

The Dharma for Sovereigns and Warriors

Onjō-ji's Claim for Legitimacy in *Tengu zōshi*

Haruko WAKABAYASHI

One of the recurring themes depicted in the Tengu zōshi, a set of seven scrolls dated 1296, is the conflict among established temples of Nara and Kyoto. The present article focuses particularly on the dispute between Enryaku-ji (sanmon) and Onjō-ji (jimon) that took place during the thirteenth century as it is depicted in Tengu zōshi. The analysis of the texts, both visual and verbal, reveals that the scrolls are more sympathetic to Onjō-ji than Enryaku-ji. This is evident especially when the verbal texts of the Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji scrolls are compared. Closer examination of the scrolls also shows that Onjō-ji claims superiority over all other established temples. This study shows how the scrolls reveal the discourse formed by the temples during disputes in the late Kamakura period in order to win support from political authorities. Tengu zōshi, therefore, in addition to being a fine example of medieval art, is also an invaluable source for historical studies of late Kamakura Buddhism.

Keywords: *Tengu zōshi* — *Onjō-ji* — *Enryaku-ji* — *ōbō buppō sōi* — narrative scroll (*emaki*) — ordination platform (*kaidan*)

TENGU ZŌSHI 天狗草紙 is a set of narrative scrolls (*emaki* 絵巻) dated to 1296.¹ The set consists of seven scrolls: the Kōfuku-ji 興福寺, Tōdai-ji

* This article is based on a chapter of my doctoral dissertation, and was revised and presented most recently at the Setsuwa Bungakukai in Nagoya, December 2001. I wish to thank Kuroda Hideo, Abe Yasurō, Harada Masatoshi, and my colleagues Saitō Ken'ichi, Fujiwara Shigeo, and Kuroda Satoshi for reading and commenting on my drafts.

¹ The reproductions of *Tengu zōshi* that I mainly use are in the SNEZ 27 and ZNET 19. The text is reproduced in its entirety in the SNEZ (ZNET does not include the texts for the Kofuku-ji and Tōdai-ji scrolls). On the other hand, the illustration of all scrolls except the Kofuku-ji and Tōdai-ji scrolls are reproduced in full color in the ZNET. I have therefore used the SNEZ mainly for the analysis of the text, and the ZNET to examine the illustrations.

東大寺, Enryaku-ji 延暦寺, Onjō-ji 園城寺, Tō-ji 東寺 (which includes depictions of Daigo-ji 醍醐寺 and Kōyasan 高野山), and the two so-called Mii-dera 三井寺 scrolls (hereafter referred to as the Mii-dera A and B scrolls). The first five scrolls, as the titles obviously suggest, illustrate prominent Buddhist temples of Nara and Kyoto, and depict their monks as *tengu*.² The first of the two Mii-dera scrolls begins with three *setsuwa*-type stories followed by a scene depicting Ippen 一遍 (1239–1289), the founder of the new Ji school of Pure Land Buddhism, and the *hōkasō* 放下僧 Jinen Koji 自然居士 (dates unknown), as *tengu*.³ The second Mii-dera scroll begins with a scene in which *tengu* from all sects gather and resolve to build a temple, engage themselves in practice, and make an effort to attain buddhahood. The scroll concludes by stating that the *tengu* have all achieved salvation.

A number of historians and scholars of literature have used *Tengu zōshi* as a source that offers diverse insights into Buddhism and society during the late Kamakura period. For example, KURODA Hideo (1986), IMAI Masaharu (1985, pp. 273–79), KANAI Kiyomitsu (1991), and other scholars interested in Ippen and the so-called “new” Kamakura Buddhism have referred to the scenes of Ippen in the Mii-dera A scroll. The depiction of the *hōka* Zen monk, Jinen Koji, has aroused the interests of historians of Zen, such as Harada Masatoshi, as well as those of performing arts, like Tokue Gensei, especially in reference to the Noh play, “Jinen Koji” (HARADA 1990; KANAI 1969; TOKUE 1968 and 1971). Furthermore, a brief reference to *eta* 穢多 in the Mii-dera A scroll has been noted by Amino Yoshihiko as the earliest source that uses the term *eta* for the *hinin* 非人 or the outcastes, and the scene of the *eta* child catching a kite by the river has been widely reproduced in works on the history of *eta/hinin* (AMINO and ISHII 1988, pp. 22–23). The scenes that depict various temple activities such as the Sakura-e 桜会 at Daigo-ji, *ennen-mai* 延年舞 at Kōfuku-ji, and the *den-gaku* 田楽 at Onjō-ji have also been studied by scholars of social and

² One of the notions of *tengu* that developed by this time is that monks who could not get rid of their arrogance or attachment would fall into the realm of *tengu* and become *tengu* themselves. See, for example, the *Hirasan kojin reitaku* and the *Shasekishū*. For discussion of how different images of *tengu* were used by the author of *Tengu zōshi* to criticize the condition of the Buddhist society at the time, see WAKABAYASHI 1995a and 1995b.

³ *Hōkasō* were monks or lay entertainers who danced and sang songs, many of which were related to Zen teachings. Ippen and the *hōka* monks in this scene are portrayed as *tengu* that defy Buddhism by teaching the wrong views and misleading the people. In a number of *ōjōden* (collections of stories about those who attained rebirth into the Pure Land) from the Heian and Kamakura periods (see *Ojōden/Hokke genki*) and in the *Konjaku monogatarishū*, for example, *tengu* appear as demonic creatures that practice heretical teachings or challenge and disturb the Buddhist monks. They often possess the monks or create delusion and temptations.

cultural history of medieval Buddhism (TSUCHIYA 2001; FUKUHARA 1995, pp. 156–57). In more recent years, *Tengu zōshi* has also drawn the attention of scholars who are interested in the history of established Buddhist institutions (*kenmitsu jiin* 顕密寺院) (HARADA 1998, pp. 105–50).

In this article, I wish to focus on one of the established temples depicted in *Tengu zōshi*—Onjō-ji. Onjō-ji, located to the southeast of Mt. Hiei 比叡山, is the headquarters of the *jimon* 寺門 school of Tendai; and although not as powerful as Enryaku-ji, it has survived until today as one of the main centers of Tendai Buddhism. There are several reasons for my choosing this particular temple. First, I wish to examine how the dispute between Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji is portrayed. One of the recurring themes depicted in the first five scrolls of *Tengu zōshi* is the critique against occasional confrontations the temples had with other temples and the authorities, which oftentimes resulted in violence. This theme is represented in the scenes of *daishu sengi* 大衆僉議, or the “mass assembly.” These assemblies were held by the monks in order to decide matters that were considered important to the temple, such as disputes with other temples and sects, as well as discontent toward court decisions. The monks in the assembly scenes in the Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji scrolls of *Tengu zōshi* clearly express contempt toward each other, a clear reference to the rivalry between Enryaku-ji (*sanmon* 山門) and Onjō-ji (*jimon*).

Second, the narrative text of the Onjō-ji scroll is among the most detailed and elaborate of all extant texts of *Tengu zōshi*. The text strongly advocates the supremacy and legitimacy of Onjō-ji, and some interesting comparisons can be made with other contemporary written documents. Examining these sources will give us insight into discourses used by the established Buddhist institutions to justify their positions at times of dispute with other temples. More specifically, it reveals a new development in such theories as the *ōbō buppō sōiron* 王法仏法相依論 (the concept of mutual dependence of the Law of the Sovereign and the Law of Buddha), which became a dominant ideology that supported the Buddhist institutions in the medieval period.

Finally, the study of Onjō-ji and its claim to legitimacy as presented in *Tengu zōshi* leads to the larger issue of its authorship. The two art historians UMEZU Jirō (1972 and 1978) and UENO Kenji (1984) have suggested that the author may be closely related to Enryaku-ji. The historian HARADA Masatoshi, through his study of Zen and the reformist groups affiliated with Zen, has recently reached a hypothesis that the author may be a group of people under the influence of someone like Keisei, an early thirteenth century monk who had studied at Onjō-ji (HARADA 1998, pp. 105–50). A careful textual study of the scrolls and

related documents have led me to the same conclusion as Harada—that Umezū and Ueno’s theory is refutable, and that the author may be someone more closely affiliated with Onjō-ji.

Onjō-ji vs. Enryaku-ji: The Dispute over the Building of an Ordination Platform in Onjō-ji

First, let us look at the assembly (*daishū sengi*) scenes in the Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji scrolls. Similar scenes are found in other contemporary works, such as the *Hōnen shōnin eden* 法然上人絵伝 (ZNET 2: 114–15, 121–22). These assemblies were held as a commonplace procedure to discuss and decide matters that were important to the temple. Such matters included conflicts with other temples and sects, or discontent toward certain decisions made by the imperial court (KURODA 1980; MATSUO 1988, pp. 1–32; ADOLPHSON 2000, pp. 240–87). The manner in which the assembly was carried out at Enryaku-ji is well-described in the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語 (Engyō copy 延慶本) and *Genpei jōsuiki* 源平盛衰記:

At the assembly of three pagodas (*santō sengi* 三塔僉議), three thousand monks gather in front of the Great Lecture Hall (*daikōdō* 大講堂). They cover their heads with torn robes (*kesa* 裂裟) and carry a three-foot long staff called *nyūdōjō*, which they use to brush off the dews on the grass on their way. The monks also carry a small stone to sit on. One by one, they sit next to each other, but cannot identify their disciples and colleagues. The monks pinch their noses and change their voices, and announce: “Clergymen of the Mountain, assemble!” The appeals are brought up and discussed. Those who agree shout, “*mottomo, mottomo*” (indeed, indeed), and those who disagree shout, “*iware nashi*” (that is ungrounded). This is the rule of our mountain. *(Genpei jōsuiki*, pp. 92–93)⁴

The description above roughly corresponds to the assemblies depicted in the *Tengu zōshi* (Figure 1). Most of the monks who are present are wearing hoods that indeed look like a monk’s robe wrapped around one’s head. Inscriptions in each scene summarize the argument that the monks are making, and the characters “*mottomo*” floating amidst the crowd suggest that the monks are expressing their consent. In addition to these monks, lay members were also apparently present, as seen in the Enryaku-ji scroll. They and the lower-ranking monks are

⁴ A similar passage is also found in *Heike monogatari*, pp. 97–98.



Figure 1

wearing armors and bearing arms, suggestive of their readiness for violent protests.

What do these assembly scenes represent? From the overarching theme of *Tengu zōshi*—that is, a critique against the monks of the established Buddhist institutions for their ego and arrogance—the assemblies must symbolize something more than simply a gathering of monks. In fact, it was probably not difficult for the contemporary viewers of these scrolls to make a mental association between these assemblies and violent protests and military combats that followed these meetings. As Kuroda Toshio noted, upon reaching an agreement at the assemblies, the monks often either (1) gathered arms and took violent action or (2) marched into the capital with symbols of their kami (known as *gōso* 強訴, 嘴訴)—Kōfuku-ji held a branch of the sacred tree (*shinboku* 神木) of Kasuga Shrine, Tōdai-ji carried a portable shrine (*shin'yo* 神輿) of Hachiman Shrine, and Enryaku-ji carried a *shin'yo* of Hie Shrine (KURODA 1980, pp. 65–70). Military conflicts among the armed monks of temples, lay servicemen, and warriors serving the court occurred quite frequently. As for *gōso*, the act of bringing sacred objects into the capital was taken seriously by the people of the time. Branches and portable shrines were kept under guard in temples of Kyoto, and courtiers and sometimes even the emperor paid a visit to venerate the kami. Major religious events were scaled down, postponed, or canceled while the kami were in the capital. Such uncontrollable acts of protest and rampage are described by the retired emperor Shirakawa in the *Heike monogatari*:

The waters of the Kamo River, the dice of *sugoroku* (board game), and the monks of the mountains (i.e., the monks of

Mt. Hiei and Enryaku-ji)—these are the things that are beyond my will...
 (Heike monogatari 1: 129)

In *Tengu zōshi*, the *daishu sengi* is depicted in the Enryaku-ji, Onjō-ji, Kōfuku-ji, and Tōdai-ji scrolls. The statements made in the Kōfuku-ji and Tōdai-ji assemblies are plain. The monks simply argue that “Kōfuku-ji is the head of all temples and sects,” and that “all monks receive precepts at Tōdai-ji,” and thereby advocate their supremacy (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 82). In comparison, the inscriptions in the Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji scrolls are much more elaborate and vigorous in tone:

[Enryaku-ji] The feeble monks of Onjō-ji are inclined to attack the *sanmon*; although fixed in cloud and mud, they still have thoughts of becoming equivalent to us. We should surround the area and turn them into ashes. Our mountain is the site for the prosperity of the Law of Buddha; it is the holy ground for protecting the state. Our petition, too, is different from other temples; we can reason an ungrounded statement as a righteous petition. If the sovereign decision is delayed, we shall close our gates, and the temples and halls will sway the *shin’yo* of the seven shrines at the *jinnotō* 陣頭⁵ and bring turmoil to the land.

“Mottomo, mottomo....” (Tengu zōshi [SNEZ 27], pp. 84–85)

[Onjō-ji] The ferocious rioters of *sanmon*, with no training and no learning are up in the mountains and looking down upon our temple. This is the extreme of *gekokujō* 下剋上 (the lower dominating the upper) and an act of violence and outrage. We must soon kick away the great peak and plunge it into the waters of the lake.

“Mottomo, mottomo....”

The issue of the ordination platform is the major petition of our temple and the true demand of the three cloisters. Two hundred years of spring and fall have passed since we first reported to the throne. And now, at the time of our wise king and our sacred lord, the austere personal edict of the emperor has been promulgated. However, due to the ungrounded violence of the *sanmon*, there is a rumor that the edict will be taken back. The emperor should never be double-tongued; his words are like sweat [once it flows, it cannot be taken back].

⁵ *Jinnotō* is the location of the noble council’s meeting, close to the imperial residence (ADOLPHSON 2000).

Let us entrust the matter to the official note, and by ordaining through the *samaya* precepts, the monks of all provinces should pray well for the peace of the realm. We shall all protest!

"Mottomo, mottomo...."

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 87)

In the above passages, the monks of Enryaku-ji are directing their attack specifically toward “the feeble monks of Onjō-ji,” and the Onjō-ji monks toward “the ferocious rioters of the *sanmon*, with no training and no learning” (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], pp. 84–85, 87). Furthermore, the second part of the inscription in the Onjō-ji scroll speaks of the ordination platform and how important a petition it is for the temple. The passage goes on to say that the emperor had initially promulgated an edict to allow the building of the platform, but due to the riots by the monks of Enryaku-ji, the edict had been rescinded. From this, we can tell that the inscription refers to the dispute between Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji over the issue of building an ordination platform (*kaidan* 戒壇) for the *samaya* 三摩耶 precepts, and particularly, to the incidents that occurred between 1257 and 1264 (“Tendai ryōmon kasen no koto,” “Ryōmon fuwa no koto,” “Myōson zasu-ron no koto,” “Kakuchū zasu-ron no koto,” FUKUO 1931, and HIRAOKA 1988, pp. 167–227). With the support of the bakufu, the petition of 1257 by Onjō-ji to build its own ordination platform had initially been approved by Emperor Gosaga 後嵯峨 in 1260. However, it was followed by an immediate protest by Enryaku-ji, and the approval was eventually revoked. Onjō-ji appealed to the bakufu for permission to build the platform in 1262. Then, in 1264, Onjō-ji monks took advantage of the burning of Enryaku-ji’s ordination platform and carried out the precept rites at their own temple. A month later, monks of Enryaku-ji burned Onjō-ji.

The conflict between Enryaku-ji (or the *sanmon*) and Onjō-ji (or the *jimon*) had, in fact, continued for centuries prior to this incident, since the monks of the Enchin 円珍 (Chishō Daishi 智証大師, 814–891) faction were forced by the Ennin 円仁 (Jikaku Daishi 慈覺大師, 794–864) faction to leave Mt. Hiei and establish their headquarters at Onjō-ji in 993. Thenceforth, Enryaku-ji had claimed Onjō-ji to be its sub-temple, and Onjō-ji asserted independence from Enryaku-ji. One of the major issues that often evolved into an open dispute was Onjō-ji’s proposal to build its own ordination platform.

The ordination platform on Mt. Hiei was built in 822, immediately after Saichō’s death. Thereafter, all monks of the Tendai sect were expected to receive the precepts there before being appointed to the higher ranks of monkhood. However, forty-two years after the incident

in 993, the monks of Onjō-ji were forbidden to ascend the platform in Enryaku-ji. Not being able to be ordained at Enryaku-ji was a serious problem for the monks of Onjō-ji. For example, with regard to the appointment of the abbot, Enryaku-ji would claim that the monks of Onjō-ji were not qualified, since they had not formally received the precepts. This, in fact, was the very reason given by Enryaku-ji to explain why Kakuchū 覚忠 could not be the abbot for more than three days after he was appointed in 1162. Furthermore, not having been ordained also disqualified Onjō-ji monks from participating as lecturers at any of the three major Tendai services, which was one of the most important steps for being promoted to the higher clerical ranks.

The proposal to build an ordination platform at Onjō-ji was first submitted to the court in the year 1039, and this was followed by a number of demonstrations and petitions in 1040 and 1041. To this, Enryaku-ji violently objected, for the platform had long served as a symbol of its legitimacy as the chief Tendai temple. Having another platform built at Onjō-ji would greatly undermine this privilege, and would be a serious threat to their legitimacy. The court, in fear of Enryaku-ji's protest, hesitated to make any decision. In 1042, Enman-in 円満院 of Onjō-ji was burned by Enryaku-ji monks. The issue thus had been disputed for over two centuries prior to 1257. What was special about the 1257 incident was that due to strong bakufu support, Onjō-ji was initially granted approval for the ordination platform, but with Enryaku-ji's protest, the emperor later revoked the approval.

Let us go back to the *daishu engi* scenes of the Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji scrolls, and see how this incident is presented in the *Tengu zōshi*. After humiliating the Onjō-ji monks, Enryaku-ji goes on proudly to say:

Our mountain is the superior land where the Dharma flourishes,
and a sacred land for the protection of the state.

And it is for this very reason, they say, that

our petition is different from other temples; we can reason an
ungrounded statement as being a righteous petition.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], pp. 84–85)

Awkwardly enough, the monks of Enryaku-ji themselves are claiming that their statement is “ungrounded” (*hikyo* 非拠), but that they could nevertheless justify such a petition. The inscription in the Onjō-ji scroll follows up with this statement by the monks:

Due to the ungrounded violence of the *sanmon*, there is a
rumor that the edict will be taken back.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], pp. 84–85)

The edict here refers to the court's permission to build the ordination platform. The monks of Onjō-ji blame Enryaku-ji's "ungrounded violence" (*hikyo no ranbō* 非拠之濫妨) for the rescindment of the edict. Furthermore, they criticize the monks of Enryaku-ji as "ferocious rioters with no training and no learning" (*hishu higaku no moaku no kyōto* 非修非学ノ猛惡ノ凶徒) and argue that for the *sanmon* to be up in the mountains looking down to Onjō-ji is "the extreme of *gekokujō* and an act of violence and outrage." By simply comparing the inscriptions in the *daishu* *senki* scenes, we may be inclined to believe that the *Tengu zōshi* is more favorable to Onjō-ji than to Enryaku-ji.

Onjō-ji's Claim for Legitimacy and Supremacy: The Narrative Text

Let us now move on to the main narrative text of the Onjō-ji scroll, focusing particularly on its claim for legitimacy and supremacy. Each of the first five scrolls of *Tengu zōshi*, which depicts the temples of Nara and Kyoto, begins with a narrative text that describes the history and miraculous tales of the temple. The temples depicted in the scrolls are Kōfuku-ji, Tōdai-ji, Enryaku-ji, Onjō-ji, and the Shingon temples (Tō-ji, Daigo-ji, and Kōyasan all in the same scroll). What is noteworthy is that whereas one scroll is allocated to each of the two Tendai temples, only one scroll is used for the three Shingon temples. Obviously, there is more attention given to the Tendai sect than to any of the other schools. The emphasis on the Tendai temples becomes even clearer when we compare the length of each text. The number of lines (each line consists of approximately 15 to 20 characters) in the text of each scroll is as follows: the Kōfuku-ji scroll (excluding the introductory passage that serves as a preface to the whole set), 83 lines; Tōdai-ji, 73; Tō-ji, 64; Enryaku-ji, 113; and Onjō-ji, 167. The Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji texts are the longest of all five scrolls, and the text of the Onjō-ji scroll is almost twice as long as the Kōfuku-ji text. Since the texts praise the history and teachings of each temple, the longer the text, the more detailed and elaborate the acclamations. The overwhelming length of the texts of the Tendai temples, especially that of the Onjō-ji scroll, is therefore worthy of attention.⁶

⁶ Naturally, there remains the question of whether all of these texts have survived in their full length. At this point, I suggest that the surviving texts are close to their original for the following two reasons. First, judging from the content, each is integral in telling the following: the history of the temple; superiority of the sect; the Shinto deities that protect the temple and the sect; miracles performed by buddhas, bodhisattvas, Shinto kami, and monks. Then each text ends by saying that because of such pride in their own temples and sects, the monks cannot avoid attachment and arrogance and thus become *tengu*. Second, copies of the texts (Kōfuku-ji/Tōdai-ji, Onjō-ji, Enryaku-ji, and Tō-ji/Daigo-ji/Ninna-ji/Kōyasan)

How does *Tengu zōshi* assess these two temples, Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji, and their founding fathers? First, from comparing the two texts, it becomes evident that the author possesses a more favorable attitude toward Onjō-ji. The text of the Enryaku-ji scroll describes in length the achievements made by Saichō 最澄, the founder of the Tendai sect in Japan. More than half of the text is devoted to Saichō. However, when it comes to describing Ennin (Jikaku Daishi, the founder of the *sanmon* faction), the passage amounts to merely twenty lines or so, and nowhere in the text is he acclaimed as the successor of Saichō. In contrast, the text of the Onjō-ji scroll describes Enchin as “the direct line of transmission of Tendai, and the legitimate successor of Shingon,” and claims Onjō-ji to be the “place for the prosperity of the Tendai sect” (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 85). In this way, in the Onjō-ji scroll, Enchin, the founder of the *jimon* faction, is clearly identified as the rightful successor of Tendai, whereas in the Enryaku-ji scroll, there is no mention of Ennin’s legitimacy. In other words, both the Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji texts give the readers the same message: that Saichō is the founder of the Tendai sect in Japan, and he began his school on Mt. Hiei; that Ennin had assumed the role of the leader on Mt. Hiei, but the true line had been passed on to Onjō-ji by Enchin.

The scenes of assembly (*daishu sengi*) and the texts of both Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji scrolls suggest that the author of *Tengu zōshi* is more partial to Onjō-ji than to Enryaku-ji. In fact, a closer look at the texts of the other scrolls reveals that throughout *Tengu zōshi*, Onjō-ji is given clear preference over all other temples. The text of the Onjō-ji scroll, after all, is the longest among the five scrolls of *Tengu zōshi* that describe the temples of Kyoto and Nara. Furthermore, whereas other scrolls begin by simply mentioning who founded the temple and from whom it had taken vows, the Onjō-ji text gives a much more detailed account of its origins. After stating that it was built as a result of the vows of emperors Tenji 天智 and Tenmu 天武, and that it is a holy site of the two masters, Kyōji 教持 and Chishō (Enchin), the text continues

without the paintings have been recently discovered at the Kanazawa Bunko (TAKAHASHI 1998). In comparison with the texts that are now with the paintings, the Onjō-ji and Enryaku-ji texts are almost exactly the same, and the portion of the Kōfuku-ji text of the Kōfuku-ji-Todai-ji copy that has survived, too, corresponds to the *Tengu zōshi* text. According to the title page of the Kanazawa Bunko copy, Kōfuku-ji and Todai-ji are combined; this suggests that together, they may have constituted one scroll, just like the Shingon temples that are combined. This may explain why the texts of these scrolls are shorter. However, since the Todai-ji text at the Kanazawa Bunko is lost, it is difficult to ascertain this point. In sum, as far as the Onjō-ji, Enryaku-ji, and Kōfuku-ji texts go, the texts are almost identical, and therefore suggests that these texts in the *Tengu zōshi* are close to its original. The only exception is the Tō-ji text, of which the copy is much longer. The texts require further study, and I hope to pursue this problem in my future research.

on to compare its founding history with the other temples:

If one asks the zodiac stars of its founding years, [Onjō-ji's] origin lies earlier than Tōdai-ji or Kōfuku-ji, and if one inquires of the beginning of the [chanting of] sutras by the donors, it began earlier than Tō-ji or Enryaku-ji.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 86)

Furthermore, it mentions that all of the Shinto kami in Nara and Kyoto protect Onjō-ji:

the incarnations of the Southern Mountains and the deities of the Northern Peaks all protect the Buddha Dharma of [Chishō] Daishi....

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 86)

In comparison, other scrolls only mention specific kami that protect their temple, such as Kasuga myōjin 春日明神 for Kōfuku-ji and Sannō Gongen 山王権現 for Enryaku-ji. Finally, the Onjō-ji text describes its teachings as superior:

Speaking of our teachings—Shingon, Tendai, Hossō, Kusha—other temples are either esoteric but not exoteric, or exoteric but not esoteric. Others may teach both esoteric and exoteric, but not the teaching of *shugen* 修驗 (ascetic practices). It is only our temple that teaches all three.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 86)

The most powerful argument in the text of the Onjō-ji scroll for advocating the supremacy of Onjō-ji uses *ōbō buppō sōiron*, or the concept that the Law of the Sovereign and the Law of the Buddha are dependent on each other. Closer examination of the Onjō-ji text reveals that it indeed makes frequent references to kingship and authority. For example, one passage tells the story of when Emperor Tenji cut the ring finger on his left hand and buried it under a lantern as an expression of his sense of guilt for having put Soga no Iruka 蘇我入鹿 to death. He offered a permanent lamp (*jōtō* 常燈) to the Buddha Miroku and all the buddhas throughout the universe. At the time, he also prayed that his descendants, “one hundred kings to follow,” would succeed to the realm, that the imperial virtue would prosper even more, and that all people would also flourish and appreciate the imperial beneficence until Miroku appeared. The text thus claims that,

The lord of the continuing line of this country is the descendant of this sacred lord who had made the original vow. This temple, among all other temples that serve the state today, is

the first that was built as a result of an imperial vow. Therefore, as the sovereign of the state, one must worship our temple and worship our Dharma.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 85)

The text also includes anecdotes about Emperor Seiwa 清和, whose *kanjō* 灌頂 (precept conferring ceremony) was carried out by the monks of Onjō-ji at the time of his coronation. Similarly, Emperor Uda 宇多 received *kanjō* from his master, Monk Jōkan 静観, and Emperor Goshirakawa 後白河 received it from Kōken 公顕, following the tradition. Both Jōkan and Kōken were monks of the *jimon* school, and at each occasion, the emperor bowed low to the monk. The significance of the precept-giving ceremonies is suggestive of the importance of the *samaya* precept and the building of the ordination platform for the ceremony to take place. Furthermore, these episodes are told in relation to how the power of the sovereign is dependent on the power of the Dharma of Onjō-ji:

The kingship that rules the one heaven and holds dominion over the four seas is solely dependent on the power of the Buddhist Dharma of Mii [Onjō-ji].

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 86)

The most remarkable application of the *ōbō buppo soiron* can be seen in the following passage, cited from a document known as the *Mii-dera engi* 三井寺縁起, attributed to Enchin:

According to the words of the Daishi (Enchin), our Buddhist teaching shall be transmitted to the sovereigns and the ministers; if the sovereigns and ministers ever neglect the Dharma, then the land will deteriorate and the Law of the Sovereign will decline. The deities of heaven will turn their backs and the deities of the earth will be in fury; disease will spread among the people, and dead bodies will be lying in piles all over the streets. The inner and the outer will be in confusion, and the distant and the near will be in disturbance.

Here, the Dharma practiced at Onjō-ji and the devotion of the king and ministers to the temple are related to the peace or disorder in the realm. The passage is then followed by a statement that relates peace and disorder of the country to the more concrete happiness and sorrow of the monks of Onjō-ji:

For this reason, when there is happiness among my (Enchin's) followers [i.e., the monks of Onjō-ji], the king is in peace and the ministers are in peace; when there is sorrow among my fol-

lowers, the world will be in disorder and the troubles of the foreign rebels shall vie with one another in coming....

Further warnings are also given to the authorities about the danger of disappointing them:

Due to this, if Onjō-ji is petitioned three times, [this is a serious matter, and therefore] the Sovereign must be discreet. The realm, too, shall be disturbed. For this reason, the sacred lords and wise ministers of the past have all worshiped the Dharma of the Daishi. Seiwa, Kanpyō 寛平, Engi 延喜, Tenryaku 天暦, Enyū 元融, Ichijō 一条, Toba 鳥羽, Goshirakawa, Lord Chūjin 忠仁公 (Fujiwara Yoshifusa 藤原良房), Lord Shōsen 照宣公 (Fujiwara Mototsune 藤原基経), Midō Kampaku 御堂閑白 (Fujiwara Michinaga 藤原道長), Uji no Sesshō 宇治摂政 (Fujiwara Yorimichi 藤原頼道) are examples.

(*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 86)

Here, and in the aforementioned quote from Enchin's writing, we see typical usage of the *ōbō buppō sōi* discourse. The power of the sovereign comes from the power of the Dharma, in this case, particularly that of Onjō-ji, and in order to maintain power and prosperity, the rulers must keep worshipping at the temple. If the Dharma declines, the power of the sovereign also declines, and the peace of the country shall be disturbed.

The emphasis on the relationship between Buddhism and the court or the state is not unique to the Onjō-ji scroll. The use of terms such as *chingo kokka* 鎮護国家 (pacify and protect the state), which reflects a related notion that developed earlier in the Heian period that Buddhism serves to protect the state, can be seen in the Tō-ji and Enryaku-ji scrolls. For example, the text of the Tō-ji scroll states in the beginning that Kyōōgokoku-ji 教王護国寺 (Tō-ji) is the *dōjō* 道場 (place of training) for *chingo kokka*. However, there is no further explanation of how, therefore, it is important for the king or the people to worship the temple. The text also recounts the legends of Kūkai 空海, the founder of the Shingon sect in Japan, and how he practiced the protective Dharma for the nation and its fertility. Thus, according to the text, abundant crops and peace under heaven has solely been due to his magical power. Yet again, these legends are not expanded to tell the necessity for the sovereigns to continue worshipping at the temples he founded (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], pp. 87–88).

Likewise, the text of the Enryaku-ji scroll describes how Enryaku-ji was originally built in order to protect the imperial throne and the domain. Furthermore, it mentions how Ennin built Sōji-in 懿持院 as a



Figure 2

dōjō for *chingo kokka*. The Sōji-in, according to the text, summons up the true mandate of the lord, his subjects, and the common people; therefore, if Enryaku-ji is not in peace, the nation will be in disturbance. Ironically, it is at this very Sōji-in in the painting that the monks and child attendants of Enryaku-ji are turning into *tengu* (see Figure 2, *Tengu zōshi* [ZNET 19], p. 23).

Hence, although both Tō-ji and Enryaku-ji scrolls mention the important roles of the temple in protecting the state (*chingo kokka*), their arguments do not fully develop into that of the mutual dependence of Buddhism and the court, nor do they claim that the prosperity or decline of one would cause the same to the other (*ōbō buppō sōiron*). Neither the main text of the Kōfuku-ji scroll nor the text of the Tōdai-ji scroll mention anything related to kingship or the state; it is therefore only in the Onjō-ji scroll that the concept of *ōbō buppō sōiron* is extensively discussed.

What makes Onjō-ji further distinct from all of its contenders is its reference to the *buke* warrior class. The visual text of the Onjō-ji scroll, for example, is suggestive of its close relationship with the *buke*. There is, in the painting, a scene that depicts a procession of several men on horseback (*Tengu zōshi* [ZNET 19], pp. 38–39). The procession is led by a young man on horseback, wearing a hat with a feather attached, attended by several men. Next on horseback is a man in armor carrying a bow case. Then comes a man in a hunting outfit, carrying bows and arrows, followed by a child attendant and several men in black robes. This is the scene portraying *yabusame* 流鏑馬, a ceremonial competition in mounted archery performed by *bushi* at shrine festivals (TOKITA 1987). Sources such as the *Jimon kōsōki* 寺門高僧記 and *Onjō-ji denki* mention that *yabusame* had been performed at Onjō-ji during

the Hachiman 八幡 and Shinra myōjin 新羅明神 festivals (FUKUHARA 1995, pp. 156–57; *Onjō-ji denki*, p. 105). No other scroll depicts occasions as such in which the *buke* would so actively participate. In this respect, this particular scene is symbolic of Onjō-ji's relationship with the *buke*.

The narrative text further elaborates on Onjō-ji's relationship with the warrior class; as a matter of fact, it insists that not only is the sovereignty of the emperor dependent on the Dharma of Onjō-ji, but so is the prosperity of the warrior class. The text gives a historical explanation for this:

[Abe 安倍] Sadatō 貞任 was put to death in the eastern provinces due to the powers of the *jōbuku* 調伏 rituals performed by the Monk Gyōkan 行觀, and the Taira clan drowned in the western seas because of the prayers by the monks of our temple. Due to this, Minamoto Yoriyoshi 源頼義 sent his eldest son to the holy deity Shinra, and the commander of the right of Kamakura [Yoritomo 頼朝] buried his hair at the site of Tō-in 唐院. (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], pp. 86–87)

The above passage refers to Onjō-ji's relationship with the key events that led to the success of the Minamoto. The first refers to a victory in the mid-eleventh century of Minamoto no Yoriyoshi, appointed by the emperor as a general to subdue the northern provinces, which, led by Abe no Sadatō, had been rebelling against the court (Former Nine Years' War). These events led to the rise in the power of the Minamoto clan within the court. According to the *Jimon denki horoku*, Yoriyoshi, having become a devout believer in Enchin's school, made his eldest son, Kaiyō 快譽, become a scholar of *jimon*. After his victory, he also made another son, Saburō Yoshimitsu 三郎義光, a parishioner (*ujibito* 氏人) of Shinra myōjin, the protective deity of Onjō-ji. The *Jimon denki horoku* also mentions that Yoriyoshi had close ties with the monk Gyōkan, who, according to the text, performed rituals to help subdue Sadatō (*Jimon denki horoku*, pp. 33–34).

The second episode in the above passage refers to the renowned battle between the Taira and the Minamoto clans, and the victory of the Minamoto that marked the beginning of the Kamakura shogunate. In fact, Onjō-ji was involved in this battle from the very beginning. Provoked by Minamoto no Yorimasa 源頼政, Prince Mochihito 以仁王 proclaimed an edict in 1180 to subjugate the Taira clan. In turn, however, they were pursued by Taira no Tomomori 平知盛 and his troops, and the Prince and Yorimasa were killed in battle at Uji. Consequently, Onjō-ji was burned down by the Taira. Although this uprising resulted in failure, it initiated the insurrection of the Minamoto

clan against the Taira clan.

Hence, Onjō-ji's claim for legitimacy and supremacy according to *Tengu zōshi* can be summarized into the following four points: (1) Onjō-ji is the legitimate line of both Tendai and Shingon; (2) Onjō-ji's history and teachings are superior to all other temples of Nara and Kyoto; (3) the ups and downs of the imperial family is dependent on the rise and fall of Onjō-ji's Dharma; (4) the rise and fall of *buke* (Minamoto clan), too, is dependent on Onjō-ji's Dharma. For the above reasons, both the imperial family and the *buke* are encouraged to worship the Dharma of Onjō-ji.

Onjō-ji's Claims: The Tengu zōshi and the 1319 Petition

It is noteworthy that the arguments discussed above were used against Enryaku-ji in an actual petition, “Ōmi Onjō-ji gakuto shukurō ra moshijō” 近江園城寺学頭宿老等申状, regarding a dispute over the platform issue that Onjō-ji submitted in 1319, just about twenty years after *Tengu zōshi* was produced. In the course of this conflict, Onjō-ji was burned down by the monks of Enryaku-ji. Consequently, the document is subtitled “The conditions of the ravages of fire caused by the incompetent *sanmon*.” In this document, the *sanmon* monks are again denounced as the “violent troop” (*kyōto*) and for their “ungrounded violence” (*hikyo no ranbō*). Furthermore, the term *ransui* 濫吹 (being in a position without the real ability of competency) used in the subtitle of the petition to describe the *sanmon* has a similar connotation to the phrase “the extreme of the lower overturning the upper” (*gekokujō no shigoku*) found in the inscription of the assembly scene of the Onjō-ji scroll.

The 1319 petition is divided into eight sections. Sections I through IV describe the nature of the dispute and criticize the monks of Enryaku-ji for their false accusation, violence, and injustice. Section V, entitled “Condemnation of the violent troop shall not go against the will of the unseen” (“the unseen” being buddhas, bodhisattvas, and deities), describes the monks of Enryaku-ji as those who have no sense of shame for having violated the precepts. It asserts that the destruction of Onjō-ji by Enryaku-ji monks is against the will of the buddhas and deities, and therefore, they must be punished.

The section that is of most interest is the sixth, entitled, “This temple [Onjō-ji] surpasses other temples.” There is a striking parallel between the composition of this section and that of the narrative text of the Onjō-ji scroll (see Appendix for a translation and comparison of the text of the Onjō-ji scroll and the 1319 petition). The following seven assertions, though they do not necessarily follow the same sequence, appear in both texts. (Here I follow the order in which they

appear in the 1319 petition, and the numbers in a circle correspond to the numbers in the Appendix).

- I. The claim that the temple was founded by Emperor Tenji and is the true temple where the bodhisattva Miroku benefits sentient beings (Ⓐ). The petition further claims that Onjō-ji is the only temple where, even in this age of the Final Dharma, the holy water that washes away the sins of the people continues to flow. The holy water refers to the water of *mii* 御井, the "honored well," in which emperors Tenji, Tenmu, and Jitō 持統 took their first bath on the day of their birth. This is where the name, Mii-dera comes from.
- II. The statement that the temples of Nara are exoteric but not esoteric, Tōji and Ninna-ji are esoteric but not exoteric, and although Tōdai-ji and Enryaku-ji study both exoteric and esoteric, their virtues are far from *shugen* (ascetic practices) (Ⓑ).
- III. The claim that the founder, Enchin, is the rightful successor of Tendai, because he was the legitimate disciple of both Saichō and Gishin 義真, and because he went to China to study (Ⓒ). The petition also states that he belongs to the legitimate line of the esoteric sect as well, having studied under Faquan 法全 in China. For this reason, numerous masters of wisdom and practice have emerged from this temple, and monks of eminent virtue and unsurpassed efficacy are inclined to be among the followers of Enchin.
- IV. The claim that emperors of Kanpyō (Uda) and Kenkyū (Goshirakawa) were students of Enchin's disciples, and therefore received the precepts from them (Ⓓ).
- V. The passage taken from the writing of Enchin (Ⓔ) that relates peace and disorder of the state to the conditions of the Dharma and monks of Onjō-ji. This, as is clear in the Appendix, is the exact passage quoted from the Mii-dera engi in the Onjō-ji scroll. In fact, the same passage repeatedly appears in petitions and other documents written by Onjō-ji.⁷ In all cases, the quote is almost identical, with minor differences, and begins with a phrase which either says "the (Daishi) *engi* says..." or "the Kōso Daishi *kibun* 高祖大師記文 (Writings of the Patriarch) says...", suggesting that it has been taken from a writing by Enchin. In other words, this was a stock phrase used by Onjō-ji to advocate its importance

⁷ See, for example, the *Onjō-ji gean*; the petition regarding the office of *bettō* at Shitennō-ji in *Jimon denki horoku*, pp. 333–36; "Hon-ji kyōgyō sekke ni mōsu no koto" in *Mii zokutōki*, pp. 108–214.

in relation to the Law of the Sovereign and ultimately, the fate of the state. The original text, *Mii-dera engi*, seems to have been lost, but the title is listed in the *Sange sotoku senjutsu henmokushū* 山家祖徳撰述篇目集 (A collection of selected writings by the Tendai patriarch), volume one.

- VI. The statement that says that for this reason, lords and ministers have always been devoted to Onjōji (⑥) (Note that the names of the emperors and ministers are the same in both texts).
- VII. The emphasis on Onjō-ji's relations with the *buke*, and the claim that the prosperity of the *buke* is also dependent on the efficacy of the Dharma of Onjō-ji. For example, both texts mention that Minamoto no Yoritomo owes his victory over the Taira clan to the powers of the prayers by the Onjō-ji monks(⑦). Section VI of the petition ends with a statement that for the above reason, “the prayers of the Mountain [i.e., Mt. Hiei] cannot compare to the protective powers of our temple [i.e., Onjō-ji].”

Section VII, which follows this statement, is a description of all the disturbances and calamities that occurred in the past, and claims that these were all due to either Onjō-ji being burned down, or the frequent petitions by its followers. In sum, this violent troop of Enryaku-ji that is recklessly destroying Onjō-ji without any regard to ensuing harm to the imperial household is, for the realm and for the country, disloyal and unjust, and therefore, must be punished.

The 1319 petition ends with a section entitled “Kantō [i.e., bakufu] especially must not abandon this temple.” Beginning with the relationship among Minamoto no Yoriyoshi and his son, Yoshimitsu, and Minamoto no Yoritomo, the passage describes at length the relationship between Onjō-ji and the *buke*, and how the prosperity of the latter has been dependent on Onjō-ji. The petition ends by demanding that the *sanmon* be punished soon for its excess violence, and that all measures shall be taken for the prosperity of the *jimon*.

With the above arguments, the readers are convinced that the rampage of the monks of Enryaku-ji is greatly unjust, and that they deserve severe punishment. Moreover, the court and the bakufu must be on Onjō-ji's side, since Onjō-ji, and not Enryaku-ji, is the legitimate line of Tendai, and because Onjō-ji has always had close ties with the emperors, their ministers, and the Minamoto. They must also make sure that Onjō-ji does not perish, since the prosperity of the country, the court and the *buke* are all in accordance with the Dharma of Onjō-ji. Onjō-ji is the bearer of the Dharma for the sovereigns and warriors, and neglecting Onjō-ji may result in grave disorder in the realm.

Hence, as we compare the Onjō-ji text of *Tengu zōshi* and the 1319

petition, we see that the parallels between these texts are so evident that they cannot be explained as a mere coincidence. The arguments presented in these texts were frequently used by Onjō-ji to justify itself against its enemies, especially Enryaku-ji, and gain protection from the court and the bakufu. What is noteworthy is that these arguments show a new development in the much discussed concept of *ōbō buppō sōiron* (SATO 1998, pp. 17–88; KURODA 1996, pp. 271–85). By the late Kamakura period, not only was there a need to stress the interdependence between the Law of Buddha and the Law of the Sovereign, but there was also a need to highlight the temple's relationships with the *buke* for the established Buddhist institutions to advocate their legitimacy. As many scholars have pointed out, the balance of power that had been shared by the so-called *kenmon* power blocs (the court, the bakufu, and the religious institutions) since the late Heian period, was breaking down and shifting more toward the *buke* power by the mid-to late thirteenth century (KURODA 1980, pp. 171–221; KURODA 1995, pp. 187–241; ŌISHI 1994; TAIRA 1994; and HARADA 1997). Emperor Gosaga, who initially gave Onjō-ji the approval to build the ordination platform, for example, had been enthroned with the support of the bakufu, and his son was the *shōgun* in Kamakura at the time.

It was during this period, when Hōjō Tokiyori 北条時頼 was the regent in Kamakura, that the bakufu began intervening with the politics in Kyoto and most importantly, with the imperial succession. The bakufu also began to take charge of the conflicts among religious institutions as well. This can be seen from the fact that whereas the petitions regarding conflicts between Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji in the early thirteenth century were addressed to the retired emperor, the content of the 1319 petition reveals that petitions of this nature were by then addressed to the bakufu in Kamakura. The 1319 dispute, furthermore, was eventually settled when Kenben 顕弁, the abbot of Onjō-ji and the older brother of the Kamakura regent Kanazawa Sadaaki 金沢貞顕, finally pushed ahead and built the ordination platform at Onjō-ji. The platform issue that had continued for more than 250 years had thus finally come to an end with strong bakufu intervention. Under such circumstances, there was a need for Onjō-ji to claim itself as the provider of the Dharma for both the Sovereign and the warriors.

*Onjō-ji and the Question of Authorship of *Tengu zōshi**

No scholar has yet provided a definite answer to the question of authorship of *Tengu zōshi*. Most scholars who have worked on the *Tengu zōshi* either agree with or do not question Umezawa and Ueno's

theory that it had been produced by someone from or related to Enryaku-ji. There are three principal reasons given for this theory: (1) the Enryaku-ji scroll is the longest and the most detailed scroll of all five scrolls that depict the temples of Nara and Kyoto; (2) the frequent depiction of the young boys (*chigo* 稚兒) are suggestive of its relations with the *chigo monogatari*, the tales of *chigo*, many of which are known to have been written under the influence of Enryaku-ji; and most importantly, (3) the similarity with *Nomori no kagami* 野守鏡 in its expression of criticism towards Ippen and the Zen schools.⁸ The third argument, first raised by Umezawa Jirō, has been considered the most convincing since the words of the two texts are almost identical, and its date is also very close to that of the *Tengu zōshi*.

However, I have several reservations about the above arguments. First, from looking at the paintings, it seems problematic to say that the Enryaku-ji scroll is the longest and the most detailed since the other scrolls, as they survive today, do not seem to be in complete form. Of the seven, two, the Kōfuku-ji and the Tōdai-ji scrolls, are copies. Of these, the Kōfuku-ji scroll seems to retain its complete form, judging from its content that tells the full sequence of the Yuima-e 維摩会 service, beginning with the procession of the high monks, and ending with a symbolic protest to the imperial envoy. Its length is comparable to the Enryaku-ji scroll, and it is the only one of the two scrolls (the other is the Enryaku-ji scroll) whose picture begins and ends with layers of mist with a definite, curved shape. This is not true with other scrolls.

Second, with regard to the depiction of boys, although many of the *chigo* tales indeed take place at Enryaku-ji, they are rarely of a critical nature. Yet, *Tengu zōshi* clearly uses the *chigo* image as a motif to critique the secular attachments held by the monks. They are the source of *ma* 魔 (evil) that transforms the monks into *tengu*. Such use of *chigo* is evident in the scene where the *chigo* and monks are turning into *tengu* at Sōjiin (see Figure 2, Enryaku-ji scroll), and where the *chigo* and the monks are enjoying drinking at the temple ruins (Mii-dera A scroll, *Tengu zōshi* [ZNET 19], pp. 60–61).

Third, although it is true that the criticisms against Ippen and the Zen schools seen in *Nomori no kagami* are very similar to those seen in the scroll, *Tengu zōshi* as a whole is not as critical of Zen as *Nomori no kagami* is. The author's rather positive attitude toward Zen can be seen in the text of the last Mii-dera B scroll, as will be discussed later.

Finally, it is indeed true that much attention is given to the Tendai

⁸ *Nomori kagami* is an essay on poetry written in 1295. The author is unknown.

sect throughout *Tengu zōshi*; however, having examined and compared the two Tendai scrolls, we have already seen that the *Tengu zōshi* portrays Onjō-ji more favorably than Enryaku-ji. For the above reasons, one cannot be convinced that the author(s) of these scrolls is someone associated with Enryaku-ji.

What image of the author would emerge if we shift our attention to Onjō-ji? In the remaining part of this section, I wish to examine the text and painting of the concluding Mii-dera B scroll as further clues for Onjō-ji's position in *Tengu zōshi*. The Mii-dera B scroll begins with the following text:

Facing such a sorrowful incident [note: referring to a *tengu* being caught and killed by the *eta* child in the previous scroll], even *tengu*, since they are not rocks and trees, felt the sorrow of the world and how they are causing their own ruin. Thus, they decided to give up their malicious attachment and get rid of their arrogance; in each arose the true minds...

(Tengu zōshi [SNEZ], p. 92)

The text continues by having each *tengu* describe its own approach to the practice of Buddhism. The first *tengu* describes the teaching of the Pure Land; the second describes the teachings of Tendai; then comes a *tengu* who advocates Kegon, followed by another speaking on Hossō, and yet another on the Sanron. A long passage on Zen follows the description of Sanron, and the last to be discussed is Shingon, which takes up the most space among all the teachings. The text ends with a statement that the *tengu* must immediately build a temple and train according to the teachings of their own sects.

The text is followed by a painting that depicts *tengu* from all sects, seated in a circle, gathered to determine that they must make an effort to attain buddahood (see Figure 3, *Tengu zōshi* [ZNET 28], pp. 66–67). At the head of the circle is a *tengu* labeled “*shoshū hottō kenmitsu tōryō*” 諸宗法燈顯密棟梁 (the lamp of the Dharma of all sects), the head of exoteric and esoteric Buddhism. He is clearly the chief of all *tengu* and a neutral figure, not bound to any particular sect. Then, right across from the chief, at the top left, is the Tendai *kanju* 天台貫主, the head monk of Tendai. Below him is a *tengu* labeled “*Atago Tarōbō*” 愛宕護太郎房.⁹ To the right of the chief *tengu* is the master of Kegon (*Kegon sōshō* 華嚴宗匠), followed by the Zen monk who has attained the Dharma (*tokuhō zenji* 得法禪師), head scholar of Sanron (*Sanron gakutō* 三論學頭), the Hossō monk of high virtue (*Hossō sekitoku* 法相碩德), the

⁹ Atagoyama no Tarōbō becomes an extremely popular *tengu* by the Muromachi period. This scroll, in fact, may be one of the earliest reference to Tarōbō.



Figure 3

chief administrator of the three mountains of Kumano (*sanzan kengyō* 三山檢校), the *Ritsu* monk who holds the precepts (*jikai risshī* 持戒律師), and seated at the very bottom is the *nenbutsu* monk. These *tengu* represent the leaders of the Buddhist establishment, who have committed themselves to reform.

Next to the meeting hall is a scene of some *tengu* and low-ranking monks taking part in the construction of a temple. The painting ends with scenes of monks (the *tengu* have turned into humans) studying the *sutra*, seated in meditation, and finally attaining buddhahood. The picture is followed by a long text that discusses the meaning of *tengu* and evil, and explains how all the *tengu* could achieve buddhahood.

There are several noteworthy features in the painting and the text. First is the Tendai *kanju* depicted in the conference scene. He is placed at the highest position next to the chief, not much lower than him, hinting the author's inclination toward this particular sect—Tendai. Furthermore, this Tendai *kanju* holds a *vajra*, a symbol of esoteric practice, and indeed, there is no other figure in this group that represents Shingon, or esoteric Buddhism. Who can this figure represent?

This question can be resolved by reviewing the passages on Tendai and Shingon in the narrative text that precedes the painting. The description of Tendai comes second, after that of Pure Land. It recounts the importance of the teachings of the *Lotus Sutra*, but in comparison to the depiction of other teachings, the text does not seem to place particular emphasis on the Tendai sect. Upon examining the text, what is clearly notable is its emphasis on Shingon. In the text, the passage on Shingon states:

As for the teaching and practice of Zen, the living-body Sakyamuni passed on the expedient Dharma that terminates the delusion of affection (*jō* 情), whereas for the esoteric teachings (*mikkyō* 密教), the Dainichi of the Dharma-body spoke of the ultimate reality of the appearing virtue to the bodhisattva of the inherent existence. Tendai and Kegon are the exoteric teachings of the one vehicle and are not the most important and perfect teaching (*ichidai engyō* 一大円教). Hossō and Sanron are the profitable sword of the one mind, and have not yet exercise the *vajra* (*kongō* 金剛) of the three mystic practices. The esoteric teaching of the Shingon, therefore, is the highest teaching of all sects. The high can serve for the low, and the superior has the virtue to substitute the inferior, thus persons of superior capacity and wisdom can quickly attain the way, and those with heavy hindrance and weak capacity may also at once attain liberation. (Tengu zōshi, Mii-dera B scroll, p. 93)

Similarly, there are phrases such as “the Shingon teaching is the highest” and “this is the power of the Shingon” in earlier parts of *Tengu zōshi* (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 80). Such repeated emphasis on the superiority of Shingon and the claim that it is the best of all teachings, suggest that the author of *Tengu zōshi* is someone who identifies himself with the Shingon teachings.

More important to note, however, is that Shingon discussed above is not that of the Shingon sect founded by Kūkai, but the esoteric teachings of Enchin, the founding father of the *jimon* school. After a brief description of the Shingon teaching, there is a passage that begins, “Sannō-in 山王院 cited a sutra and said...” (*Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 93). Sannō-in is another name given to Enchin. Furthermore, as a concluding remark on Shingon, the text says:

Chishō Daishi resolved that those who practice exoteric teachings will not be able to attain buddhahood. Moreover, on the capacity of a person, he said, “only those who have inferior capacity benefit.” He claimed this age to be the Age of the Final Dharma, and that therefore, one should practice the three mystic practices and dwell on the fivefold meditation and attain buddhahood. (Tengu zōshi [SNEZ 27], p. 93)

In other words, the “Shingon” described above is not the Shingon of the Shingon sect founded by Kūkai, but the esoteric practice taught by Chishō Daishi. Onjō-ji, since the very time it separated from Enryaku-ji, had placed emphasis on the esoteric teachings. The *samaya* ordination platform, which they had long been asking to have

built, was a dais for Shingon precepts. Their argument was that Onjō-ji was the center for the esoteric teachings of Tendai, and therefore, needed an ordination platform of its own for the esoteric practice.¹⁰ We have also seen that the narrative text of the Onjō-ji scroll claims that Enchin is the “legitimate successor” not only of Tendai, but also of Shingon. By claiming itself to be the center of esoteric practice, Onjō-ji tried to compete with Enryaku-ji, which placed more emphasis on the exoteric teachings. The Tendai *kanju* in the Mii-dera B scroll carries the *vajra*, a symbol of esoteric teachings; therefore, he must represent the *imon* school of Tendai.

There are two other figures in the conference scene that deserve attention. One is the *sanzan kengyō*, the chief administrator of the three mountains of Kumano. This position had been traditionally appointed to high-ranking monks from Onjō-ji. He is also depicted in a *yamabushi* style, thus representing Shugendō. The text of the Onjō-ji scroll mentioned that Onjō-ji not only practices exoteric and esoteric Buddhism, but *shugen* as well, and therefore, is superior to all other temples that only practice either esoteric or exoteric Buddhism, or even both, but not *shugen*.

Another noteworthy figure is the *tokuhō zenji*, or the Zen monk who has attained the Dharma. He is wearing an indigo robe, which clearly distinguishes him from others. As noted earlier, *Tengu zōshi* is not critical of Zen as many scholars have assumed it to be. For example, the passage on Zen in the Mii-dera B text begins with an outline of legends and teachings pertaining to the school, then ends with an assertion of Zen’s superiority:

By opening one’s mind, becoming suspicious, and trying to reach enlightenment, one may soon fall into mistakes. Why should one with abundant wisdom and understanding use the knowledge for contemplation? Since this is the only path for rising and the Law that surpasses all others, which the buddhas did not transmit [through words], it reaches at the top of Vairocana. Through this sect of *jikishi* (直指), one shall realize his original nature. *(Tengu zōshi* [SNEZ 27], p. 92)

This passage on Zen, in fact, exceeds in length the descriptions of all other sects except Shingon in the Mii-dera B text. The passage on the Pure Land is ten lines long; on Tendai, thirteen lines; on Kegon, five lines; on Hossō, one and a half lines; and on Sanron, one and a half

¹⁰ *Onjō-ji gean*, dated the eighth month of Kōchō 2 (1262), a petition regarding the building of the *samaya* precept dais, contains a detailed explanation of Shingon and the nature of the *samaya* precept and why it is important for Onjō-ji to have the platform built.

lines. The passage on Zen occupies thirty-four lines. The reason for such exceptional length is perhaps because there is no other scroll, as there are for the other traditional, established sects, in which the history and legends of Zen could be told. At the same time, this passage shows the enthusiasm and interest of the author in advocating the teachings of Zen. When compared with the passage on Pure Land, which is another of the sects that has not been described in much detail in the preceding scrolls, we see that Zen takes up more than three times as much space. Such a strong emphasis on Zen suggests that *Tengu zōshi* is by no means denying Zen in the way *Nomori no kagami* does. This attitude toward Zen can be understood when we shift our attention to Onjō-ji. Whereas Enryaku-ji often protested against and sometimes even tried to burn Zen temples, Onjō-ji tended to be more supportive and cooperative with the Zen school. After all, both Onjō-ji and Zen were patronized by the *buke* (i.e., Kamakura bakufu) throughout the Kamakura period.

In sum, the text of the Mii-dera scroll reveals the superiority of Tendai and Shingon teachings at Onjō-ji, and does not deny Zen. As for the painting, of the ten figures that are depicted in the conference scene, three—the Tendai abbot with a *vajra*, the Zen monk who is seated above the Sanron and Hossō sects, and the ascetic of Kumano—are closely associated with Onjō-ji. Both the text and the painting of the concluding scroll thus supports the hypothesis that the author of *Tengu zōshi* is sympathetic to Onjō-ji and the *jimon* school.

In a recent publication, the historian Harada Masatoshi, also supports the theory that the author of the *Tengu zōshi* may have been someone associated with Onjō-ji or the *jimon* school (HARADA 1998, pp. 105–50). Through his study of Zen and the reformist groups affiliated with Zen, Harada has come up with a conclusion that the author of the *Tengu zōshi* may be a group of people under the influence of someone like Keisei 慶政, an early thirteenth-century monk of Hokkesan-ji 法華山寺, who had studied at Onjō-ji.¹¹ Regardless of his aristocratic background, Keisei stayed away from power and instead, advocated the need for reform within the established Buddhist institution. Since he had close ties with Myōe 明惠, whose temple, Kōzan-ji 高山寺, is known to have produced another *emaki*, *Kegonshū soshi eden* 華嚴宗祖師繪伝, Harada suggests that it is possible that Hokkesan-ji, too, had the assets to produce an *emaki* like the *Tengu zōshi*.

¹¹ Keisei is believed to have been a brother of Kujō Michiie, and is the author of *Hirasan kojin reitaku*, which contains a question and answer dialogue between he and a *tengu* of Mt. Hira. On Keisei, see KOBAYASHI 1993, pp. 215–40.

Conclusion

In sum, the analysis of verbal and visual texts of the *Tengu zōshi* and its comparison with contemporary sources have led to a hypothesis that the author of the *Tengu zōshi* may be someone from or closely related to Onjō-ji. Five facts that support this hypothesis are as follows:

1. In depicting the dispute between Enryaku-ji and Onjō-ji, both the verbal and visual texts are more sympathetic to Onjō-ji.
2. The Onjō-ji scroll is distinct in many ways from the other scrolls, especially in its claims for superiority in relation to the power of the sovereign and the *buke* and to the peace of the state.
3. The text of the Onjō-ji scroll is strikingly similar to the petitions of Onjō-ji in terms of its structure of argument and citations used from temple records.
4. Onjō-ji emphasized esoteric teachings, which explains why the superiority of Shingon is repeatedly mentioned in the texts; moreover, representation of Shingon in these scrolls are closely related to the Tendai sect and to Enchin's teachings.
5. Onjō-ji had close ties with the monks of the newly growing Zen sect, which explains why Zen is well-represented in the texts.

Close examination of the Onjō-ji scroll and the petitions also reveals the nature of justification of temples of this time. The legends and miracles were important. The claim for legitimacy of the transmitted teachings was important. And most important of all was the relationship between the power of the Dharma and the power of Sovereign. The notion that *ōbō* and *buppō* are dependent on each other was a widespread ideology of the time. We see similar ideas expressed in much of the literature throughout the medieval period. The *Gukan-shō* 愚管抄, for example, retells the history of Japan in the context of *ōbō* supported mainly by the Kujō family and the *buppō* centered at Enryaku-ji. Similarly, in *Tengu zōshi*, the author claims that the most powerful and important *buppō* is that of Onjō-ji, and extends the *ōbō* not only to the imperial family, but also to the bakufu. This reflects the close relationship that Onjō-ji had with the *buke* families, and, at the same time, their awareness of the two centers of power and their conscious effort to keep a balance in standing between the two.

Appendix

Text of the Onjō-ji scroll, Tengu zōshi

1319 Petition

VI. Our Temple is Superior to Other Temples

① *Onjō-ji was built at the behest of emperors Tenji and Tenmu, and has been a holy site of patriarchs Kyōji and Chishō (Enchin). If one asks the zodiac stars of its founding years, [Onjō-ji's] origin lies earlier than Tōdai-ji or Kōfuku-ji, and if one inquires of the beginning of the [chanting of] sutras by the donors, it began earlier than Tō-ji or Enryaku-ji.... ② Daishi (Enchin), due to the encouragement from Sannō, went to T'ang between the years 851 and 854. In Japan, he met the Golden Fudō who gave him the esoteric precepts, and in China, he was granted an audience by Fachuan of Xuanfa temple who passed the teachings and rituals on to him. He learned esoteric teachings from Priest Faquan and exoteric teachings from Priest Gishin. Faquan has inherited the Dharma from Priest Farun, and Gishin has been a close disciple of Priest Dengyō. For this reason, the founding patriarch (Enchin) is the direct line of transmission of Tendai, and the legitimate successor of Shingon.... ③ The cloistered Emperor Kampyō (Emperor Uda) regarded Priest Jōgan as his master and received precepts from him.... Furthermore, the cloistered Emperor Goshirakawa followed the tradition set by Kampyō and visited historic remains associated with Priest Jōgan. He regarded Priest Kōken of Hongaku-in as his master and received the precepts.... ④ The teach-*

① *Our temple has been built by Emperor or Tenji, and it is the true place of merits of the merciful Buddha. From this time of the Final Dharma, when the sutra and the Way have diminished until five billion, six hundred and seventy million years have passed, it is only in Mii-dera that the water of Dharma continues to flow and the sin and filth could be washed. ④ When we ponder over the essence of other temples, Nanto (Nara) and Kōfuku-ji are exoteric but not esoteric, Tō-ji and Ninna-ji are esoteric but not exoteric. Although Tōdai-ji and Enryaku-ji both study exoteric and esoteric teachings, their virtues are far from shugen. Onjō-ji is the only temple that studies all three ways of exoteric, esoteric, and shugen. ② Above all, the founder Chishō (Enchin) Daishi is the legitimate line of shimei Tendai and a direct disciple of Dengyō and Gishin.... He is also the last of the priests who have gone to T'ang and received the secret teachings of both exoteric and esoteric teachings.... As for exoteric teachings, he studied at Mt. T'ien t'ai under the eighth abbot of Chanlin temple, Priest Liang qing.... As for esoteric teachings, he studied at Qing long temple under the eighth patriarch of Shingon, Priest Fa quan.... [For this reason, he is] the legitimate successor of the esoteric school and the exoteric school.... ③ The cloistered emperors of two generations,*

ings of our temple are Shingon, Kampyō and Kenmu, have studied Tendai, Hossō, and Kusha. Other temples may be exoteric but not esoteric, or esoteric yet not exoteric. Some may practice both exoteric and esoteric, but they do not teach the way of shugen. Only our temple practices these three teachings at one time.

⑤According to the words of the Daishi (Enchin), [our] Buddhist teaching shall be transmitted to the sovereigns and ministers; if the sovereigns and ministers ever neglect the Dharma, the land will deteriorate and the Law of the Sovereign will decline. The deities of heaven will turn their backs and the deities of the earth will be in fury; diseases will spread among the people, and dead bodies will be lying in piles all over the streets. The inner and the outer will be in confusion, and the distant and the near will be in disturbance. When there is happiness among my followers, the Sovereign will be in peace, and the ministers will be in peace; when there is sorrow among my followers, the world will be in disorder and the troubles of the foreign rebels shall vie with one another in coming. Due to this, if the petitions mount up to three times, the Sovereign must be discreet. The realm, too, shall be disturbed.

⑥For this reason, the sacred lords and wise ministers of the past have all worshipped the Dharma of the Daishi. Seiwa, Kanpyō, Engi, Tenryaku, Enyū, Ichijō, Toba, Goshirakawa, Lord Chūjin, Lord Terunobu, Midō Kampaku, Uji Kampaku are lords and ministers who were particularly devoted to Daishi's Dharma.

⑤According to the writings of the Patriarch (Enchin)...[our] Buddhist teaching shall be transmitted to the sovereigns and ministers; if this temple is destroyed, the precepts will be discontinued, temples will be destroyed and the Dharma will diminish, the land and temples will deteriorate and the Law of the Sovereign will decline. The deities of heaven will turn their backs and the deities of the earth will be in fury; diseases will spread among the people, and dead bodies will be lying in piles all over the streets. The inner and the outer will be in confusion, and the distant and the near will be in disturbance.... The Dharma protects the Law of the Sovereign, and if the Dharma is diminished, the Law of the Sovereign, too, will be diminished. The fate of the four seas is dependant on the ups and downs of Mii, the peace and disturbance of the hundred kings abide by the rise and fall of our temple.... The lord that reveres this temple is an enlightened lord; the subject that looks up to this temple is a loyal subject.

*Terunobu (Fujiwara Mototsune),
Midō Kampaku (Fujiwara Michinaga), Uji Sesshō (Fujiwara Yorimichi)*
are examples. ⑦The prosperity of the buke has also been dependant on the efficacy of jimon. (Abe) Sadatō had been subjugated in the eastern provinces due to the conquering power of Priest Gyōkan. The Taira drowned in the western seas because of the prayers of the priests of our temple. Owing to these incidences, Lord (Minamoto) Yoriyoshi offered his eldest son to the god of Shiragi, and the Minister of the Right of Kamakura (Minamoto no Yoritomo) buried his hair at the site of Tō-in.

⑦Daishōkoku (Taira no Kiyomori) was devoted to sanmon; his clan was demolished in the Western Seas. The Minister of the Right Minamoto (Yoritomo) was devoted to jimon; his clan prospered in the east. It is clear that the prayers of the Mountain (Enyakuji) cannot compare to the protective powers of our temple....

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- DNBZ *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 151 vols. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912–1922.
- KI *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文, ed. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, 51 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1971–1997.
- NKBT *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系. 100 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1957–1961.
- SNEZ *Shinshū Nihon emakimono zenshū* 新修日本絵巻物全集, 32 vols. Tokyo: Kadokawa Bunko, 1975–1981.
- SNKBT *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989–.
- ZNET *Zoku Nihon emaki taisei* 続日本絵巻大成, ed. Komatsu Shigemi 小松茂美, 20 vols. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1981–1985.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Engyō-bon Heike monogatari* 延慶本平家物語. 2 vols. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 1988.
- Genpei jōsuiki* 源平盛衰記. Tokyo: Kokumin Bunko Kankōkai, 1910.
- Heike monogatari* 平家物語. NKBT 32–33.
- Hirasan kojin reitaku* 比良山古人靈託. SNKBT 40.

- Hōnen shōnin eden* 法然上人絵伝. ZNET 1–3.
- Jimon denki horoku* 寺門伝記補録. DNBZ 127.
- Kakuchū zasu-ron no koto* 覚忠座主論事. In *Jimon Denki Horoku* 19. DNBZ 127, pp. 314–18.
- Konjaku monogatarishū* 今昔物語集. NKBT 22–25.
- Mii zokutōki* 三井続灯記. DNBZ 111.
- Myōson zasu-ron no koto* 明尊座主論事. In *Jimon Denki Horoku* 19. DNBZ 127, pp. 312–13.
- Nomori no kagami* 野守鏡. Gunsho Ruijū 27. Tokyo: Gunsho Ruijū Kansseikai, 1936.
- Ōjōden/Hokke genki* 往生伝/法華驗記. Nihon Shisō Taikei 5. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.
- Ōmi Onjō-ji gakuto shukurō ra mōshijō* 近江園城寺学徒宿老等申状. KI 35: 27012.
- Onjō-ji denki* 園城寺伝記. DNBZ 127.
- Onjō-ji gean* 園城寺解案. KI 12: 8869,
- Ryōmon fuwa no koto* 両門不和事. In *Jimon Denki Horoku* 19. DNBZ 127, pp. 310–11.
- Sange sotoku senjutsu henmokushū* 山家祖徳撰述篇目集. DNBZ 95, pp. 194–206.
- Shasekishū* 沙石集. NKBT 85. [English translation by Robert E. Morrell, *Sand and Pebbles*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.]
- Tendai ryōmon kasen no koto* 天台両門合戦事. In *Onjō-ji Denki* 4. DNBZ 127, pp. 42–43.
- Tengu zōshi* 天狗草紙. SNEZ 27, ZNET 19.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ADOLPHSON, Mikael

- 2000 *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

AMINO Yoshihiko 網野善彦, ISHII Susumu 石井進, et. al., eds.

- 1988 *Nihon chūseizō no saikentō* 日本中世像の再検討. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppan.

FUKUHARA Toshio 福原敏男

- 1995 *Sairei bunkashi no kenkyū* 祭礼文化史の研究. Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku.

FUKUO Takeichirō 福尾猛市郎

- 1931 *Jikaku monto to Chishō monto no kōsō ni tsuite* 慈覚門徒と智証門徒の抗争について. In *Onjō-ji kenkyū* 園城寺研究, ed. Tendaishū Jimonha Goenki Jimukyoku 天台宗寺門派御遠忌事務局, 537–77. Ōtsu: Onjō-ji.

HARADA Masatoshi 原田正俊

- 1990 *Hōkasō, boro ni miru chūsei Zenshū to minshū 放下僧・暮露に見る中世禪宗と民衆.* *Hisutoria* 129: 25–54.
- 1994 *Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura jidai kōki no Buppō 天狗草紙に見る鎌倉時代後期の仏法.* *Bukkyō Shigaku Kenkyū* 37/1: 40–79.
- 1997 *Chūsei kōki no kokka to Bukkyō: Zenshū no tenkai o tōshite 中世後期の国家と仏教—禪宗の展開をとおして.* *Nihonshi Kenkyū* 415: 32–64.
- 1998 *Nihon chūsei no Zenshū to shakai 日本中世の禪宗と社会.* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

HIRAOKA Jōkai 平岡定海

- 1988 *Nihon juinshi kenkyū: Chūsei kinsei hen 日本寺院史研究—中世近世編* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

IMAI Masaharu 今井雅晴

- 1985 *Chūsei shakai to jishū no kenkyū 中世社会と時宗の研究.* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

KANAI Kiyomitsu 金井清光

- 1969 *Nō no kenkyū 能の研究.* Tokyo: Ōfūsha.
- 1991 *Chūsei geinō to Bukkyō 中世芸能と仏教.* Tokyo: Shintensha.

KOBAYASHI Yasuharu 小林保治

- 1993 Keisei 慶政. In Iwanami Kōza Nihon Bungaku to Bukkyō 1, ed. Konno Tōru 今野 達, Satake Akihiro 佐竹昭広, Ueda Shizuteru 上田閑照, pp. 215–40. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

KURODA Hideo 黒田日出男

- 1986 *Sugata to shigusa no chūseishi 姿としぐさの中世史.* Tokyo: Heibonsha.

KURODA Toshio 黒田俊雄

- 1980 *Jisha seiroku 寺社勢力.* Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- 1995 *Kuroda Toshio chosakushū 黒田俊雄著作集* 3. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- 1996 The Imperial Law and the Buddhist Law. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23: 271–85.

MATSUO Kōichi 松尾恒一

- 1988 Nanto jiin ni okeru shuto to ennen kekkō: Sengi no geinōka o megutte 南都寺院における衆徒と延年結構—僉議の芸能化をめぐって. *Geinōshi Kenkyū* 103: 1–32.
- 1995 Kōfuku-ji Yuima-e ennen no seiritsu 興福寺維摩会延年の成立. *Geinōshi Kenkyū* 128: 1–32.

ŌISHI Masaaki 大石雅章

- 1994 Jiin to chūsei shakai 寺院と中世社会. In Iwanami Kōza Nihon Tsūshi 8, ed. Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘, Amino Yoshihiko 綱野善彦, Ishii Susumu 石井 進, et. al., pp. 135–70. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

SATŌ HIROO 佐藤弘夫

- 1998 *Kami/hotoke/ōken no chūsei* 神・仏・王権の中世. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

TAIRA Masayuki 平 雅行

- 1994 Kamakura Bukkyō-ron 鎌倉佛教論. In Iwanami Kōza Nihon Tsūshi 8, ed. Asao Naohiro, Amino Yoshihiko, Ishii Susumu, et al., pp. 255–302. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

TAKAHASHI Shūei 高橋秀栄

- 1998 Shinshutsu shiryō: Emakimono *Tengu zōshi* no kotobagaki 新出資料—絵巻物天狗草紙の詞書. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu Kenkyū Kiyō* 56: 291–314.

TOKITA Izumi 鶴田 泉

- 1987 Yabusame gyōji to Kamakura bushidan 流鏑馬行事と鎌倉武士団. *Geinōshi Kenkyū* 99: 1–29.

TOKUE Gensei 德江元正

- 1968 Mukoiri jinen koji-kō 聾入自然居士考. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 47/7:27–41.
1971 Hōkasō-ron「放家僧」論 *Kokugakuin Zasshi* 72/3:1–16.

TSUCHIYA Megumi 土谷 恵

- 2001 *Chūsei jiin no shakai to geinō* 中世寺院の社会と芸能. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

UENO Kenji 上野憲示

- 1984 *Tengu zōshi kōsatsu*『天狗草紙』考察. In ZNET 19, pp. 114–43.

UMEZU Jirō 梅津次郎

- 1972 *Emakimono sōshi* 絵巻物叢誌. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
1978 *Tengu zōshi ni tsuite* 天狗草紙について. In SNEZ 27, pp. 3–14.

WAKABAYASHI Haruko 若林晴子

- 1995a *Tengu: Images of the Buddhist Concepts of Evil in Medieval Japan*. Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University.
1995b *Tengu zōshi ni miru Kamakura Bukkyō no ma to tengu* 天狗草紙に見る鎌倉佛教の魔と天狗. In *Emaki ni chūsei o yomu* 絵巻に中世を読む, ed. Fujiwara Yoshiaki 藤原良章 and Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦, 226–78. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.