

THE DEAD: SHINTO ASPECTS OF BUDDHIST RITUAL

D. P. MARTINEZ

1. Introduction

THE commonly accepted model of religion in Japan treats Shintoism and Buddhism as two separate systems, so any attempt to identify Shinto aspects of Buddhist ritual requires some explanation. As the historian of religion Grapard notes, scholars of Japan hold Shinto and Buddhism to be two distinct systems of religious practice and 'students continue to uphold the dissociations by specializing either in Shinto or in Buddhism. By doing so, they are actually throwing most of Japanese culture out the window' (1984: 242). It can be said that, in contrast to other scholars, anthropologists of Japan have tended to avoid any debate on the two religions. They either refer to 'ancestor worship' without asking how this accords with either Shinto or Buddhist orthodoxy (cf. Embree 1946; Beardsley 1959; Plath 1964), or they have accepted Ooms's argument (1976) that there is a division of labour between the two systems, with Shinto including all life-cycle rituals and Buddhism relating specifically to the dead. Yet, there has arisen among

Fieldwork was conducted for a total of two years between 1984 and 1986 in the diving and fishing village of Kuzaki, Mie Prefecture, Japan. For financial support I am grateful to the Japanese Ministry of Education, who awarded me a Monbushō grant, and to the Institute of Social Anthropology, University of Oxford, for a Philip Bagby Studentship.

indigenous Japanese folklorists and history-of-religion scholars an interesting debate on the subject.

In an important work entitled *About our Ancestors* (Yanagita 1970), the founding father of Japanese folklore studies, Yanagita Kunio, argued that all rituals relating to the worship of ancestors were Shinto in origin with the meekest veneer of Buddhism laid over the top. The Buddhism of Japan, according to Yanagita, was thus not really Buddhism at all, but another example of how the Japanese always adapt and change foreign imports to suit the overriding demands of their unique, consistent and fundamentally unchanging culture. In the case of Buddhism, they had had since the sixth century to accomplish this. Whether agreeing with Yanagita or not, other folklorists and religious scholars accept a tripartite division of religion in Japanese history and within modern society: folk, Shinto and Buddhist religions (cf. Hori 1968, Kitagawa 1987, Earhart 1982).¹ Moreover, the history of Shinto, often labelled 'the indigenous religion of Japan', is of special interest for twentieth-century scholars since it is from Shinto roots that state Shinto and militant nationalism arose.

However much anthropologists have tended to avoid the debate, it is of importance for the discipline. If there has always existed a tension between Shinto and Buddhism, how does one explain the mixture of 'folk' practices found in village religious life which does not correspond to Ooms's typology, Buddhism for the dead, Shinto for the living? How is one to explain the persistence and vitality of Japanese 'new' religions which, save for the ubiquitous Sokka Gakkai, mix the two religions along with any other to fit the needs of the group? Should we agree with Grapard that there was never a 'true' Buddhism in Japan until the Meiji Restoration of 1868 forcibly created both Shinto and Buddhism as two distinct religions; should we side with Yanagita in maintaining that 'true' Buddhism never flourished in Japan because it was foreign and could not; or should we consider the argument of Sokka Gakkai that Japanese Buddhism is tainted and that only by following the teachings of Nichiren, a thirteenth-century Buddhist monk, is one taking part in true Buddhist practices? In short, can we avoid the question—'What is "true" Buddhism?' which seems to arise in work on other Buddhist societies? Is this question one which should concern anthropologists of Japan at all?

In this article I want to use material from my fieldwork to argue that much about village religious life can be explained in terms of the long internal debate on the nature of both Buddhism and Shintoism. That is to say, that although the question of what is true Buddhism can be seen to be one imposed by Western scholars in other societies, in Japan this Western concern is only a small part of a much older debate which has worked itself out according to the political and philosophical climate. This debate has often centred on the question of what 'pure' Shinto was, and the resolution of the debate, especially during the Meiji

1. It could be said that the current tripartite division of religion substitutes 'new' religious sects for the category of folk. As I shall suggest below, this represents an important continuity rather than a break with Japanese pre-Meiji (i.e. pre-1868) society.

Restoration, has had important consequences for the fate of Buddhism. Moreover, village religious life can only be understood if we are aware of this historical dimension. In taking this approach, I am not only relying on my own reading of the history of religious life in Kuzaki and on the description given below of the mixture of Shinto and Buddhism ritual practices which are necessary to turn the village newly dead into Buddhas; I also make use of Kuroda Toshio's reinterpretation of religion in his *Shinto in the History of Japanese Religion* (1981).

Briefly, Kuroda argues that the term 'shinto' is originally a Chinese term for any religious beliefs concerning local deities and/or Taoist practices. Japanese courtiers then adopted the word to describe exactly the same practices in Japan. Until the Japanese Middle Ages (twelfth to seventeenth centuries) the term did not refer to a coherent system of religious belief. In fact, local deities were completely subsumed into Buddhist practice just as they had been in Tibet, and it was this mixture which formed the basis for what is now called 'folk' religion in Japan: in reality, Kuroda argues, this was the religion of most of Japan. However, Japanese nationalist scholars of the Middle Ages began to argue that Shinto practices were the remnants of an ancient indigenous religion. This argument was strengthened by neo-Confucian scholars of the Tokugawa era (1600-1867), who imported a Chinese debate on the nature of 'true' Buddhism. At the same time, the Tokugawa government codified and restructured Buddhism in a set of codes known as *Various Ordinances Regarding Sects and Temples* which identified Shinto with Buddhism (Saunders 1964: 248). During this period, the government assumed control over court-connected temples and also had a certain amount of control over the clergy, who were kept out of politics and busy with religious affairs. Saunders also notes that 'believers were exhorted to attend the Buddhist temple of their home region *regardless of its sect*. The temple for its part was to keep a register of its members and to issue certificates of adherence. Certain days were set for obligatory attendance' (1964: 249-50, my emphasis).

The real division between Shinto and Buddhism occurred during the Meiji Restoration, when priests were forced to decide which religion they were practising. Buddhist temples were destroyed, and newly designated Shinto Shrines were rid of Buddhist artefacts and any hint of Buddhist practices. Kuroda, then, like Grapard, argues against the generally accepted tripartite description of Japanese religious history; both scholars agree that the true nature of religion in Japan was a syncretic mixture of what we now call Shinto and Buddhism,² and that to ignore this is to not understand Japanese culture. As I want to show below, their assertion is true not only for the history of Japan but also for the religious practices, still prevalent, which involve the dead.

2. Although both scholars use the term 'syncretic' it could be argued, as Gellner notes in his introduction above (pp. 101-2), that this is not the most appropriate term.

2. *The Village: Kuzaki*

According to village records (*Kuzaki Kambeshi* n.d.), Kuzaki has always had strong Shinto associations. This association has been emphasized by other scholars of the village (Aichi 1965; Iwata 1961; Kurata 1974), and, with pride, by the villagers themselves. Historical documentation can be found for the village's ties with Ise Shrine since AD 1111 (Aichi 1965: 16-17), and villagers point out that the importance of the relationship is partly to do with the fact that the village tutelary deity is Amaterasu, who also happens to be the principal deity worshipped at Ise as well as the ancestress of all Japan. All this might appear to contradict the idea that Shinto was never separate from Buddhism, since Ise Shrine is held to be the centre of the cult of the 'true' and ancient Shintoism, but Hardacre (1989) points out that until the Meiji Restoration Ise was neither important as a national Shinto shrine nor so singularly Shintoist.

Hardacre's point confirms some of the uncertainties I felt during fieldwork: if Ise was so Shintoist, why did its priests dress like medieval court officials (most courtiers were Buddhist from the eighth century onwards)? And why did an important village ritual, performed by Ise priests on July 1st include a shamanistic dance whose origins were Chinese? Why did the Kuzaki Shinto shrine have a statue which looked like Buddhist Kannon, but which the villagers insisted was Amaterasu? Why did the village women's monthly pilgrimage up the sacred Shinto mountain of Sengen always include worship at a clearly Buddhist altar? In fact, village women left offerings at the Buddhist temple during any Shinto festival, but rarely vice versa. Similar questions plagued me during the writing-up of my thesis: why did so many of the village's forty sacred areas (*mōsha*) disappear during the Meiji Restoration? And why did the January Hachiman festival take place in the Shinto shrine area when Hachiman has strong Buddhist associations and in some places is considered to be the avatar of Maitreya (Kitagawa 1987: 248)? Why, if Buddhist rituals are held only for the dead? And, in village folklore, Shinto practices were for women, did village grandmothers bear responsibility for the worship of the dead? And why did they include various 'Shinto' elements in their worship? None of these questions can be answered if we accept the now standard tripartite model of Japanese religion, but they do make sense if we do not. In the rest of this brief article, I will refer only to village practices concerning the dead to make my point, but a similar case might be made with reference to other rituals.

The village Buddhist temple is a Soto-Zen temple. Soto-Zen is associated strongly with the Tokugawa samurai, and in the case of Kuzaki the sect appeared in the village in 1661. It is not clear why a Soto-Zen priest came to Kuzaki, and there seems to have been some resistance to his collecting of household registries, for it was 1716 before complete records were kept.³ The temple built in 1816 is

3. It is not clear from the sources why this delay occurred, nor did the current priest explain it to me. However, it seems to have been during this time that the villagers were in conflict with

still there, opposite the ancient site for the village Shinto shrine (which was moved and rebuilt during the nationalist phase of the 1930s). The current priest is the thirteenth-generation descendant of the original priest sent to Kuzaki. Villagers, who regard the priest as a very learned and wise man, seem to classify him and his family as separate from the rest of village life: his children go to different schools, and his wife is from a farming rather than a coastal village. The temple grounds have a deserted feel to them in what is a rather crowded village, while children are often to be found playing on grounds of the the Shinto shrine. As is true of many modern Buddhist priests, the current priest supplements his income by teaching in a nearby secondary school, and this, he argues, accounts for his playing so little a part in village life. In contrast, the Shinto priest is the village milkman and is always invited to secular village celebrations where his behaviour is a source of great fun and some gossip. All this might seem to indicate that villagers are little involved with Buddhist worship, but, interestingly enough, it is central to the yearly calendar of religious life. However, it is the practice of Buddhist rites relating to Amida Buddha rather than Soto-Zen rites which are important to the villagers and their dead.

The worship of Amida, associated with the Sutras said for the ancestors (*nembutsu*), is often classified in the literature on Japan as belonging to the realm of 'folk' religion rather than 'true' Buddhism (cf. Hori 1968: 83-139). As such, I would argue, the importance of *nembutsu* in Kuzaki is evidence of the older Buddhism which has always prevailed in the village despite the Tokugawa imposition of Soto-Zen and the Meiji separation of Shinto and Buddhism. It should also be noted that the Buddhist priest does not reject these rites, but only participates in one of them, regarding the others—as he told me—as part of the way in which unlearned people seek to attain enlightenment. According to Zen, any path to enlightenment is acceptable, so rather than taking a stand against these practices the priest tolerates them. However, he does his bit for 'true' Buddhism by publishing short pamphlets on Soto-Zen to give to the villagers.

3. *The Dead in Kuzaki*

The standard explanation for the division between living and dead, Shinto and Buddhism, is that the dead were considered to be so polluting and dangerous that Shinto priests were glad to let the Buddhists take over their care. Yanagita (1970: 118-19) elaborated on this explanation by adding that in Shinto all the dead eventually became deities (*kami*), but that human corpses were so dangerous that

the feudal lord over his strict price controls on their catches (Aichi 1965: 16), and the new priest may have been seen as a government spy.

they were entrusted to Buddhist specialists. Thus, the fact that most Japanese do not think about the reincarnation of the dead but believe that all properly cared-for dead become Buddhas (*hotoke*) is yet another indication of the continuity of an ancient Shinto attitude. Until recently, the end of the Buddhist cycle of rituals for the dead (in some cases 33 years, in others 100) was marked by becoming *kami*. The question is whether we should take this as evidence of two competing systems of religion, or of two sets of beliefs which were held to be complementary and which made perfect sense to the practitioners. I would like to argue for the latter and must now turn to my fieldwork data in order to make the point.

In Kuzaki, the dead are polluting, so much so that when a diver from a nearby village had a heart attack and died in the sea, the purification ceremony which had been carried out the month before for the safety of the divers had to be repeated. The newly dead (*nyūgeshi*), i.e. their ashes, are so dangerous that they are buried in a graveyard outside the village's southern boundary which is marked by six *bodhisattvas*. On the other hand, household ancestors, those dead for more than a year, are worshipped in the temple graveyard, where each household maintains a memorial stone.⁴ All funerals are conducted by the Buddhist priest, but three days or so after the funeral most families go to visit a Shinto medium in order to talk to the dead. This is to ensure that they have 'arrived safely' in the land of the dead (identified with Amida Buddha's Paradise) and are happy with their death and the ceremonies that followed it. After speaking to the *nyūgeshi*, the medium then calls on all the family's named dead.⁵ Messages are passed from the other side, and warnings are given about potentially dangerous situations, unguarded household corners, or the need for certain rituals. For a fee the medium will take care of all this, selling charms for general protection against demons and other evil spirits.

After this Shinto consultation, the first year of death is filled with Buddhist rites which must be performed for the dead. In Kuzaki this included the reciting of sutras on both the spring and autumn equinoxes, a practice once common throughout Japan and which Yanagita links to the 'ancient' Shinto calendar. However, it is during the first return of the *nyūgeshi* to the village, during the summer festival of the dead (O-bon) that we find a complete fusion of Shinto and Buddhist practices.

The bulk of the ritual work done during O-bon is carried out by the various village age-grades, of which the most important is that of the village grandmothers. These women, who are called the *nembutsu-bāsan*, because they are responsible for reciting sutras for the dead, are initiated into the group at the age of sixty and must leave it after their seventy-first year. Younger women and men can recite

4. Yanagita (1970: 129) also argues that this practice of having double graves is proof that Shinto notions of death pollution are more important than Buddhist teaching.

5. That is, those dead who are still remembered by the living members of the household; after 33 years, most of these dead are subsumed into the category of undifferentiated ancestors (*senzo*) who were also once called *kami*.

sutras as well, but it is these older women who are charged with the saying of sutras during important festivals and in the Buddhist temple. During O-bon, their work begins on August 7th and lasts until the 24th.⁶ During this time the grandmothers pray in the Buddhist temple each morning at 6 a.m. and again each afternoon at about 3 p.m. on part of the bay overlooking the seashore. In between these sessions they visit village households and recite *nembutsu* before each family's Buddhist altar.

The afternoon sessions on the bay take place in a sacred area created by the building of a temporary gate called a *chaya*, which resembles a Shinto shrine gate or *torii*. The bay faces east, the direction in which the dead are said to be living (although Amida's Paradise is in the west), and the purpose of the sutras recited here is to guide the village dead safely back to Kuzaki. The grandmothers begin their work so early in the month, they told me, because the newly dead have less distance to travel and therefore return home more quickly. They must also be guided carefully, since they have not made the trip before and it would be terrible if they went to the wrong houses.⁷ In order to keep out stray or hungry ghosts (*gyoji* in Kuzaki dialect), poisonous leaves are burned over the fire, which the grandmothers also sprinkle with tea brought from the households of those who are legitimate village dead. This is an interesting combination: the leaves or *shishibi* are definitely connected with Shinto ideas, but tea is often used in Japanese Buddhist worship. It is as if the stray dead are equated with dangerous *kami*, while village dead are already connected to the Buddhist *hotoke*.

However, the newly dead are still in an ambiguous, liminal category. On August 13th, the 'real' start of O-bon according to the village priest, all the village dead are blessed in a ceremony at the temple—all the village dead save the newly dead. The household memorial tablets (*ihai*) which have been brought to the temple for this occasion are returned, except for the new tablets which have been made for the *nyūgeshi*: these remain in place on a makeshift altar covered with offerings of food, sake and water until August 15th. It is on the afternoon of the 15th that these liminal dead are incorporated into the larger category of *hotoke*, which includes the other village dead. This is accomplished by the joint efforts of the grandmothers and the grandfathers of the village and their sutras.

First, at the bay, the grandmothers summon the newly dead into a large umbrella⁸ (*kasabuki*) which has been constructed by the eldest males of the second

6. This seems to be in keeping with an older tradition of celebrating a long O-bon. In most of Japan dates now vary but generally the festival lasts only from August 13th to the 15th.

7. In order to help the *nyūgeshi* to reach the right households, each household with a recently dead member must build a *tōrō*, as it is called in village dialect. This is a structure of rice straw decorated with ribbons and a lantern.

8. Picone (1984: 195) cites the folklorist Origuchi in identifying the umbrella as a 'symbol of the appearance of the *kami*. These umbrella-shaped structures are thus merely variants of the *yorishiro*, the ritual objects of elongated form into which the *kami* are thought to descend during

generation from each household that has had a recent death (such households are called *hatsu-bon*). The youngest man in this group is then charged with carrying the umbrella to the old folks' club, where it is placed while the village grandfathers recite the 'great' *nembutsu*, a sutra to Amida Buddha exhorting the *nyūgeshi* to remember that they are dead and that they should be on the path travelling further into Amida's Paradise. Then the *kasabuki* is carried to the Buddhist temple while all the members of the *hatsu-bon* households follow behind. The *kasabuki* and its followers run round the temple courtyard clockwise three times and then stop before the temple entrance where the Buddhist priest is waiting. He prays for the dead and gives them all new Buddhist names (*kaimyō*). The carrier must now run out of the courtyard with the umbrella, thus taking the dead with him, while the *hatsu-bon* households may finally take the new memorial tablets home. Thus the *nyūgeshi* become Buddhas in Kuzaki.⁹

4. Conclusion

I have described very briefly and sketchily some of the practices relating to the dead in Kuzaki which, as indicated in my description, could be broken down into Shinto or Buddhist.¹⁰ However, no villager ever did this in my presence, for the reason that *nembutsu* practices and all rituals involving the dead are seen as forming a coherent whole and are defined as Buddhist. While the contention that Shinto is for life-cycle rituals and Buddhism for the dead now forms part of what the modern Japanese believe is the 'true' and 'ancient' tradition of their society, this is not always reflected in their actual religious life. For the people of Kuzaki, the fact that there might be a tension between orthodox Buddhist practices (as the village priest sees them) and their own is unarticulated and, more importantly, not perceived. What the villagers do for the dead is 'what we always have done', and that is that. If there is any contradiction in their system of belief it is that they

a rite.' However, umbrellas are also an important symbol in Mahayana Buddhist iconography, representing *bodhisattvas*.

9. The idea that all the dead become Buddhas contradicts, as I have mentioned, the orthodox Buddhist belief that one must be reincarnated many times in order to achieve this. I once asked about this contradiction and was told, 'Yes, we are supposed to believe in rebirth aren't we? Well, maybe next time *you* will be reincarnated as a Japanese and won't need to be born again after that!' Some of the new religions make much of this 'folk' model in which all the dead attain nirvana and contrast it with their teachings that reincarnation is an important part of life and death processes (cf. Hardacre 1984).

10. For a more detailed description of all Kuzaki O-bon practices and an analysis of the role of each village age-grade see Martinez 1988.

have classified Shinto ritual practices as being 'for women' and Buddhist ones as being 'for men'. That this is not how the religious division of labour works itself out in the village—men participate in all important Shinto festivals and the women are mainly responsible for the dead—seems not to matter (although it has implications for the naïve anthropologist who accepts these categories without question, as I did initially). When the world was divided into Shinto versus Buddhism in 1868, the villagers developed an ideology to fit the division. In reality, however, their religious life is full of practices which demonstrate that the two systems are for them still one, despite what they say and despite the historical process of division.

A new, large Shinto shrine was built away from the Buddhist temple in 1936, but the old shrine buildings still stand on the bay across from the temple, and it is not clear who was the priest for these shrines. The current Shinto priest is only the third generation of priests in his family, while his rival's family have been there for thirteen, and for all explanations of Shinto ritual, he referred me to the grandfathers, who were the traditional practitioners of Shinto rites. It is also true that for explanations of village Buddhist practices I was referred to the grandmothers, thus making it clear that the priests who preached religious orthodoxy and separation were not as important as the people whose ritual performances showed every sign of being an amalgamation of various religious systems. Indeed, I have not mentioned here the Taoist elements in village practice (keeping track of auspicious days, directions and bad luck years), nor the Confucian elements which fuel village 'ancestor worship', but these are as important as any of those aspects which might be labelled Shinto or Buddhist.

In the conclusion to his article on Shinto in Japanese history, Kuroda notes that

Throughout East Asia, Mahāyāna Buddhism generally embraced native beliefs in a loose manner, without harsh repression and without absorbing them to the point of obliteration. *The question here is how Japan should be interpreted.* While acknowledging Japan as an example of this East Asian pattern, should one consider the separation of Shinto and Buddhism to be an inevitable development and, in line with Meiji nationalism, perceive Shinto as the basis of Japan's cultural history? Or, should one view *kenmitsu*¹¹ Buddhism's unique system of thought, which evolved historically from diverse elements, including foreign ones, as the distinguishing feature of Japanese culture? (Kuroda 1981: 20, my emphasis)

11. *Kenmitsu*, or exoteric-esoteric, refers to the eight medieval Buddhist sects which acknowledged their interdependence with state authority and dominated the religious sector. According to Kuroda (1981: 11), 'it was not unusual for individuals to study the teachings and rituals of all the sects...[for] the eight held a single doctrinal system in common, that of *mikkyō* or esoteric Buddhism (Skt. Vajrayāna)'. Shinto beliefs and practices were drawn into this system as one exoteric segment of it. The *kenmitsu* system was the orthodox religion of Japan until the beginning of the sixteenth century.

If we keep in mind the fact that the debate about 'true' Buddhism seems to have appeared in other Buddhist societies, then Kuroda's searching for something specifically Japanese is wrongly focused. The evolution of Japanese Buddhism may have been slightly different from Buddhism's evolution in other societies, but the fact that it evolved into a feature of Japanese culture and then became the source for a religious, philosophical, political and now anthropological debate can also be seen as part of the East Asian and possibly even Asian pattern. Moreover, it can be said that whatever may be debated, many local practices continue almost as they always have, with the addition of new 'fundamentalist' sects perhaps, but without the complete abolition of the old beliefs.

REFERENCES

- AICHI DAIGAKU 1965. *Ama no mura - Toba-shi, Kuzaki-chō* (An Ama village, Toba City, Kuzaki Ward) [Special Issue of the Memories (*sic*) of the Community Research Institute of Aichi University], Toyohashi City: Aichi University.
- BEARDSLEY, RICHARD K., JOHN W. HALL, and ROBERT E. WARD 1959. *Village Japan*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- EARHART, H. BYRON 1982. *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity*, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- EMBREE, JOHN R. 1946. *A Japanese Village, Suye Mura*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.
- GRAPARD, ALLAN G. 1984. 'Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shinto and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (*shimbutsu bunri*) and a Case Study: Tōnomine', *History of Religions*, Vol. XXIII, no. 3, pp. 240-65.
- HARDACRE, HELEN 1984. *Lay Buddhism in Contemporary Japan: Reiyūkai Kyōdan*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- ... 1989. *Shintō and the State: 1868-1988*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- HORI, ICHIRO 1968. *Folk Religion in Japan, Continuity and Change* (eds. Joseph M. Kitagawa and Alan L. Miller), Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- IWATA, JUNICHI 1961. *Shima no Ama: fu Shima no gyofu no mukashigatari* (The Ama of Shima, with Reference to the Folktales of Shima Fishermen), Toba City: Shinto Insatsu Kabushiki Kaisha.
- JINGU SHICHO 1986. *O-Ise Mairi* (Worship at Ise), Tokyo: Otsuka Kōgeisha.
- KITAGAWA, JOSEPH M. 1987. *On Understanding Japanese Religion*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- KURATA, MASAKUNI 1974. 'Noshi Awabi no Yurai' (The Origin of Noshi Awabi), in *Ise-Shima* (Nihon no Minwa, Vol. 13), Tokyo: Rengō Insatsu Kabushiki Kaisha.

- KURODA, TOSHIO 1981. 'Shinto in the History of Japanese Religion' (transl. James C. Dobbins and Suzanne Gay), *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol. VII, no. 1, pp. 1-21.
- Kuzaki Kambeshi* n.d. *Kuzaki Kambeshi* (Records of the Sacred Guild of Kuzaki). Unpublished historical records of Kuzaki Ward, Toba City, Mie Prefecture, Japan.
- MARTINEZ, D. P. 1988. *The Ama: Tradition and Change in a Japanese Diving Community*, University of Oxford: D.Phil. thesis.
- OOMS, HERMAN 1976. 'A Structural Analysis of Japanese Ancestral Rites and Beliefs', in William H. Newell (ed.), *Ancestors*, The Hague: Mouton.
- PICONE, MARY J. 1984. *Rites and Symbols of Death in Japan*, University of Oxford: D. Phil. thesis.
- PLATH, DAVID W. 1964. 'Where the Family of God is the Family: The Role of the Dead in Japanese Households', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. LXVI, no. 2, pp. 300-17.
- SAUNDERS, E. DALE 1964. *Buddhism in Japan with an Outline of its Origins in India*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- YANAGITA, KUNIO 1970. *About our Ancestors: The Japanese Family System* (transl. Fanny Hagin Mayer and Ishiwara Yasuyo), Japanese Ministry of Education.