

Sources for the Study of Religion and Society in the Late Edo Period

Helen HARDACRE

This study introduces late Edo-period gazetteers (chishi) as valuable sources on the institutional history of Japanese religions. Using two gazetteers of the Kantō area, it explains how these sources may be used to calculate the number of temples, shrines, and other religious institutions to produce a statistical portrait of religious institutions and their relation to society. Using the gazetteers as a database, we can discover the distribution of Buddhist temples by sect, the head temple of each local temple, as well as information on each sect's administration of shrines. One can learn how many shrines existed, the identity of their principal deities, and how many shrines of each type existed in a given area. Shrines can be sorted according to their administering agency, whether it be a temple, a village, a shrine priest, or a private individual. Shrines listed in the Engishiki of 927 can be identified, as can shrines traditionally titled ichinomiya and ninomiya, and those regarded as tutelary shrines (chinjusha, ubusunagami). Temples and shrines holding shogunal land grants (shuinjō) can be identified. It is possible to compile a list of all area shrine priests and to determine how many of them held Yoshida or Shirakawa licenses. Since the gazetteers are arranged by village and state the population of each, it is possible to determine how many temples and shrines existed on average per village, and also how many households on average supported each temple and shrine. These features make it possible to derive an outline of religious institutions in relation to the population.

Keywords: gazetteers (*chishi*) — local religion — temples and shrines — economy and religion — Edo period

THIS STUDY IS BASED upon the self-evident assumption that to understand the relation between religion and society requires knowledge of

* I would like to thank Hiromi Maeda and Suemoto Yōko for extensive assistance in the compilation of statistical information presented in this essay.

the number and type of religious institutions existing in a particular place and time, and how they were related to each other and to the populace. Fortunately, high-quality sources to support such an investigation in the late Edo period exist for a significant part of the Kantō region. This study introduces nineteenth-century shogunal gazetteers (*chishi* 地誌) as a rich source for the study of religious life in the late Edo period, with the aim of showing how these sources may be used to provide data supporting studies of religion and society. Based on these sources, it presents an account of religious institutions circa 1826–1841 in two regions: Kōza County (Kōza gun 高座郡) in Sagami Province (Sagami no kuni 相模国), and Western Tama (Nishi Tama 西多摩) in Musashi Province (Musashi no kuni 武蔵国).

Religion in Local Gazetteers

In 1810 the shogunate commissioned a broad survey of Musashi Province, which was completed in 1826 as a work of 257 fascicles, *Shinpen Musashi fudoki kō* 新編武蔵風土記稿 (SMFK). A second work, adopting the same format, was commissioned for Sagami Province in 1830 and issued in 1841 as a work of 126 fascicles, *Shinpen Sagami no kuni fudoki kō* 新編相模国風土記稿 (SSKFK). Both were compiled by the Geography Bureau (*Chiri kyoku* 地理局) of the Shōheikō 昌平黌 (official academy of the shogunate) with the oversight of the Hayashi 林 family, Confucian scholars in service to the shogunate, by Mamiya Kotonobu 間宮士信 (1777–1841), and a group of 41 compilers, in the case of SMFK, and 27 in the case of SSKFK (*Kokushi daijiten* 7, pp. 925–26; 13, p. 198).

Another gazetteer commissioned by the bakufu in conjunction with SMFK and SSKFK, called *Gofunai fudoki kō* 御府内風土記稿, was part of the bakufu's plan to compile a comprehensive geographical survey of Edo, along with Musashi and Sagami. Notes for this project, called *Gofunai bikō* 御府内備考, were compiled between 1826 and 1829, as a source book for the compilation of *Gofunai fudoki kō*. However, while the survey of Edo was originally to be included with Musashi, the size of the work became unwieldy, and it was decided to split off the section on Edo to a separate work. Unfortunately, *Gofunai fudoki kō* was destroyed in an 1872 fire in the Edo castle and is no longer extant. However, *Gofunai bikō* is extant and has been published. This work, comprising 292 fascicles, was divided into main and continued parts. The main part, consisting of 145 fascicles, concerns all matters other than temples and shrines and has been published (ASHITA 1958–59). Temples and shrines are treated in the continued section, consisting of 147 fascicles, the original copy of which is held at the Tokyo Komonjokan 東京古文書館 (with another copy at the National Diet Library).



The process of compiling these gazetteers ensured accuracy. Village headmen were issued a list of topics which were to be investigated, recorded, and submitted as an official document called a *chishi kakiage* 地誌書上. Among other things, headmen were to provide detailed accounts of temples and shrines, outlining their founding and later history, recording the extent and tax status of all landholdings, including any untaxed land granted by the shogunate under shogunal “vermillion seal deeds” (*shuinjō* 朱印状), identifying the main object of worship, the dimensions of buildings, the number and character of sub-shrines, chapels, or intendant temples (*bettō* 別当, temples in charge of shrines), and, in the case of temples, the sect and head temple of each. Village submissions were examined by the compilers, who traveled to each locale, frequently requiring further investigations to be undertaken and the account of a village re-submitted several times. A document from a Kamakura temple called Daichō-ji 大長寺 illustrates the process. It shows that fourteen or fifteen surveyors were involved, and that two of them came to the temple to confirm the initial report and to acquire additional data. Surveyors lodged in the village and

called in the village officials, requiring them to submit extra data, drawings, and maps. In some cases village officials were required to make as many as three or four additional submissions of material before the compilers were satisfied. The compilers combined data collected at the local level with records in the shogunate's possession (TAMAMURO 1998a, pp. 4-5; TAMAMURO, 1998b, pp. 1-16).

The gazetteers provide detailed accounts of the number, type, and location of religious institutions in Musashi and Sagami in the mid-nineteenth century, in addition to much information about the character of popular religious life, relations between temples and shrines, and the myths and legends surrounding their founding and later history. The gazetteers provide perhaps the most detailed empirical information available for this period concerning the placement of religious institutions within specific villages over a significant region of the country, the Kantō. In the printed version of these works published as part of *Dainihon chishi taikai* 大日本地誌体系 there are, however, some typographical errors that can result in misreadings of significant material, such as a temple's name. Also, there are contradictions in such items as the sectarian identity of some temples, which must be sorted out by referring to other sources. Unfortunately, these errors have not been corrected in the recent reprinting of *Dainihon chishi taikai* by Yūzankaku, the edition used in the present study. However, the recent publication of indexes for SMFK and SSKFK make the texts much more readily usable. Despite their limitations, these two works are regarded as among the most accurate data extant.

These two gazetteers could be characterized as ethnographic; they provide descriptions of geography: rivers, mountains, and other natural topographical features, roads, accounts of the borders of each settlement, the names of hamlets within villages, and the distance of each village from Nihonbashi in Edo. The location of the official notice board is noted, as is the consistency of the local soil. Whenever historical sources are available on a location, they are quoted or summarized. Many settlements are illustrated, usually with a central depiction of a temple or shrine. SMFK and SSKFK each included several accounts of travel to the area, and poetry inspired by the scenery, compiled as the "arts and letters section" (*geibunbu* 芸文部) of the work (ASHITA and TAMAMURO 1998; ASHITA and NEMOTO 1996). These two official surveys were probably influenced by local gazetteers of the late Edo period compiled by private individuals, which used similar formats to compile expanded accounts of local life and customs. In that sense, the shogunal surveys fit a recognizable niche within local history writing of the period (KONISHI, KODAMA, et al. 1987, vol. 1, pp. 566-82).

The prominence of religious institutions in SMFK and SSKFK is unmistakable. In any village entry, temples and shrines occupy more space than any other type of information. Entries on religious institutions follow a regular order: shrines are listed first, followed by temples, chapels, and hermitages. Each shrine's sub-shrines (*massha* 末社) and chapels (*dō* 堂) are listed beneath the main shrine. In cases where a shrine was actually administered by an intendant temple, it is listed under the temple in charge. Like shrines, temples also regularly had small shrines and chapels within their precincts. Thus, sub-shrines and chapels may be among the minor buildings of either a shrine or a temple. In addition to those chapels existing as an appendage to a temple or shrine, however, there were also free-standing chapels, which are usually listed following the entries concerning a village's temples. Chapels differed from temples in that they had no resident priest or parishioners, but they usually possessed a consecrated object of worship such as a statue. Rites could be conducted there either by Buddhist clergy of a temple administering the chapel, or less formal ritual and devotional practices could be conducted by local people. Chapels could also serve as the meeting places for confraternities (*kō* 講). Smaller still were the *-an* or *iori* 庵 "hermitages," originally the residence of a religious recluse, but by the Edo period more likely a retired temple priest. Hermitages generally are listed near the end of a village's religious institutions, following chapel entries or mixed in with the chapels.¹

The gazetteers emphasize calculation of religious institutions' assets: land, buildings, statues, and other treasures. This suggests that one goal was to assess religious institutions' wealth and, probably, the burden upon the peasantry posed by supporting religious institutions and their priests. Notations on religious institutions lacking significant property could be quite simple, merely listing a shrine's name, or in the case of temples merely the temple's name and sectarian affiliation. But entries on significant institutions include features such as those outlined below.

ALL RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

General features that are recorded for all religious institutions are the size and location of their land holdings; the date of their founding, if known; the physical dimensions of the precincts and built structures; the existence of any shogunal land grant; the identity of the central object

¹ There are many cases, however, in which a hermitage was practically indistinguishable from a chapel, having an enshrined object of worship, and providing sufficient space for group worship, but having no resident priest. In rare cases hermitages could be the site for a village graveyard.

of worship (*shintai* 神体), and sometimes the dimensions of statues.

SHRINES

One of the facts listed for shrines is whether the shrine is mentioned in the *Engishiki* 縁起式 (927). Inclusion of a shrine in this ancient record was a testament to its antiquity and a mark of considerable prestige. Such shrines, called *shikinaisha* 式内社, meaning “shrine mentioned in the *Engishiki*,” almost always had shogunal land grants. The shrine’s founding legend (*engi* 縁起) is recorded in the case of larger and more important shrines. These usually explain how the particular gods enshrined there came to be worshiped by local people. In some cases the name of a shrine priest presently serving at the shrine, his immediate superior, and the location of his residence may be recorded. If the shrine was held by a temple, by the village people, or by an individual, the holder’s name and location are recorded. If the shrine was designated as the tutelary shrine (*mura chinju* 村鎮守) of the village or some district within the village, that fact is noted.² An example of a shrine entry from Western Tama follows:

Kasuga Shrine 春日社 (Hinohara-mura — Kamigumi, Shimogumi 檜原村上組下組 — combined population 64 households) [SMFK vol. 6, pp. 78–79].

The shrine’s precincts occupy 50 *bu* 歩, with untaxed lands of 2 *se* 畝, 6 *bu*, located within this village. The date of the shrine’s establishment is unknown. The deity enshrined is Amenokoyane no Mikoto 天兒屋根命, and the object of worship is a seated wooden statue, 1 *shaku* 尺, 3 *sun* 寸 in height. It is clothed and wears a crown. The shrine is surrounded by a high, double wooden fence, topped with copper. The wooden fence is further surrounded by a woven bamboo fence. The worship hall (*haiden* 拝殿) measures 9 *shaku* 2 *ken* 間 and has stone lanterns and stone lion dogs to the left and right. The *torii* bears an inscription with the name Urabe Nagatsura³ 卜部良連. The shrine is served by *negi* 禰宜 Nakamura Kawachi 中村河内, who resides in a place called Aza Kotozura 字事貫.

On the shrine’s annual festival of the second day of the second month, Kawachi recites the Nakatomi Harae 中臣禊

² The term *chinju* is used without distinction in these records to indicate a protective shrine whose territory is congruent with the boundaries of the village in which it is located, a protective shrine whose territory extends only to one sector of a village, or a protective shrine whose territory exceeds the boundaries of a single village, sometimes encompassing a group of villages or a region. See HŌYA SHI-SHI HENSAN IINKAI 1989, vol. 2, p. 643.

³ In this case, as in most others, there is little guidance for the reading of personal names. “Nagatsura,” the reading suggested here, is a reasonable guess, but impossible to verify.

prayer, and a Buddhist priest from Kichijō-ji 吉祥寺 provides Buddhist music (*hōraku* 法楽). The shrine palanquin is paraded through the village by about sixty of the *ujiko* 氏子. This practice appears to be an ancient one; a record of the annual festival for Genki 元龜 2 [1571] exists, stating the order of events and listing some thirty-six names. In a similar record of the Tenshō 天正 era [1573–1592], the names of Hirayama Ujishige 平山氏重 and Ujihisa 氏久 are found. In following years there were both increases and decreases in the number of *ujiko* names, but now there are about sixty.

At the festival, sake is distributed in sets of two cups each, one being a bowl and the other a cup formed by the bowl's upturned lid. Rice is distributed likewise in five bowls as a set, each containing 7 *gō* 合, 5 *shaku* 勺 of mounded rice. One hundred of these are prepared for consumption at the festival.

Two of the *ujiko* are named the persons in charge of the festival, a duty that rotates for the festival's management. The persons in charge pour sake for the others and distribute medicinal herbs [an herb now called *habucha* 波不茶] wrapped in white paper. They say that this practice has always been maintained without change. It appears to be a vestige of some ancient custom.

A description of a shrine and its festival can reveal a great deal about the character of social life in the community. The Kasuga Shrine was one of ten shrines in this village. That it is listed before the others and described in more detail suggests the compilers' opinion that it is the most important shrine of the ten. Compilers devoted twenty lines of printed text to this shrine, while the others had four to ten. This Kasuga Shrine was unusual in possessing a statue of a kami and in its distinctive festival, notable for preserving ancient traditions. An accompanying illustration shows hamlets with houses at the edge of terraced fields, in steep peaks and valleys, joined by a wooden bridge with stone foundations. Because it is called a Kasuga Shrine, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the shrine originated as a provincial branch of the Kasuga Shrine in Nara, which also enshrines Amenokoyane, the ancestral deity of the Nakatomi house. This shrine had noteworthy properties and a strong local following. Evidently the number of recorded sponsors grew in the late sixteenth century from thirty-six to around sixty families, or roughly equivalent to the entire population of the Kamigumi and Shimogumi districts within Hinohara Village at the time of the survey. In effect, then, supporting this shrine appears to have become a duty of the households living in these two

districts, who probably regarded it as a local protective shrine, though the survey compilers have not described it as *chinju* or *ujigami*.

Not many shrines in Western Tama could boast a copper-topped double wooden fence, a statue, stone lanterns, a palanquin, or lion dogs. Nor would the majority have been so grand as to construct a worship hall, a built structure actually large enough for people to enter into. Most shrines of this area were much smaller and informal, too small for a person to enter. All of the properties of this Kasuga Shrine were probably donated to the shrine by local people, some of whose names are recorded; thus the shrine gate (*torii*) inscribed with the name of Urabe Nagatsura was probably constructed or purchased for the shrine by him. Likewise, scions of the Hirayama family were probably prominent organizers and fundraisers for the shrine's festivals in the late sixteenth century.

We can tell that both Buddhist and Shinto priests were involved in the performance of ritual connected with the annual festival. Evidently the shrine priest lived elsewhere in Hinohara Village, not in the district of this shrine. The Buddhist temple Kichijō-ji, whose priest performed *hōraku* at the annual festival, is the only temple located in the same district as the shrine. It belongs to the Rinzai sect, had a grant for 20 *koku* 石, and is a branch temple of the famous Kamakura Rinzai temple Kenchō-ji 健長寺. Performance of music at the Kasuga Shrine's festival probably brought the temple some income, but the connection was likely equally or more significant for providing a second, satellite venue for the extension of the temple's local influence. Since both priests resided elsewhere, it appears that the shrine did not serve as a priest's residence, further suggesting that local people assumed responsibility for the shrine's on-going care and upkeep.

The use of one hundred bowls of rice and, probably, a corresponding amount of sake gives the impression of a community whose shrine sponsors were capable of organizing the populace to carry out the many observances involved in the annual festival (carrying the palanquin, hosting the priests, preparing the offerings, distributing the food and drink to be consumed, etc.), and capable of compelling residents to contribute material resources necessary to perform the festival annually and maintain the shrine's property.

TEMPLES

Points of information listed in the gazetteers for temples include the following: date of founding; the founder's name and those of significant lay patrons, if known; the sect to which the temple belongs; its head temple; the temple's *sangō* 山号 appellation (a secondary name for the temple, ending with the character for "mountain"); its

main object of worship; any sub-buildings such as chapels, shrines, hermitages, along with details about their founding and objects of worship. If it is known that the temple previously belonged to a different Buddhist sect, the circumstances of the transfer are recorded. If the temple has any documents regarding its history, these are quoted or summarized, as are purely legendary tales. Gazetteers use several terms for temple founders. *Kaisan* 開山 and *kaiki* 開基 designate two roles in the founding of a temple. The *kaisan*, literally “the one who opens the mountain,” is the figure who first establishes a temple by consecrating an object of worship. The *kaiki* may be either a lay person who provides significant material support or a monk who revives the temple after a period of disuse or inactivity. These terms are sometimes used interchangeably, and different Buddhist sects use them in slightly different ways. The term *chūkō* 中興 indicates a person who revives a temple after a period of inactivity and can be used interchangeably with *kaiki*.

Sometimes the entry even for a significant temple could be rather short and simple, as in the case of the Ōba Village 大庭村 temple Sōgen'in 宗賢院 in Kōza County, which held numerous branch temples within the county:

Sōgen'in (Ōba Village, 171 households) [SSKFK vol. 3, p. 266].

Called Banryūzan 蟠龍山, Sōtō sect; head temple: Sōse-ji 總世寺 in Ashigara Shimo County 足柄下郡. Main object of worship: Shaka 釈迦. First established in the Eishō 永正 era [1504–1521] by the monk Kyodō 虛堂 [died 1522, ninth month, ninth day]. In 1649, tenth month, the temple received a shogunal grant for ten *koku*.

Temple treasures: a scroll of the founder Kyodō, created during his life, praised [in the text of an inscribed] decorative banner in the second year of Tenbun 天文 [1533] by Yōkoku 陽谷, abbot of Kenchō-ji; a *chagama* 茶釜 [cauldron for use in tea ceremony], said to have been used by the military forces of Ōba Saburō 大庭三郎.

Kannon-dō [i.e., the temple has a Kannon chapel attached to it.], which has a copper statue.

This short entry, just over four lines long in print, is perhaps more notable for what it omits than for its contents, but it exemplifies the necessity to consult related sources. On the face of it, Sōgen'in is an unremarkable Sōtō temple enshrining a statue of Shaka, as all temples of this sect are expected to do. Its only notable properties are a paint-

ing of its founder and a tea cauldron used by a warrior from the clan for whom the village is named. Its only attached facility is a Kannon chapel. However, when we look at all the temples of the Sōtō sect in this county (a total of 73), we find that eleven of them are branch temples of Sōgen-in. In terms of near competitors of the same sect, it was rivaled only by Hōsen-ji 宝泉寺 (discussed immediately below). This means that Sōgen-in stood at the head of a significant network of temples for this sect in this county. For all that, however, the absence of a meditation hall (*zendō* 禅堂) or training facilities means that it was not a temple which trained novices but was instead an ordinary parish temple. Recent research on the Sōtō sect during the Edo period shows that only a tiny minority of the sect's temples had meditation facilities (WILLIAMS 2000), which puts Sōgen-in with the majority. This temple was one of only seven temples among the 247 temples of the county to have a shogunal grant for 10 *koku* or more. Thus it was a relatively prosperous and influential temple for this locale.

Regrettably, we do not know from SSKFK how many parishioners this or any other temple had. The shogunate did not keep such records, nor did the Sōtō sect maintain such records comprehensively until after the Meiji period, which means that it is necessary to turn to sources outside the surveys for the few pre-Meiji data on this question which survive. Luckily there is a published history of this temple, and from it we learn that records in use from 1736 to 1763 suggest that there were about 232 parishioner households for this temple during the Edo period (YUYAMA 1996, pp. 69, 216).

In some cases temple entries are more concerned with the history of prominent supporters than with the site as a religious institution. This is the case in the entry for Hōsen-ji, another Sōtō temple in Kōza, which was also a training center for monks, a *sōdō* 僧堂.

Hōsen-ji (Endō Village 遠藤村, 160 households) [SSKFK, vol. 6, p. 293].

A branch temple of Sōji-ji 惣持寺 in Nōtō 能登; called Gyokuyūzan 玉雄山, Sōtō sect; main image is Shaka, [a statue] constructed in Tenbun 3 [1534]. The temple has a *shuinjō* for 21 *koku*, granted in Tenshō 19 [1591]. The temple's *kaisan* was Nyogen 如幻 (d. 1530, first month, twentieth day).

The *kaiki* was Senba Tosa no Kami 仙波土佐守, and there is a commemorative stone pillar for him in the precincts. Senba is said to have been a retainer of the Hōjō 北条 family; the day of his death is not known, but a memorial is performed for him on the twenty-fourth day of the month. The posthumous name *Zentoshū sasshi gyokuyū hōsen koji* 前土州刺史玉雄宝泉居士 is

inscribed on his ancestral tablet.... In the genealogy of the Senba family, it states that the family ancestors served the Hōjō for generations, and that Fuse Mikawa no Kami 布施三河守 died at ninety-four We may assume that the ancestor called Tosa no Kami is the same person as this Fuse Mikawa no Kami, and that he took the title Tosa no Kami. Inasmuch as their posthumous names *-hōsen* 宝泉 [or 法泉] have the same sound though written with different characters, they probably are the same person.

In addition, the graves of Toda Kyūbei Katsunori 戸田九兵衛 勝則 and others are located at this temple. The temple possesses a talisman of the Toyotomi 豊臣 clan.

Great Bell (dating from [1753])

Konpira Shrine 金比羅社

Kannon Chapel

Enma Chapel 閻魔堂 [a chapel dedicated to Enma, one of the judges in hell]

Monks' Hall [the living quarters for monks-in-training]

Meditation Hall

Sub-temple (*tatchū* 塔頭): Genkō-in 玄光院, established by Hōsen-ji's eighth abbot Jōgan 場岩 died 1665, ninth month); enshrines a statue of Shaka.

This entry illustrates the interest survey compilers took in local history, and the manner in which they used genealogies in combination with temple materials such as graves, pillar inscriptions, and posthumous names to understand what support a temple had received from local notable families prior to the establishment of the Tokugawa shogunate. In this case compilers were able to compare a posthumous name given by this temple with the genealogy of the Senba family, retainers of the Odawara Hōjō in the sixteenth century, to determine that the person known in the genealogy as Fuse Mikawa no Kami was one and the same as the temple's *kaiki*, the original lay supporter of the temple. In all likelihood it was members of this family who originally underwrote the temple's construction and confirmed the temple in its holding of the land identified in the deed for twenty-one *koku*.

Hōsen-ji is the only temple in this county with facilities for training novices. It is a much more complex institution than Sōgen-in, having an attached shrine and two chapels, a monks' hall, meditation hall, and a sub-temple (in all likelihood the residence of retired priests). Hōsen-ji had eight branch temples in the county.

The description of Hōsen-ji raises questions and assists in the for-

mulation of hypotheses about this temple, but they can only be pursued further by looking for other documents. Combining the data from the surveys with village-level data can produce a dynamic picture of local religious life. The case of Hōsen-ji illustrates some of the research strategies that may be pursued. Modern prefectural and city histories are major resources on all significant temples and shrines. Histories of Kanagawa Prefecture and Fujisawa City regularly mention this temple, but beyond small pamphlets there is no published history of the temple. However, the Fujisawa City Archives possesses a collection of primary documents from the temple that may be consulted, and publications of the city archives, especially the journal *Fujisawa shi-shi kenkyū* 藤沢市史研究 and publications of the city Education Committee (Kyōiku linkai 教育委員会), provide other important resources. It is fortunate for our understanding of religious life here that Keiō University has a campus in Fujisawa City. Its faculty and students have assembled significant historical-ethnographic research on Endō Village, where Hōsen-ji is located. It is not the goal of the present study to research each and every temple and shrine of the area, but the gazetteers provide a map to researchers who wish to pursue them further, and there is now a wealth of available primary documents and secondary studies to support such research.

CHAPELS AND HERMITAGES

The gazetteers record for chapels and hermitages any affiliation with a temple; that temple's location; or, if not administered by a temple, a notation that the chapel or hermitage was held by the village, or, more rarely, the name of a lay individual in charge; and, in some cases, the chapel's physical dimensions and principal object of worship. Most chapel entries lack any further documentation than these bare facts, but in rare cases a chapel could be more complex. The following example is one of those, having both shrines and a temple attached to it.

Shōkoku Kannondō 星谷観音堂 (Zama-iriya juku 座間入谷宿,
175 households) [SSKFK vol. 3, pp. 340-41]

Shōkoku Kannondō: The eighth site on the Bandō 坂東 thirty-three Kannon pilgrimage route; its main object of worship is a seated statue of Shō Kannon 聖観音, by Gyōki 行基, 1 *shaku* 1 *sun* in height, with other statues of Yakushi 薬師, Fudō 不動, and Bishamon 毘沙門天. According to the temple's *engi*, Gyōki established the chapel by installing the statue of Shō Kannon. This area has clear springs in which the stars are reflected, so that even on a dark night there is light. For this reason, the

local people call it Star Valley.⁴

In later years the chapel was revived by the priest Rigen 理現. The former site was located four or five *chō* 町 to the north. When the Odawara Hōjō came to the area, the chapel was used to billet the forces of [Hōjō] Ujiteru, lord of Mutsu [1540–1590]. He ordered that funds for its construction be gathered in Tenshō 8 [1580]; for further details, consult the documents of the intendant temple [quotations from these follow, establishing the chapel's connection with Ujiteru].

[a list of attached properties follows:]

Hakusan Shrine (Hakusansha 白山社);

Sericulture Shrine (*yosan jinja* 養蚕神社);

Talisman Chapel (*satsudō* 札堂), enshrining Shō Kannon and Memyō Bosatsu 馬鳴菩薩 [a sericulture deity].

Bell tower, with an antique bell cast in Karoku 嘉禄3 [1227], first month, twenty-first day [the bell's inscription is recorded, stating that a figure named Shūryō 秀亮 collected the necessary funds, with the patronage of Minamoto Nobutsuna 源朝臣];

Niō Gate (Niōmon 仁王門);

Intendant temple: Shōkoku-ji Myōhōzan Jihō-in 星谷寺 妙法山持寶院, Kogi Shingon sect 古義真言宗; head temple:

Sōji-in 總持院 of Kawaraguchi Village 河原口村. Kaisan: Gyōki;

Chūkō: Rigen. In the reception room are a statue of Kokuzō bodhisattva 虚空藏菩薩 carved by Gyōki (1 *shaku*, 2 *sun*), and a statue of Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師. *Shuinjō* for 2 *koku*, dated Tenshō 19 [1591], eleventh month.

This chapel has evidently prospered through the patronage of pilgrims on the area's circuit of thirty-three temples dedicated to Kannon, and a visit today proves that it is still an active pilgrimage site. If it was established by Gyōki (668–749), its founding would be quite ancient, making it one of the oldest religious institutions of the survey area. However, even if a statue carved by the great saint was consecrated at that time, the chapel seems to have remained unknown beyond the local area. Unfortunately, nothing is known of Rigen, who is said to have revived the chapel, and who also revived the intendant temple, but he must have been a Shingon monk active after Gyōki's time. In any case, the entry suggests that the chapel originated in the ancient period, fell into desuetude for an indeterminate time, and was revived by Rigen, coming under Shingon influence at that time.

⁴ "Star valley" is the literal translation of *shōkoku*, which can also be read as *hoshidani*.

Since the Bandō pilgrimage circuit is thought to have been established during the Kamakura period (1185–1333), it is not unlikely that the Shingon sect moved in to administer the chapel and its pilgrimage traffic, with support from Minamoto Nobutsuna, around the time the bell was cast. The 1580 rebuilding with Hōjō Ujiteru's patronage allowed for a revival, followed by the land grant of 1591 to the intendant temple, which was evidently in full control of the chapel by that time.

Patronage of temples by the Odawara branch of the Hōjō family marked the extension of their influence throughout Sagami. This chapel and the two temples examined above all appear to have received significant support during the sixteenth century, laying the groundwork for their incorporation into the system of religious administration characteristic of the Edo period.

*Religious Institutions in Western Tama and Kōza County
at the End of the Edo Period*

Following a general discussion of the area surveyed by SMFK and SSKFK, this section illustrates the kind of analysis of religious institutions that can be constructed from the data in the gazetteers. This section presents methods for using the gazetteers to relate religious institutions to the population, and to each other, also showing ways to test the accuracy of the gazetteers on particular points. Specifically, this section will examine the situation of temples and shrines in Kōza County and Western Tama, comparing the sectarian distribution of temples and examining the phenomenon of temple administration of shrines. The shrines are examined in terms of the deities installed as their objects of worship, and also in terms of their administration: by temples, villages, and shrine priests. It will become clear that SMFK and SSKFK are most useful in providing a general grasp of questions regarding the relation between religion and society, or the nature of relations between and among religious institutions. On their own, the gazetteers do not provide comprehensive answers to all questions, but they assist in the formation of hypotheses that can be pursued in combination with other kinds of data.

KŌZA COUNTY AND WESTERN TAMA

The area within the Kantō covered by SMFK is Musashi no kuni (Musashi Province), and the area covered by SSKFK is Sagami no kuni (Sagami Province). Musashi included modern Tokyo and Saitama Prefectures, the northeastern part of Kanagawa Prefecture, and the capital city of Edo. Sagami included modern Kanagawa Prefecture, minus

the northern part that had been included in Musashi. Sagami and Musashi shared a border along the northern edge of Kōza County in Sagami.

The two areas addressed by the present study were chosen for several reasons: because of the mix of religious institutions in each; because of the ready availability of a wealth of data on each; because they have a closely equivalent number of villages (but not so many as to be unmanageable); because of their proximity to each other while yet having different economic profiles; and because of the author's prior familiarity with both. The choice of these two areas thus was based to a certain extent on matching or contrasting profiles, and to a certain extent on criteria of expedience. Similar research could discover many other viable comparisons within the territory covered by the gazetteers.

Tama County as catalogued by SMFK contained 457 villages, far too large an area to treat as a single unit. In order to facilitate comparison with Kōza County in Sagami, it was necessary to find a meaningful sub-unit within Tama containing a roughly equal number of villages. The territory called Western Tama in this study covers fascicles 108 to 118 of SMFK, corresponding to the Komiya 小宮 and Mita 三田 estates (*ryō* 領). This portion of SMFK's Tama County consists of 107 villages, later incorporated into these several cities, towns, and villages in contemporary Nishi Tama County: Akigawa-shi, Fussa-shi, Ōme-shi, Hamura-chō, Hinode-chō, Itsukaichi-chō, Mizuho-chō, Okutama-chō, and Hinohara-mura. The Kōza County section of SSKFK was the first completed section of the whole, finished in 1832. Kōza County was an official administrative district of Sagami Province, consisting of 108 villages, and it continues to exist as a county within contemporary Kanagawa Prefecture, with little change to its borders as they were in the Edo period.

Both Sagami and Musashi were divided in the late Edo period into areas under the direct control of the bakufu and others under *hatamoto* 旗本 control. Based on SMFK, Western Tama's population was 7,919 households. Kōza's population based on SSKFK was 11,460 households. Although its area was considerably smaller, Kōza could support more people than Western Tama, because so much of the latter was mountain and forest, whereas Kōza had more arable land (SMFK vol. 4, pp. 286–307; SSKFK vol. 3, pp. 251–64).

WESTERN TAMA

SMFK gives a detailed account of the villages of Western Tama near the Tama River (Tamagawa 玉川) (SMFK vol. 4, pp. 286–307). Originating in the Chichibu Mountains in what is now Yamanashi Prefec-

ture, this large river flows east from its source across Tama and empties into Tokyo Bay. The Tama River Aqueduct (Tamgawa jōsui 玉川上水), one of three waterways supplying Edo built in the seventeenth century, originated at Hamura 羽村 in Western Tama. From ancient times the Tama River was an important source of water, and SMFK devotes considerable space to a description of its width, depth, and turns, identifying bridges, ferries, and places subject to flooding. According to SMFK, the gradual development of techniques for diverting the river made possible the opening of many new fields in the Musashino Plain and thus facilitated the formation of Tama villages after about 1650. The upper and lower reaches of the Tama River and the smaller Aki, Nippara, and Naruki rivers divide Western Tama into several distinct settlement districts to the west of Haijima, where the Aki and Tama rivers converge. These rivers flow between steep mountains of the Chichibu range, which terminates around Hinohara in Western Tama. Paddy land was limited to low-lying areas between the rivers, and these were the places where population centers developed.

When SMFK was compiled, the population averaged 74 households per village. The *muradaka* 村高, or official productive capacity measured in *koku*, of the 107 villages here was 18,443 *koku*. There were only eight villages where there were 200 households or more, and these were the places where significant farming was possible: Ōme, with 420 households was the only place exceeding 400 households; it was followed by Ōkuno 大久野 (390), Hirai 平井 (374), Hamura (292), Kami Naruki 上成木 (238), Fussa (222), Ina 伊那 (200), and Itsukaichi 五日市 (195). Ōme, Itsukaichi, and Kami Naruki were the three most westward population centers, and each of them was connected by roads to Edo.

Because farmland was so limited, the Tama region developed other commodities, such as charcoal, textiles, and lumber, which were sold at markets in Ōme (on days ending in 2 or 7), and in Itsukaichi (on days ending in 5). The bakufu arrogated a large tract of forest land in Tama for its exclusive use, and trout caught in the rivers here were conveyed to the shogun's table. The villages developed a cottage industry of textile weaving that was described with much evident interest in SMFK. Distinctive weaves and patterns developed throughout the region, and the finished cloth was sold in local markets, at the regional center Hachiō-ji, and in Edo. Since the city of Edo was rapidly exploiting its own supply of lumber and charcoal, the forests of Tama were harvested to meet this bottomless demand from the nearby capital. Thus by the early nineteenth century, Tama was not much hindered by its lack of paddy land, but had instead begun to develop a

commoditized economy based on its own markets and those of Hachiō-ji and Edo.

KŌZA COUNTY

SSKFK's account of Kōza County states that the area is bordered by the Sakai River on the east and the Sagami River on the west (SSKFK vol. 3, pp. 251–65). Kōza County was largely agricultural land, with a high plateau running from north to south, and fishing villages along the coast. SSKFK records that during the Shōhō 正保 era (1644–1648) there were 95 villages, increasing during Genroku 元禄 (1688–1704) to 108 villages. Over the same time, the county's *muradaka* increased from 38,150 *koku* to 49,667 *koku*. This amount was roughly 2.7 times the capacity of the villages of Western Tama. The Tōkaidō 東海道 passed through Kōza at its southern edge roughly parallel to the Sagami Bay. The land on both sides of the road was low-lying, with sandy soil. From the sea northward to the border with Musashi, the land rose in elevation. At its northern end, the central plateau was mountainous, but from about half way down, it was opened for cultivation by the construction of new fields in 1675, making possible the increase of villages and production just mentioned.

With an average population of 106 households, the villages of Kōza County were larger than those of Western Tama, and there were ten towns and villages with more than 200 households. Of these the post town of Fujisawa was by far the largest, with 878 households. It was responsible for providing horses, lodging, porters, and miscellaneous services to daimyō using the road for alternate attendance at the shogun's court (*sankin kōtai* 参勤交代). Other village population centers were Tana 棚 (569 households), Chigasaki 茅崎 (486), Kami-mizo 上溝 (408), Ōshima 大島 (300), Kugenuma 鵜沼 and Murota 室田 (258, each), Shimo-mizo 下溝 (234), Shimokusawa 下九沢 (210), and Fukaya 深谷 (200). These population centers clustered at either end of the county, in the southern area along the Tōkaidō between Fujisawa and Chigasaki, or in the north, in the valley between the mountainous extension of the central plateau and the Sagami River. Main north-south roads paralleled the Sagami and Sakai Rivers, while several east-west roads other than the Tōkaidō led to the pilgrimage site Ōyama just west of the county's northern tip and actually visible from villages in the north. Seaside villages around Chigasaki were sources of many kinds of fish, especially sardines and mackerel, and edible seaweed. The county was also regarded as a source of medicinal herbs.

Table 1. Late Edo Period Religious Institutions in Relation to Population, Kōza County and Western Tama.

	Western Tama	Kōza County
Year	1826	1841
No. Villages	107	108
No. Households	7,919	11,460
No. Shrines	390	356
No. Temples	239	272
Average Temples per village	2.2	2.5
Average Shrines per village	3.6	3.3
No. Temples maintained by parish support	220 ^①	230 ^②
No. Shrines maintained by public support	162 ^③	164 ^④
Average no. of supporting households per temple	36 [7,919/220]	50 [11,460/230]
Average no. of supporting households per shrine	49 [7,919/162]	70 [11,460/164]

SOURCES: SMFK and SSKFK

① Western Tama temples maintained by parish support: Total number of temples (239), minus Shugen temples (8), minus Fuke-shū temple (1), minus temples founded after about 1635 (10) = 220.

② Kōza County temples maintained by parish support: Total number of temples (272), minus Shugen temples (35), minus temples founded after about 1635 (7) = 230.

③ Western Tama shrines maintained by public support: *Chinju* shrines (42), plus shrines held by villages (127), minus number of shrines that carry both designations (7) = 162.

④ Kōza County shrines maintained by public support: *Chinju* shrines (84), plus shrines held by villages (97), minus number of shrines that carry both designations (17) = 164.

Religious Institutions in Relation to Population

Because the gazetteers record the number of households per village, these figures provide a basis for examining the relation between popu-

lation and religious institutions. Kōza had 272 temples and 356 shrines, while Western Tama had 239 temples and 390 shrines. (See Table 1.) There were on average 2.5 temples and 3.3 shrines per village in Kōza, while there were 2.2 temples and 3.6 shrines per village in Western Tama. These averages mask extreme cases such as Ōkuno Village in Western Tama, which had 390 households, 23 shrines, 15 temples, 7 chapels, and 4 hermitages. At the other extreme was Mochi Village 望地村, the smallest settlement in Kōza, which had 8 households, 3 shrines, and 1 temple. While several villages lacked a temple, a shrine was apparently a defining characteristic of a recognized settlement, and there were almost no cases of villages without at least one.

*Calculating the Number of Temples and Shrines Maintained
through Public Support*

SMFK and SSKFK are potentially good sources for understanding the relation between religious institutions and the population supporting them at the end of the Edo period. But they are based on village and county units that do not correspond exactly in all cases to the boundaries of temple parishioner groups, nor to shrine support groups. Therefore we cannot derive a precise quantification of the number of supporters per religious institution using the local gazetteers alone. While temple records would be a more accurate source, lists of temple parishioners dating from before the Meiji period are very rare, as are pre-Meiji lists of shrine supporters. In fact, if we want to examine areas as large as a county, we have little choice but to adopt the population figures of the gazetteers. Table 1 shows the results of an attempt to calculate the number of shrines maintained through public support, the number of temples supported by groups of parishioners attached to each temple, and the average number of households supporting each area's temples and shrines.

The requirement to maintain temples and shrines was an official obligation universalized during the Edo period. But not all temples and shrines were maintained through public or parish support. That being the case, how may we estimate the number that were publicly supported? Temples of the Shugen and Fuke 普化 sects did not have parishioners attached to them. This means that their number must be subtracted from the total number of temples. In Kan'ei 寛永10 (1633) the bakufu compiled a list of head- and branch temples called *Shoshū jūin honmatsuchō* 諸宗寺院本末帳. This record then became the bakufu's list of temples officially approved as *dannadera* 旦那寺 and allowed to take on parishioners. In principle, those founded after that time were not permitted to have funeral parishioners. While there are some

examples of temples founded after this time that nevertheless had parishioners, those founded after about 1633 form a special case and are unlikely to have had parishioners. These also must be subtracted from the total. In most areas of the country, the population is believed to have been firmly affiliated to temples as parishioners by the 1660s, possibly somewhat earlier in bakufu lands. Bearing in mind that the survey areas are a mix of bakufu and *hatamoto* lands, and in order to arrive at a conservative estimate, I subtracted the number of temples that could be determined to have been established after about 1633. To summarize, the number of temples estimated to have been maintained through public support in Western Tama and Kōza County was reached by subtracting from the total number of temples in each area the number of Shugen and Fuke temples, and the number of temples established after 1633. On that basis, the number of temples estimated to have been maintained through public support in Western Tama was 220 and in Kōza County 230.

Compilers were concerned to identify all the shrines that were maintained by public support, but they seem to have had little interest in documenting the remainder, in any detail, especially those shrines maintained on an informal basis, such as roadside shrines or those within residential compounds. Only some of the shrines were designated for support by villages, those that were identified as village protective shrines, *chinjusha* 鎮守社 or *ubusunagami* 産土神, and those listed in the gazetteers as “held by the village,” *mura-mochi* 村持.⁵ Thus if one wishes to discover how many shrines were designated for public support, it is necessary to identify the protective shrines and those shrines “held by the village.” The total of these two categories, minus the overlap created in cases where one and the same shrine carries both designations, represents a reasonable estimate of the number of shrines maintained through public support. These calculations produced the estimate that 162 shrines in Western Tama and 164 shrines in Kōza County were publicly supported.

I estimated the average number of households available in each area to support temples and shrines maintained with public support by dividing the population by the numbers arrived at above. I found that on average there were in Western Tama 36 households supporting a temple and 49 per shrine, while in Kōza County there were 50 households per temple and 70 per shrine. These figures are of course rough estimates, subject to correction as more large-scale data on tem-

⁵ I assumed that the terms *mura mochi* and *hyakushō mochi* both mean that a shrine is supported by levies on village populations. There were some cases where the same shrine is listed both as one of these and as a *chinjusha*; I corrected for these overlapping cases.

ple parish membership become available. It is quite likely that these averages were sometimes exceeded, especially in the population centers, as we saw in the example of Sōgen-in. At present, averages are probably most useful as rough guides to the relation of religious institutions to the population of this area at the end of the Edo period.

While no nationwide, comprehensive research yet exists allowing us to state with certainty how many parishioner households each temple actually had through the period, scholars estimate that to ensure the livelihood of a single temple priest would require from 100 to 150 parishioner households. This estimate, pioneered by Tamamuro Fumio, is based on the assumption that in any group of 100 to 150 families there will be at least one death per year, which, together with annual levies, would assure the priest performing the funeral of his living costs for one year. But the temples in the survey area actually could not have had that many parishioners at the end of the period, according to population statistics recorded in the local gazetteers. The average ratios of temples to population in the survey area falls short by one-half to almost two-thirds the number of parishioner households estimated as necessary to support a temple. This leads us to hypothesize that many temples in the survey area, especially those outside the population centers, must have been poor.

TEMPLES

The sectarian distribution of temples seen in Western Tama and Kōza County is part of a larger development within the Kantō area. It is estimated that 90 percent of Kantō temples were rebuilt between 1467 and 1665. During this period of fluidity, many temples were closed or changed their sectarian affiliation, and some were reopened with entirely new organizations in place. But after 1665 or so, even if a subsect affiliation might change, the temples were unable to change sects any longer, nor could new sects be formed. From this time on, the pattern of sectarian distribution remained stable until the end of the Edo period (TAMAMURO 1999, pp. 40–41).

The bakufu marked its respect for individual temples by granting them land in *shuinjō*, with a concentration in bakufu lands where *fudai daimyō* 譜代大名 and *hatamoto* were numerous. In many cases these grants were only confirming a temple in land it already held, as many area temples already had been granted land by the Hōjō during the medieval period. Among other things, the grants entitled religious institutions acting as landlords to collect rent from the peasantry living on their lands, and this ability to rent land formed an important part of the economic resources of temples (and shrines). But while it was important that the new overlord confirm these landholdings, and

while they were meant to be reconfirmed with each change of shogun, the land was not the only point. The land grants established a relationship between the bakufu and religious institutions. In return for their stewardship of land, temples and shrines receiving these grants were expected to pray for the peace of the realm and to respond to any shogunal requests for special rituals (for example, to cure illness, bring rain, or stop a flood). Many temples and shrines receiving such grants from the shogunate rebuilt their main buildings to face Edo as a mark of their fealty.

These grants were not made evenly throughout the country but instead were most numerous in Kantō, Kai, Kinki, Tōkai, and Echigo. From a total of 3,806 grants, some 2,311 (61 percent) were made in the Kantō. Three Kantō temples had more than 10,000 *koku*, and all of these were official prayer temples (*bodaiji* 菩提寺) of the Tokugawa house.⁶ There were 91 temples in the Kantō that had grants for 100 *koku* or more, known as “famous temples” (*meisatsu* 名刹); one of these was located in Kōza, Shōjōkō-ji 清浄光寺, the head temple of Jishū 時宗 (MURATA 1999, p. 283).

Throughout the Kantō, the Shingon sect was overwhelmingly strong, with the sub-sect Shingi Shingon 新義真言 stronger in the north and Kogi Shingon stronger in the south. Except for Edo and Sagami, Shingonshū had more temples in each province than any other sect, though counties could show slight variations, as the analysis below will show. Temples of the Sōtō sect were overall the second most numerous, especially in Sagami, where they had spread originally through *bushi* patronage and also by the popularization of funerals and other commercialized ritual offered to commoners. Rinzaishū did not expand much during the Edo period, but it had great strength in Kamakura, based at Kenchō-ji. Tendaishū 天台宗 was also very strong in the Kantō, based in part on the influence of Tenkai 天海 (1536–1643), advisor to the bakufu on religious affairs.

Jōdoshū 浄土宗 was strongest in Edo, based on the support of the Tokugawa house, with many temples linked to Zōjō-ji 増上寺, where Tokugawa graves were located. The Nichiren sect 日蓮宗 was strongest in Edo and in Awa 安房 (present-day Chiba Prefecture, Nichiren’s birthplace) and in the southern Kantō. Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗 was sparse in the Kantō, though it had a concentration in Edo. It made headway during the Kansei era 寛政 (1789–1800) when a group of peasants from Echigo were moved into Hitachi and Shimotsuke to open new fields; they brought their Jōdo Shinshū temples to the Kantō when they were relocated (MURATA 1999, pp. 274–82).

⁶ They were Zōjō-ji, Kan’ei-ji, and Nikkō Rinnō-ji.

The Shugen sects had made inroads in the Kantō in the late fifteenth century following a proselytizing tour by the Honzan Shugen 本山修験 abbot from Mt. Kinbu 金峰山 in Yoshino 吉野. He established an organization centering in what is now Saitama Prefecture along the Nakasendō 中山道, linking Musashi mountain ascetics to his temple. The Tōzan Shugen sect 当山修験 had a major center in Edo at Shinagawa-dera 品川寺, and both Tōzan and Honzan lines had received *hatto* 法度 from the bakufu recognizing and regulating their operations, as had the other sects discussed above. Like them, the Shugen sects transmitted government communications through official liaison temples (*furegashira* 触頭). Ten Shugen temples in the Kantō received shogunal land grants (MIYAKE 1999, pp. 843–44, 853).

The sectarian distribution of temples could differ significantly even within two adjacent areas in the same region of the country. (See Table 2.) In both Kōza County and Western Tama, however, the Zen sects Rinzai and Sōtō had the largest number of temples, followed by Shingon. In Western Tama, Rinzai Zen had the largest number of temples, followed by Sōtō and Shingi Shingon, with no other sects having more than a handful of temples. In Kōza, Kogi Shingon was the second largest sect after Sōtō, followed by Jōdo and Nichiren, with Rinzai and the two Shugen lines having roughly equal representation. Thus the temples of Western Tama were essentially controlled by Rinzai, Sōtō, and Shingi Shingon, while Kōza showed a broader distribution of a greater variety of sects. In both areas the Tendai sect was weak.

The three strongest sects of each area show differing patterns of connections of head- and branch temples. The Kogi Shingon sect in Kōza had sixty temples, of which forty-two (about 70 percent) were attached to one of four temples as direct branches. Thus Anraku-ji 安楽寺 of Okada Village 岡田村 had fourteen branch temples in Kōza, Enzō-ji 円蔵寺 of Chigasaki Village had eleven, Kan'ō-in 感応院 in Fujisawa had ten, and Sōji-in 総持院 in Kawaraguchi Village had seven.⁷ These four Kogi Shingon temples and their forty-two branches constituted a tight-knit network of sectarian organization in Kōza County that was circumscribed within the county.

This pattern of organization differs significantly from that seen in the Sōtō sect in Kōza. Sōtō had more temples in Kōza than Kogi Shingon (seventh-three versus sixty), but only nineteen of them (26 percent) were controlled from within the county. Two temples, Sōgen-in in Ōba Village and Hōsen-ji in Endō Village, had eleven and eight

⁷ These figures address only the branch temples existing in Kōza; in some cases these head temples had other branch temples outside the county.

Table 2. Temples, Chapels, Hermitages, and Shrines Held by Buddhist Sects in Kōza County and Western Tama in the Late Edo Period (also includes chapels held by villages and shrine priests)

Sect	Kōza County				Western Tama			
	Temples	Chapels	Hermitages	Shrines	Temples	Chapels	Hermitages	Shrines
Tendai	3	2	1	0	3	0	0	1
Kogi Shingon	60	18	2	66	2	0	0	0
Shingi Shingon	4	4	0	12	59	13	0	35
Rinzai	18	5	1	5	84	11	10	15
Sōtō	73	21	1	14	77	13	11	8
Jōdo	40	23	0	2	0	1	0	0
Jōdo Shinshū	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Jishū	4	2	0	3	3	1	0	2
Nichiren	25	17	2	16	0	0	0	0
Honzan Shugen	16	1	0	24	4	2	0	9
Tōzan Shugen	19	0	0	22	4	2	0	2
Fuke	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Held by village	0	0	0	0	0	45	0	0
Affl. unknown	0	0	0	9	2	19	2	0
Shrine Priests	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Total	272	93	7	173	239	110	23	72

branch temples, respectively, within the county. The other fifty-four Sōtō temples were attached to head temples outside the county. This pattern of administration of Kōza temples by head temples outside the area is seen even more clearly in the case of the Jōdo sect. There were no Jōdo temples in Kōza holding more than four branch temples in the county. About half of the forty Jōdo temples in Kōza were directly attached to one of two head temples recognized as national head temples for this sect, Chion-in 知恩院 in Kyoto and Zōjō-ji in Edo. The rest were held by a variety of regional head temples in other places.

What consequences flowed from these different patterns? For a local temple to be directly linked to a nationally famed sectarian headquarters temple like Zōjō-ji or Chion-in was no small thing. Such a

connection was highly prestigious, and for parishioners of the local temple no doubt was a source of pride. Local temples could undoubtedly exert considerable pressure on provincial adherents to contribute to projects initiated by the head temple, whether in support of repairs after fires or large-scale ritual to commemorate a notable anniversary of a founder's birth or death. The degree to which local people could actually use such a tie to advance their own ambitions or to promote a local project probably depended on personal wealth and social skills in cultivating connections in Edo. This pattern of organization, in which branch temples in the provinces are directly linked to sectarian head temples outside the area, channels aspirations and resources outside, towards the urban center.

By contrast, the pattern of tight-knit organization at the local level in Kogi Shingon was conducive to the creation of horizontal ties among temple priests and their parishioners in different villages. When temples of a sect were linked by being branches of a shared head temple, they could cooperate to raise funds. Such funds might originally be raised in support of a specific project like repairs to the head temple. In other cases lay people and clerics used horizontal ties to support devotional projects originating from the initiative of lay people. Tight-knit local organization was the basis for a proliferation of lay devotional practices associated with Shingon. These included pilgrimage to Mt. Kōya 高野山 and also the construction of miniature Shikoku pilgrimage routes, involving eighty-eight temples, chapels, and shrines, constructed both in Kōza and in Western Tama in the early nineteenth century.

Buddhism's Control of Shrines

Shrines were pervasively influenced by Buddhism and maintained a variety of connections with temples. The nature of ritual performed by shrine priests as recorded in the gazetteers was apparently combi-native, not excluding Buddhist elements but incorporating them through connections with temples, as the following examples illustrate. The Kōza County Suzuka Myōjin Shrine 鈴鹿明神社 was served by a Buddhist priest from the Shōkoku Kannon temple for the performance of Buddhist ritual and music, as well as being served by a shrine priest. Two of the shrines served by Western Tama shrine priests had a *bettō* temple. The Iwabashiri Shrine 岩走神社 in Western Tama had a shrine priest, but in addition it was served by eight Buddhist priests from its intendant temple Daihigan-ji 大悲願寺, who chanted the *Heart Sutra* at the shrine's festivals. Among the shrine's treasures were 300 copies of this scripture (ITSUKAICHI CHŌSHI HENSAN IINKAI 1976, pp.

1026–27). Western Tama shrine priests served shrines honoring the Buddhist deity Fudō, and at chapels for Gozu Tennō 牛頭天王, Yakushi, Enma, and Jizō. It might be supposed that the presence of a shrine priest would result in the “Shintoization” of shrines, or that shrine priests would not likely be found in service at *gongen* 権現 shrines, where deities combining aspects of both Buddhism and Shinto were the main objects of worship, but on the contrary, eight shrine priests were in service at *gongen* shrines.

One important indication of a Buddhist sect’s ability to set its stamp on the character of religion in an area is its administration of shrines. Differing patterns of head- and branch temple organization appear to affect this ability. As Tables 2 and 3 show, in Kōza 173 shrines, or about half of all the shrines, were actually operated by a Buddhist temple. (Please note that the number of shrines listed in Table 2 represents only those shrines controlled by temples, not the total of all shrines.) If we compare the shrine holdings of Kogi Shingon, Sōtō, and Jōdo in Kōza, we can see a striking contrast: whereas Kogi Shingon controlled sixty-six shrines, Sōtō and Jōdo had only sixteen between them. This means that Kogi Shingon had a further sixty-six places in which to conduct rituals and from which to collect funds, while Sōtō and Jōdo together had only about one-fourth that many.

Shrines under a temple’s administration must be considered outposts or satellites of the Buddhist sect in control, at least in institutional terms, because it was Buddhist priests who officiated at public rituals. These shrines were not served by a shrine priest nor administered by villages. Through temple control over the conducting of rituals, shrines became sites (additional to the temples) for the promotion of the sect’s beliefs and practices, while also promoting the sect’s strength as an economic organization. Data from SSKFK and SMFK regarding temple administration of shrines reflect the economic strength and local influence of the sects most frequently in charge of shrines: the Shingon and Shugen sects.

The extension of Kogi Shingon influence over shrines also reflects the presence of this sect in Kōza before the Sōtō and Jōdo sects made significant inroads there. While information allowing us to specify their dates of founding is incomplete, the more powerful Kogi Shingon temples in Kōza appear to have been established by the mid-fifteenth century. The main Sōtō temples there were founded in the sixteenth century. Being represented in Kōza earlier than other sects, Kogi Shingon enjoyed at least half a century without serious competition in which to construct its temples, assemble parishioners, and extend its influence over shrines.

In Western Tama we see a mixture of patterns of sectarian organiza-

tion in the area's three strongest sects: Rinzai (84 temples), Sōtō (77), and Shingi Shingon (59). Forty-nine of the area's Sōtō temples (74 percent) were attached to one of two powerful temples there, Tenneiji 天寧寺 and Kaizen-ji 海禪寺, with two other head temples and their holdings bringing a total of sixty-six temples, or 87 percent of this sect's holdings, into a tight network. Sōtō temples in Western Tama thus were virtually all controlled within the area. Rinzai and Shingi Shingon temples of Western Tama likewise were almost entirely circumscribed by a network of control within the area, but in addition, the head temples of these networks were directly linked to powerful regional temples of the sect, such as Kenchō-ji in the case of Rinzai, or Ninna-ji 仁和寺 in the case of Shingi Shingon. With respect to differing degrees of control over local shrines, the two Zen sects together controlled about two-thirds the number controlled by Shingi Shingon, mirroring the pattern seen in Kōza, but with the other subset of Shingon in control.

Other sects showed a variety of distinctive patterns. The two Shingon sects, Kogi Shingon and Shingi Shingon, were only rarely both represented in the same village, and if one was prominent in an area, the other had few holdings there. In Kōza, Kogi Shingon predominated with sixty temples, and Shingi Shingon was an insignificant presence (four temples), while in Western Tama Shingi Shingon predominated with fifty-nine temples, and Kogi Shingon had only two. While Nichiren sect temples are entirely absent in Western Tama, there were twenty-five in Kōza. The large number of chapels held by this sect (sixteen) was associated with a tradition of devotional practices for lay people and with worship of the sect's protective deities, such as Kishimojin 鬼子母神, Sanjūbanjin 三十番神, and others. Jōdo Shinshū was absent in Western Tama and only a minor presence in Kōza. Neither area had temples of the Ōbaku Zen sect 黄檗宗, though these were found elsewhere in Tama, and Reihō-ji 鈴法寺, head temple of the Fuke sect, was located in Western Tama.

SHRINES

There were 356 shrines in Kōza County and 390 in Western Tama at the time of the compilation of the gazetteers (see Table 3). Thus the gazetteers record the existence of 746 shrines for these two areas combined.

SMFK and SSKFK show concretely how temples controlled shrines' economic assets. Seven shrines in Kōza and five in Western Tama were listed in the *Engishiki* of 927 and hence were already in existence by the early tenth century. Seven shrines in Kōza and nine in Western Tama had received shogunal grants. All seven Kōza County shrines

Table 3. Shrines in Kōza County and Western Tama

	Kōza	Western Tama
Total number of shrines	356	390
<i>Shinkinaisha</i>	7	5
Shrines having <i>shuinjō</i>	7	9
Shrine Administration		
Administered by temple	173 (48%)	72 (18%)
Administered by villages*	164 (46%)	162 (42%)
Village protective shrine (<i>mura chinju</i>)	84	42
Shrines controlled by villages (<i>mura mochi</i>)	97	127
Shrines administered by Shinto priests	2	75 (19%)
Shrines owned by individuals other than shrine priests	0	13
Principal Shrine Deities		
<i>Harvest, good fortune</i>		
Inari	75	39
Shinmei	26	31
Dairokuten	18	9
Hachiman	25	22
<i>Mountain deities</i>		
Sannō/Yamagami	63	56
Sengen (Mt. Fuji)	8	7
Kumano	9	34
Atago	2	20
Hakusan	6	2
<i>Transregional deities</i>		
Kasuga	1	11
Suwa	23	5
Konpira	3	4
<i>Miscellaneous deities</i>		
Benten/Benzaiten	13	3
Tenman-Tenjū	31	10
Gozu Tennō	7	6

* Some shrines were designated as both *mura chinju* and *mura mochi*; there were 17 such shrines in Kōza and 7 in Western Tama. To eliminate overlap, these numbers are subtracted in the total identified as “Administered by villages.”

that had shogunal land grants were under a temple's control. This means that while temples controlled slightly less than half of the shrines in Kōza overall, they controlled all of the shrines with land grants. Likewise in Western Tama, where temples controlled only 18 percent of all shrines, they were in control of seven out of nine (78 percent) shrines with land grants.

The most complex and significant shrines of these areas were the Samukawa Shrine 寒川神社 in Kōza County, which had a grant of 100 *koku*, and the Mitake Shrine 御嶽社 in Western Tama, which encompassed an entire mountain and had extensive pilgrimage associations in Edo as well as in Western Tama. In Kōza 164 shrines were either held by a village and/or were officially established as a village's protective shrine, both designations meaning that the village was responsible for maintaining them; in Western Tama a total of 162 shrines came under a village's authority. But also very common were smaller shrines that might consist of a single building, sometimes too small to hold more than a talisman or wand of paper streamers as a symbol of its deity. In many cases the deity's identity and the date of the shrine's founding had been forgotten by the nineteenth century. We may suppose that the many shrines listed in the gazetteers only by name and with no further description were of this type. Shrines like this, which had no group or institution officially "in charge," can be assumed to have been small, lacking significant land or other assets; they were probably loosely maintained by local people, on the basis of religious belief rather than specific obligation.

As Table 3 shows, the shrines of both areas showed great diversity in the deities enshrined for worship, in proportions reflecting their separate economic bases: agriculture in Kōza and mountain products in Western Tama. (This Table lists only the principal types of deities enshrined for worship.) Inari shrines were the most frequently found type in Kōza, while Sannō (山王 mountain king) or Yamagami (山神 mountain god) shrines were the most numerous in Western Tama and second most numerous in Kōza. Inari 稲荷 is the god of rice, but in addition it was worshiped to secure good fortune and success in business. Sannō or Yamagami shrines address the gods and spirits ruling over mountains. The Shinmei (神明 bright deity) and Dairokuten 第六天 shrines were associated with the Ise Shrines, and were, like them, revered to secure a wide variety of benefits, including a bountiful harvest. Hachiman 八幡 was widely worshiped in both areas, as were a variety of mountain deities, especially prevalent in Tama, with shrines to the Kumano 熊野 and Atago 愛宕 deities quite numerous.

Branches had been established in both areas for a number of trans-regional shrines and their deities, such as Kasuga, Suwa 諏訪, and Kon-

pira 金比羅. These shrines presumably originated when the original shrine acquired lands in the new area, or when worshippers of the original shrine set up a provincial worship site. A variety of deities originating in Buddhism were worshiped at shrines, such as Benzaiten 弁財天, Gozu Tennō, Fudō, and many different kinds of “avatars” (*gongen*): twenty-one such shrines in Kōza and thirty-three in Western Tama, mostly associated with sacred mountains. The smallpox deity (*hōsōgami* 疱瘡神) was widely worshiped in Western Tama. Many shrines were devoted to purely local or autochthonous deities not worshiped elsewhere. In Kōza we find several shrines called Saba Myōjin 鯖明神, or “Mackerel God,” and in both areas we find the spirits of a great many small local mountains enshrined as the “Avatar” of the mountain, or a protective deity of a settlement given the title “Bright Deity” (*myōjin* 明神) of such and such a place.

SHRINE PRIESTS

Because there was no overall organizing mechanism to bring the shrines into a unified system, they operated in terms of local custom and tradition, not necessarily staffed by shrine priests. During the Edo period, all temples were at least nominally staffed by a Buddhist priest, and if a temple was too poor to support a full time resident priest, another nearby priest of the same sect would generally be seconded to manage the temple’s affairs and perform funerals. But shrines had no parallel organizational structure; there were no “sects” at this time, no “ordination,” nor was there any overall authorizing institution in control of any significant portion of the total number of shrines.

Only the Yoshida and Shirakawa houses stood in a position to confer ranks and titles on shrine priests, but their influence was not extensive in the survey area, as may be judged by the number of priests holding Yoshida licenses. Only one priest in Kōza (of a total of two named shrine priests) and seven in Western Tama (of a total of 43 named shrine priests) held Yoshida licenses. The chief priest of the Mitake Shrine held a license from the Takatsuji house 高辻家. At the time of SMFK’s and SSKFK’s compilation, there were no shrine priests affiliated with the Shirakawa house. As we have seen above, in Kōza about half of all shrines were administered by a Buddhist temple, while in Western Tama 21 percent were administered by temples, and as Table 3 shows, in both areas a sizeable proportion of shrines were administered by villages: 46 percent in Western Tama and 42 percent in Kōza. Only two shrines in Kōza were administered by a shrine priest, serving one shrine each. In Western Tama the 43 named priests served a total of 75 shrines (19 percent of all shrines). In other

words, some Western Tama shrine priests served more than one shrine, and the majority of shrines were not served by a shrine priest. In Western Tama some 13 shrines (3 percent) were held by individuals other than shrine priests.

SMFK and SSKFK introduce miscellaneous facts about shrine administration which complement these statistics. Thirty-three lineages of low-ranking priests called *negi* 禰宜 in SMFK (but *oshi* or *onshi* 御師 in other documents) are identified, (but not listed by name) as living around Mt. Mitake 御嶽山, where they acted as innkeepers and guides to pilgrims while performing certain shrine rites under the direction of the shrine's main priest, the *kannushi* 神主. The Samukawa Shrine in Kōza had a head priest, *kannushi* Kaneko Iyo 金子伊予 who held a Yoshida license, and there were also twenty-four hereditary lines of assistant shrine priests there (not listed by name), called *shake* 社家. The Suzuka Myōjin Shrine in Zama-juku (Kōza) also had a priest, *negi* Furuki Miyauchi 古木宮内 who apparently did not hold a license. Furuki acted under the supervision of the priest of the Samukawa Shrine and was answerable to the Suzuka Myōjin Shrine's intendant temple. The other shrines of Kōza were held by temples, villages, or they functioned without official oversight. Of the forty-three priests in Western Tama, forty were *kannushi*, two were *shikan* 祠官, one was a *negi*. Thus the shrine priesthood was considerably larger, stronger, and better organized in Western Tama, with a somewhat greater number of shrines and fewer under the control of a Buddhist temple.

Summary and Hypotheses

Using the data available in the gazetteers, this study has established that there were distinctive differences between Western Tama's and Kōza County's distribution of Buddhist sects. Kōza had a greater number of sects represented, with a significant presence of the Shugen sects, while some sects such as Nichiren and Jōdo Shinshū were not found at all in Western Tama. We observed differing patterns of relations between head- and branch temples in Kōza, with Shingon exhibiting a tight-knit pattern of local organization. Overall, Shingon and Zen were the strongest in both areas, as measured by the total number of temples held. Furthermore, Shingon turns out to have been even stronger than an evaluation based only on the number of temples would suggest, if we take account of the number of shrines it administered in both areas, which is far greater than its nearest competitors.

One hypothesis suggested by these figures is this: the strength of a Buddhist sect, and the character of its embeddedness in a particular

area should be assessed not only by number of temples held, but should also take its administration of shrines into account. The number of temples alone may not give a full evaluation of a sect's ability to influence the character of popular religious life.

Whereas temples were universally administered by sectarian organizations, in compliance with shogunal law, the shrines showed a great variety of complex patterns. Shrines might be administered by temples, villages, private individuals, or shrine priests. The variety of Buddhist, Shinto, Shugendō, and folk deities worshiped in the shrines, along with the institutional intertwining of the shrines with the temples makes clear the thoroughly combinative character of popular religious life. The two survey areas showed marked differences with respect to the number of shrine priests, with Kōza having almost none, and a correspondingly larger proportion of shrines under the control of a temple. Western Tama showed a larger number of shrine priests and fewer shrines under temple control. Overall, the tiny number of shrine priests taken together with the domination of so many shrines by temples suggests that the shrine priests' social position was tenuous, reflecting the underdeveloped character of Shinto, lacking organizational coherence and autonomy.

We saw that the number of households available to support a temple was on average considerably smaller in both areas than would be required to support a priest. We must bear in mind when assessing the ability of the population to support religious institutions that the shogunal guidelines for the support of religious institutions assumed an economy based on rice production. But by the time of the compilation of the gazetteers, a cash-based system was inexorably replacing the earlier system. Religious institutions lacking the resources to establish themselves on a new footing, with reliable cash revenues, were unlikely to fare well under these changed conditions. This being the case, it is reasonable to form these hypotheses: (1) temples needed to create other forms of cash-based revenue, such as money-lending, to supplement parishioner fees and funeral income; (2) temples unable to make the economic transition would likely be impoverished by the end of the period; (3) in this situation, income deriving from shrines could be a coveted source of revenue. A comprehensive study of religion and society in the Kantō area would require investigation of these and other questions which the gazetteers alone cannot answer. It should be abundantly clear, however, that the gazetteers provide rich, valuable data allowing us to form the hypotheses which can subsequently be tested through the use of other sources.

REFERENCES

- ASHITA Ijin 蘆田伊人
1958–59 *Gofunai bikō* 御府内備考. 6 vols. Tokyo: Yūzankaku. (Reprint 2000)
- ASHITA Ijin and NEMOTO Seiji 根本誠二, eds.
1996 *Shinpen Musashi fudokikō* 新編武蔵風土記稿. 13 vols. *Dainihon chishi taikai* 大日本地誌大系. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
- ASHITA Ijin and TAMAMURO Fumio 圭室文雄, eds.
1998 *Shinpen Sagami no kuni fudokikō* 新編相模国風土記稿. 7 vols. *Dainihon chishi taikai* 大日本地誌大系. Tokyo: Yūzankaku .
- HŌYA SHI-SHI HENSAN IINKAI 保谷市史編纂委員会
1989 *Hōya shi-shi* 保谷市史. 8 vols. Tokyo: Gyōsei.
- ITSUKAICHI CHŌSHI HENSAN IINKAI 五日市町史編纂委員会
1976 *Itsukaichi chōshi* 五日市町史. Itsukaichi: Itsukaichichō.
- KONISHI Shirō 小西四郎, KODAMA Kōta 児玉幸多, et al., eds.
1987 *Nihonshi sōran konpakutoban* 日本史総覧コンパクト版. 2 vols. Tokyo: Shinjin Ōraisha.
- MIYAKE Hitoshi 宮家 準
1999 *Shugendō soshiki no kenkyū* 修験道組織の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- MURATA Yasuo 村田安穂
1999 *Shinbutsu bunri no chihōteki tenkai* 神仏分離の地方的展開. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- TAMAMURO Fumio 圭室文雄, ed.
1998a *Shinpen Sagami no kuni fudokikō, Sakuin-hen* 新編相模国風土記稿索引編. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
1998b *Shinpen Sagami no kuni fudokikō sakuin-hen dai-niban kankō jo* 新編相模国風土気稿索引編第二蕃刊行序. In *Shinpen Sagami no kuni fudokikō, Sakuin-hen*. Tokyo: Yūzankaku.
1999 *Edo jidai no Sōtōshū no tenkai* 江戸時代の曹洞宗の展開. *Sōtōshū bukkuretto shūkyō to sabetsu* 11. Tokyo. Sōtōshū shūmūchō.
- TOKI Masanori 土岐昌訓
1963 *Kinsei no shinshoku soshiki: Musashi no jirei* 近世の神職組織——武蔵の事例 *Kokugakuin daigaku Nihon bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 12: 191–254.
- TSUKAMOTO Zenryū 塚本善隆, ed.
1961 *Nihon Bukkyō no chiiki hatten* 日本仏教の地域発展. *Bukkyō shigaku tokushū*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- TSURUOKA Shizuo 鶴岡静夫
1988 *Kantō kodai jūin no kenkyū* 関東古代寺院の研究. Revised edition. Tokyo: Kōbundō.

UDAKA Yoshiaki 宇高良哲

1987 *Edo bakufu no Bukkyō kyōdan tōsei* 江戸幕府の仏教教団統制. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunka Shuppan.

1979 *Edo Jōdoshū jīn-shi shiryō shūsei* 江戸浄土宗寺院史資料集成. Tokyo: Sanyōsha.

WILLIAMS, Duncan

2000 *Representations of Zen, A Social and Institutional History of Sōtō Zen Buddhism in Edo Japan*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University.

YUYAMA Manabu 湯山学

1996 *Banryuzan Sōgen-in shi* 蟠龍山宗賢院史. Fujisawa: Sōgen-in.