and lasted until the 20th century. The warrior class was in the ascendant for a time, but was subsequently permanently eclipsed. Through the examination system one climb to the position of officer or general, and there were quite a large number of them, but that did not result in real power. This is also applicable to China, but it is particularly true for Choson or Korea. Consequently, when we compare the roles of the clergy, the royal family, the warriors and civilian officials, I think we can say that compared to Japan, the situation is quite different. In the case of Choson, the role each of the social groups in each of the different ages and times is quite clearly defined.

Vande Walle :

The priests were the first to study Confucianism and introduced it into Choson, but eventually lost their position, correct? Or could they maintain their positions by transforming themselves into Confucianists, and thus succeed in joining the new nascent class of Confucianists? For example, in Japan, we have the Zen monks of the *Gozan* temples. They were Buddhist priests, yet they were also specialists in Confucianism for a long time.

Kang: May I?

Vande Walle :

Yes, Please.

Kang :

In the case of Korea, in ancient times, Buddhist priests and monks of course read the Buddhist texts. In order to do that, they had to learn classical Chinese and so they were involved in education. When the Confucians or the secular scholars who specialized in Confucianism emerged, the Buddhists retreated from the world of politics, and devoted themselves solely to the religious world. Therefore, when we look at Korean history through time, in the ancient period, the Buddhist priests played a dominant role, whereas in the Medieval era, both Confucians and Buddhist monks co-existed playing different roles, and sometimes their roles overlapped. In the Choson Dynasty, Buddhism was suppressed and Buddhist monks retreated into the mountains.

Vande Walle :

Thank you. Dr. Mitani?

Mitani :

As Dr. Kang and Dr. Vande Walle also mentioned, clerics belong to a special class, they are international. We are always talking about the history of specific countries, Japan, Korea or China, or some country in Europe, but we must pay sufficient attention to the international role of non-secular people.

Vande Walle :

Yes, that is true. Clerics often share an international culture, therefore religion has that transnational characteristic. Any other comments? Dr. Kang, would you like to add something?

Kang :

Well, if I may. Ritual is a good example. And again to take the example of Korea. Rituals were conducted in the Buddhist monk temples in ancient times, but in the Medieval era, the rituals were executed by the Confucianists, and in the Confucian era, Buddhist monks completely retreated from the scene.

Vande Walle :

Right, at that point they had played out their historical role.

Kang :

Let me add one more thing. We faculty of universities and researchers in academia, are playing exactly the same role that non-secular people used to play in the past.

Vande Walle: Dr. Kasaya, you have something to add.

Kasaya :

Yes. Since the role of Confucianism was mentioned again, let me add something to complicate the matter. I wonder whether we are warranted to treat the role of the clerics and the Confucianists in the same category. That is a further complication of the problem. That is one point.

Secondly, Dr. Egawa came up with the question whether clerics in Europe could be compared to the noblemen or courtiers in Japan. Let me say this. I think that we must not forget that the courtiers in Japan are a class of secular civilian officials. If we look at just their functions, it is true that they are similar to those of the clerics, including performing rituals, drawing up documents and acting as civilian officials. However, they are secular people. That shouldn't be forgotten. Of course, Japanese Buddhist monks did perform rituals but these are limited to religious rituals. But when we look at the court rituals, those are secular rituals, although of course, some are connected with Shinto, which is also a religion. But compared with Buddhism, Shinto has a diluted weight in terms of religious significance. This makes it even more complicated, but the participation of Confucianism and the Confucianists makes the problem more complicated.

The question is that where to draw the line? That might be difficult, but to me it seems there the people who perform a religious role, the secular people, I think there is a clear differentiation. Moreover, when we were talking about universal categories, I was interested in the concepts that emerged in the Turkish or the Islamic empire, i.e. "the people who hold the sword" and "the people who hold the pen". In Europe, we may add to these two categories the "people who pray". I think these are quite universal categories; especially the notions "people with pens" and "people with swords" as used in the Islamic world are not only easy to understand criteria, but at the same time, they have a very universal element.

Vande Walle : Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, please.

Masatoshi Harada :

We have heard several comments on clerics and non-secular people. I am a scholar of Buddhism during the Middle Ages in Japan, and would like to add a comment from my field of expertise. During the Middle Ages in Japan, the ideology to justify ruling authority and legitimacy is largely Buddhist. As Prof. Kasaya said, rituals were performed by the courtiers, but many rituals in the ritual calendar of the Court were performed by the Buddhist clergy. True enough, from the first to the seventh day of the New Year, courtiers took the lead in performing what is known as *Sechie*, but after that, the Buddhist clergy steps in. Buddhist monks performed esoteric rituals, monks from the six schools in Nara or the Tendai schools perform debates in front of the emperor and the courtiers. Therefore, in the ritual calendar of the Court, both clerics and courtiers complemented each other. So, I think we have to have a deeper look into this dimension.

Furthermore, in Japan, a country on the fringe of the Asian continent, Buddhism remained particularly strong until early modern times. Of course, we had Confucianism or Shinto, but up to the beginning of early modern times, I think Buddhism was very strong. However, in China Confucianism was very strong, while in Korea, there was some overlap: Buddhist influence predominated in Koryo times, while in Choson Confucianism prevailed. Therefore in each country and each period, the legitimacy and justification of the ruling authority differs? I think that in Japan, Buddhism played a very important role.

I would like to add a further comment on Medieval Buddhism and military force in order not to invite any misunderstanding. In the Middle Ages in Japan, how did Buddhism accommodate the use of violence? According to a previous comment, it was in particular the Pure Land strain of the new Kamakura period schools, which provided the justification for military force. Honestly speaking, that is a little bit removed from the true facts of history, because in medieval times, especially the Tendai and Nara school were the best armed Buddhist organizations. They maintained huge bands of armed monks, known in the parlance of the day as “bad monks”. So, it is especially the Tendai and Nara schools, who maintained these powerful military forces, who had a need for legitimacy in religious terms. Therefore, the older strains of Buddhism made pointed efforts at valorization or justification of their military forces. For instance, legend has it that the chief priest of the *Enryakuji* temple, Ryôgen, argued that in order to protect the temple, he had to demean himself by

resorting to military force. So, Japanese Buddhism was actively seeking to justify the maintenance of military forces.

In esoteric Buddhism there is a ritual where poisoned arrows are put up around the altar. This is a symbolic expression of the violence that prayers have. Therefore, it is by no means only the Pure Land sects of Buddhism who justify the use of violence, but rather those schools that by modern historians are subsumed under the name *Kenmitsu bukkyô*, which originated in Heian times, who did make efforts to justify the use of force.

Vande Walle : Anybody else? Yes, please.

Asaji Hirayama :

I emphasized the role of Pure Land faith in the justification of the use of violence. I would like to ask Prof. Harada whether orthodoxy in Japanese Buddhism (*Kenmitsu Bukkyô*) also referred to the theory of the degeneration of the Buddhist Dharma (Mappô no Yo) to legitimize the use of violence, as was the case with Pure Land sects.

Harada :

To be honest, I do not think that this kind of argument as justification for the use of violence can be read from the relevant texts, but it is likely that violence was considered a necessary evil in the given circumstances of the age. I am not saying that the Pure Land sects had nothing to do with warfare. In the middle of the battle, or at the time of death, warriors would call a priest to pray for them in the hour of death. That means that even on the battlefield, and in the camps, the sutra-chanting priests of Pure Land affiliation were brought in to secure salvation for the dying warriors. So, I think that this was construed as shortcut method of atonement, and in this sense, Pure Land Buddhism too must be said to have been involved in the legitimatization of violence.

Mitani :

In Buddhism, the teaching is that we must not kill a person, but how much weight did this precept have? When Tendai or Nara schools of Buddhism maintained armed bands of monks, how did negotiate the patent contradiction between the commandment

of non-violence and their military forces?

Harada :

Well, I'm not the right person to respond to that question, but if anybody is a scholar on Buddhism, please make a supplementary comment. I think the fundamental tenet is that actually we must not kill life. That is the fundamental teaching, but because of some compelling reason, violence could be justified or valorized. In Zen and the Vinaya school, the monks stressed the observance of the precept not to kill life. But, I think that once warring parties took over authority, they protected the schools and sects that advocated strict observance of the precepts. However, there was no clear-cut opposition between the Vinaya school and Tendai and Shingon schools. Different schools supplemented each other.

Egawa :

I think the theme of the discussion has deviated from the functions of the elite to a discussion of religion or ideology. Is that the agenda?

Vande Walle :

I think we are still looking at the role played by the clerics or the non-secular people, in particular the way they justify military force.

Egawa :

If we are now dealing with ideology, philosophy and religion, I would like to ask a question to Dr. Kaeuper, if I may?

Vande Walle : Yes. Please.

Egawa :

Dr. Kaeuper argued that the knights likened their own physical suffering to the passion of Jesus Christ. By doing so, they justified their actions, they made an attempt at valorization I think he used the word "valorization" or "justification". I have one question on the following point. Is this not a case of simply changing one's tune after the facts, means, is not just a case of self-justification. In the latter half of Medieval times, from the latter half of the 12th century onwards, as the warrior class was gradually being suppressed, its reason for existence, its "raison d'être" had to be argued. That became a necessity. So, that is when this discourse

of self-justification was generated. But did it really reflect their day to day mentality, or their mental attitude? I think this is literally an ideology; the ideology explaining itself. That is my first question.

The second question is whether those arguments carried enough conviction? In other words could they convince other groups or classes in society with these arguments?

Kaeuper:

It takes a woman's touch. These are very important, large questions. On valorization as self-justification I should add that I am thinking of one line of a possible set of chivalric religious valorizations. It's a justifiable argument to say that you can find cases where knights do not follow this path. I think there are two parallel tracks at least. That is, I think some knights followed mainly heroic atonement; others followed mainly the traditional line of giving gifts to the Church, going on pilgrimage etc. So, I don't mean to say that knights are not following the standard procedures of the Medieval Church. It seems that they have this option, they have this extra line that is useful to them. This makes me think in terms of the great change in the Church to come. I think knights had ideas. I know clerics wrote a lot of these ideas for them, but I think clerics are worried about chivalric independence. In the great work of Sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte D'Arthur* (the great Arthurian story), one of the knights, I think it's Gawain, comes to a hermit. He has just made a terrible mess of the quest of the Holy Grail. And he says, "I'm not doing this well." And the cleric, it's a hermit, says to him, "Of course you aren't. You don't understand it at all." And he says, "What must I do?" And the cleric says, "You must confess your sins"-- that is standard Medieval religion-- "and do such penance as I impose on you." He backs out and he says, "I can't do that. We knights often suffer much woe and pain." In other words, "you can't add to that. I've already done penance."

So there is independence, self-valorization. Although a great many knights did standard kinds of penance, the self-valorization was viewed with some suspicion. All of the anti-clerical ideas of the Middle Ages, to a certain point in time, are written by clerics. It is not as if all the clerics think one thing and all of the knights think something else. A lot of these clerics are in the employ of the knights.

A really huge issue lies in the second point that you raised. What happens as more and more knights cease to be warriors? As I said in a previous discussion,

knighthood starts, I believe, as a function and ends up as a status. And when it ends up as a status, fewer of the men who are called knight are actually strenuous practicing knights. So, a lot of these men are old and fat and they have rusty armor and are not going out on the field of battle. But I do think that to a significant degree, they have available to them the justification of their caste, of the group of knights. I was talking about this with Professor Gadeleva and Dr. to be Boogert this morning. They might have to reproduce this case for me because I only heard this over breakfast, but they gave an argument that there is a point in Japanese history when the class of warriors is no longer a vigorous class of warriors but yet maintains the ideology of the warrior. So, I think although the *raison d'être* or the actual practice changes, the ideology remains. And I think that is a tremendously important point. My note is so garbled here on the third question. Did others agree to this? Was that the question? Did others accept this?

Vande Walle:

Could they convince other people from other walks of life? Was this a convincing argument?

Kaeuper:

Yes. I think to a large degree. It is easier to convince people when you possess the swords, of course. They developed a whole mythology of chivalry that is a marvel to behold. They developed an idea that their lineage goes back to the time before Christ. If you read any of this, you'll see it's just remarkable. It's not anti-clerical. It makes the clerics very nervous but they need the knights. One clerical treatise says, "If we don't have the knights, what will happen? The heretics will take over, our enemies will come in and we'll be killed at our altars, with the sacred host rolling on the ground. So, we must honor and respect these knights etc."

So, I think in some ways they were successful though others may not have wanted to acknowledge it. But the interesting fact is that the clerics and the knights agree in hating the bourgeoisie.

Egawa :

The necessity of the existence of the warrior class was justified and acknowledged by the whole of society. However, I am not sure that the whole of society accepted that religious valorization was given to the warrior class. By the way, Mr. Bennett

talked about *Bushidô* or Japanese chivalry. The ethics for the *bushi* was established only after warriors had lost the actual battle experience. That means well into the Edo period. Then all *bushi* or Japanese warriors wanted to find some spiritual value, and thus *Bushidô* was created.

Vande Walle :

And you are saying that that is very similar to chivalry in Europe? Dr. Bennett, do you want to comment on that?

Alexander Bennett:

I am not sure if I am supposed to reply in English or Japanese. Let me speak in Japanese.

Well, how many minutes are left in this discussion?

Vande Walle : 10 minutes.

Bennett :

Well, I think with regard to the question of *Bushidô* and whether it did actually exist or not, that is a very hard-hitting question. *Bushido*, i.e. the word itself was used only from the Edo period on. Before that, the term did not exist, or at least was hardly ever utilized. Upon entering the relatively peaceful Edo period, the term *Bushidô* or 'way of the warrior' came into vogue, although it was not nearly as popular as most moderns think. Before this peaceful era, *bushi* were professional warriors constantly putting their lives on the line, but they lost the stage for their work. How could they justify their status at the top echelon of society when there were no battles left to fight? This was the big question for the Edo period *bushi*, who then set about formulating an ethos which would place them at the moral pinnacle of society, and justify the social control by warriors, who no longer had recourse to demonstrate their martial prowess. This attempt at redefining their identity is represented in the term *Bushidô*. Other *bushi* ethos (with different names) did in fact exist from centuries before, in the Kamakura, Muromachi, and Sengoku periods, but a new interpretation was given to suit the social climate in the Edo period. As to whether the other parties or other layers of society recognized the *bushi*'s separate identity or unique warrior ethos, I believe the answer is yes. As Dr. Kaeuper said, the execution of violence set *bushi* or knights apart from other

groups. The ethical structure for *bushi* had been pursued since *bushi* became a distinct class of professional warriors, not just in the Edo period. I can see many similarities with the development of chivalry outlined in Dr. Kaeuper's talk.

Vande Walle : Thank you.

Egawa :

We have to distinguish ethos and ethics. It was about the birth of the latter, which is a system of logic for explaining ethos to wider circles in society.

Bennett :

Professor Kasaya would you please give us some comment?

Vande Walle : Yes.

Kasaya :

As for the ideology, the owl of Minerva flies at twilight. Only when it's disappearing or lost, ideological constructs to preserve it enter the discourse. That is also what is often stated concerning *Bushidô*. However, there is also a great deal of misunderstanding. Samurai during the Edo period were not peaceful people. Of course, there were no wars either internally or externally; for 200 years, complete peace was maintained. But this does not mean that there were no armed clashes among samurai, or that they had lost their warrior ethos.

Bushidô was not limited to armed situations only, it also applied to the administrative pursuits, in which samurai did play important roles. I'm afraid I don't have sufficient time to give you further details on this aspect.

However, I would like to touch upon the issue of death in *Bushidô*. Like in chivalry, in *Bushidô*, the question of death was always an important theme. *The Budô shoshinshû*, a book on *Bushidô*, said that from the first day of the year to the last day of the year, *bushi* should always think about death. The risk of death can come any time and *bushi* are ready to accept death for the sake of honor. Even more famous is the passage in *Hagakure* saying that *Bushidô*'s essence is in dying. So, the question of death for *bushi* seems to be one step more advanced than the issue of death in chivalry. *Bushi* here is regarded as a weak and vulnerable existence. When it

comes to the question of life and death, a human being wishes to keep on living; everybody wishes to avoid death. But with that, you cannot serve as a samurai. In the question of life or death, samurai must choose death. By having this constant choice to make, the samurai can win a kind of freedom that transcends the question of life and death. When he reaches this realm of transcending the question of life and death, the samurai, the *bushi* does not fear death, does not cling to life; he can keep on living as samurai throughout his life. This is the essence of the phrase about *Bushidô*'s essence being in dying.

What was the ultimate achievement of the ethos of the knight? Has what I described about *Bushidô* a parallel in chivalry? Professor Kaeuper, can you give us some comments please?

Kaeuper:

I am not sure that I exactly caught the last part of your question. What is the argument in chivalry about? Can you help me again please? I am sorry.

Kasaya :

The question of death. What was the mentality of knights in the face of death? There was so much emphasis on death in *Bushidô*, but death was not the goal. Death was understood as the way to have a full life, although this sounds paradoxical. My question is how death was understood in the ethos of chivalry.

Kaeuper:

Thank you. I think the first thing we have to recognize in thinking about these issues of whether or not knights could convince others, etc., is that they're not really simply like the Japanese warrior. Remember the range; some of these are the great lords. The kings of England and France called themselves knights. It's not so hard for knights to convince others; they don't have to convince a courtier group of their status. But the question is about death. I don't think they thought they were seeking death. I mentioned earlier a line from a *chanson de geste* about every knight seeking his death. But that simply means to be ready for it and to know that that's what a violent life will come to. And over and over again in *chansons de geste*, i.e. in epics, the knights say, "Christ died for his men; we have to be ready to die for our men." So, there is that sense that death is an emulation of the death of Christ. There is that whole sacrificial sense in Medieval Christianity that is very

powerful. And it is remarkable that late in their lives any number of great lords and knights made an arrangement to be accepted into a monastic order. They entered a monastery and formally became monks to clean up their act and face death with security. Let's see, is there anything else I should say?

Vande Walle:

Professor Kasaya was actually pointing to the fact that in *Bushidô*, in his interpretation, there is this final goal of deliverance. So, by facing death, they reach a state of deliverance that transcends both life and death.

Kaeuper:

The Crusader, for example, felt that he was earning salvation. It is complicated to know what the Medieval Church said to the knights but what they heard, I'm sure, was, "You go on Crusade, you suffer a lot, maybe you even die and you're okay. You have earned your salvation." There are sermon stories in which old knights say, "Oh, look, if I go back to Europe, I'll just fall into my sins again. I'll charge the enemy one more time and die as a martyr and I'm alright." My argument, though, is that what happens is that this Crusade ethos or ideology is generalized by the knights to apply to the knighthood generally and not to the Crusader only. So, they don't have a real ideology of death in the way that you are describing, but they're certainly ready to face it and they think if they die well, that's really spiritually very good. Some knights will think, "No, I don't need to do that. I've donated to the Church. I've confessed, I've been working for charity etc," but it is the congenial line of thought in an ideology of prowess that death in a good cause willingly undertaken is a kind of deliverance.

Kasaya :

Thank you, professor Kaeuper. I think I spoke too much and as I am here in the capacity of a time keeper, I should not violate the rules, which I impose. Unfortunately, it is time to end this session. If possible, we will have an evening farewell party and before having the alcoholic drinks, perhaps we could enjoy a sober, serious discussion. As for the important points, I would like to call upon the chairperson to make a summary report of this session.

Vande Walle :

The microphone is not on. I was going to raise another question but there is no

time for that, I guess. But let me very briefly phrase it. As the symposium proceeded, the problem of definition arose with increasing insistence. This became a major problem when we talked about feudalism. There seemed to be a difference between *féodalité* and feudalism and also the feudalistic system we found in Japan. This point was already discussed yesterday, but perhaps we will have occasion to discuss this on another occasion. This is a very extensive theme and we have discussed from different perspectives and angles.

To conclude now. In the opening address, Dr. Kasaya expressed the hope that the symposium would be very fruitful and significant. And as far as I understand, I think that we have had a very fruitful discussion and meaningful symposium this week.

Now, in dealing with the overall theme of, courtiers and warriors, we touched upon the related issues such as kingship, the state, the state system, the regime etc. We have had comments and presentations from various perspectives, and I believe we all have gained a deeper understanding.

To what extent can we sensibly compare East and West? This is a question often raised. For example, in Japanese history, chronological periods are used parallel to those in Western history, yet time and again we observe that there are differences and that some of these differences make comparison complicated. The distinction between courtiers and warriors in Japan is different from that found in Europe, although we also find similarities between the two. At any rate, in the East, mainly in China and Korea and Japan, we easily see the similarities, and even if we do not, at least we use the same terms to describe the differences. Are they similarities in reality or rather similarities in discourse, in terms used, in political ideologies, deriving from literature and historical documents? The ruling classes in these three countries shared similar state ideologies. Therefore, their interpretation of their histories tends to be analogous, especially in their ancient documents. So, we have to keep that in mind when we examine the history of China, Korea and Japan from a comparative perspective.

When we study Japanese history, we often go back to the time of the Ritsuryo system, which was an ideal based on the Chinese model. As a result, historians have a tendency to describe Japanese history as an endeavor to approach that Chinese model, endeavor which ultimately failed however. Therefore, Japanese history is

often depicted as a deviation from Chinese history, but using the same terms and discourse as is used for Chinese history. By using the same terms and the same discourse, even for describing diverging developments, we may create the illusion of some common ground, some basic framework, within which both Chinese and Japanese history are being played out. From the point of view of comparative study, it seems to me that the comparative study has certain limitations which we have to be mindful about. We must deepen our understanding of the historiography of other regions and civilization, look for analogies and similarities, but also not lose out of sight the peculiarities that seem to defy reduction to a universal framework.

Here, I would like to conclude the symposium. By way of conclusion, I would like to express on behalf of all participants our sincerest appreciation to Professor Kasaya and all the other persons who have supported the organization of this symposium. We have had a very fruitful, significant symposium that lasted over 5 days. This is all owed to the capability of Nichibunken's organization and preparation. And the interpreters also did a fine job for five days. I am sure they had a difficult time. We wish to express our appreciation to the interpreters.

Tomorrow, we will have the open or public seminar. In connection with that, let me remind you that, in the hall, what is that hall called? in the public hall, there will be an exhibition of some treasures from the *Yōmei* Bunko library, so please take the opportunity to admire these very rare exhibits. I'm sure they're worth taking some time off to admire them.

Any other announcements from the Secretariat?

Pollard :

It is customary in my country that a participant, particularly from another part of the world, adds a vote of thanks. And I wonder if I may take that liberty.

Vande Walle : By all means. Please.

Pollard :

I speak on behalf of the overseas visitors. This final session has had a little discussion about priests and monks. I am reminded that this room in which we are meeting is laid out just as a Chapter house in a great European cathedral or monastery. Whether or not the architects had that in mind, it has certainly been my feeling that

we have gathered here just as we would have, had we been priests or monks. And, indeed, to some extent, we academics are the modern priests. And this gathering like an international Chapter of a great religious order, has considered many high and significant matters. I would like to thank Professor Kasaya for bringing us all together from so many corners of the world for such a worthwhile and informative discussion of our subjects. I personally have profited enormously and I would like to record, if I may on behalf of the visitors, our gratitude for your generous hospitality here at Nichibunken and to add finally also our thanks for the sterling work of the interpreters. Thank you.

Vande Walle : Thank you very much.

Kasaya :

The time is limited, so I would like to briefly say a few words of appreciation. Thank you very much for your active participation over the past five days. We have been joined by outstanding scholars from all over the world. For us at Nichibunken, it was a great honor to have you with us. We feel it has been a very significant symposium for us. Thank you very much for your participation.