

REVIEW ARTICLE

Constructing Histories, Thinking Ritual Gatherings, and Rereading “Native” Religion

A Review of Recent Books Published
in Japanese on Premodern Japanese Religion (Part Two)

Brian O. RUPPERT

Histories of Premodern Japanese Religion

We can start with Yoshida Kazuhiko's 吉田一彦 *Kodai Bukkyō o yominaosu* 古代仏教をよみなおす (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2006), since it seems in many ways like a founder and precursor of the range of works written recently concerning early and, to some extent, medieval Japanese religion. Yoshida, who has long attempted to overcome common misconceptions concerning early Buddhism, succinctly tries to correct the public's “common sense” (*jōshiki* 常識). Highlights include clarifications, including reference to primary and secondary sources that “Shōtoku Taishi” is a historical construction rather than a person, and even the story of the destruction of Buddhist images is based primarily on continental Buddhist sources; “popular Buddhism” does not begin in the Kamakura period, since even the new Kamakura Buddhisms as a group did not become prominent until the late fifteenth century; discourses on kami-Buddha relations in Japan were originally based on Chinese sources; for early Japanese Buddhists (including Saichō, Kūkai, and so on), Japan was a Buddhist country modeling

Brian O. RUPPERT is an associate professor in the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, University of Illinois.

its Buddhism on the continent; and the term for the sovereign *tennō*, written as “heavenly thearch” 天皇, was based on Chinese religious sources and only used from the late seventh century. Yoshida also includes an extensive discussion of the progress made in the study of women in early Japanese Buddhism.

Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫, in his *Nihon chūsei Bukkyō keiseishi ron* 日本中世仏教形成史論 (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2007), begins his study by calling into question the ease and ambiguity with which historians of early Japan have used the term *kokka Bukkyō* (“governmental Buddhism”),¹ and uses Inoue Mitsusada’s 井上光貞 use of the term as a typical example (a move similar to that undertaken by Taira Masayuki in his most famous study).² Critiquing Inoue’s focus on *kokka Bukkyō*, Kamikawa appeals to others who question its centrality, such as Yoshida Kazuhiko, who divides Buddhism into a series of levels. Nonetheless, Kamikawa sees ambiguity even in Yoshida’s discussion, and criticizes the notion for the following reasons: logical ambiguity; ignoring of Mahāyāna Buddhism (especially precepts) as a religious basis for Japanese Buddhism; forcing of Buddhism into an institutionally-based framework incapable of explaining Buddhism when the latter weakens (that is, post-Ritsuryō); naïve assumption that the government simply believed in the thaumaturgical powers of Buddhist ritual rather than saw it as useful for other reasons; the assumption that Buddhism was accepted by the populace simply due to belief rather than complex political factors; and the tendency to analyze the history of Buddhism in terms of cultural changes or belief rather than the larger political history of East Asia. In the place of an Inoue-esque perspective, Kamikawa argues for a position closer to Ishimoda Shō 石母田正 and, especially, Kuroda Toshio. Even so, he criticizes Kuroda’s *kenmitsu taisei* theory for failure to address the larger impact of East Asia—especially the Mahāyāna Buddhist thought which constituted the foundation of East Asian Buddhism—and Kuroda’s suggestion that it was as a specifically *Japanese* form of esoteric Buddhism that eventually reached the populace rather than what

* I would like to especially thank *Daihōrin* and Iwanami Shoten for their cooperation with my efforts to acquire information on the latest studies. I would also like to note that due to the publication of substantial newer publications I have not been able to include all of the works listed at the conclusion of the first installment of this column (see *JJRS* 37 [2010], 137–53). Finally, I have attempted to draw a better balance between fields—for example, granting greater attention to studies of religious ideas—but I have not had the opportunity to include more discussion of works on issues such as gender relations and Onmyōdō, which I plan to incorporate into the next installment.

1. Part of Kamikawa’s point is that there is actual ambiguity concerning the meaning of the term. We can take note here of the fact that the phrase can be translated as either “government Buddhism” or “royal family Buddhism,” which depending on the interpreter, may have different meaning.

2. Taira Masayuki 平雅行, *Nihon chūsei no shakai to Bukkyō* 日本中世の社会と仏教 (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1992).

Kamikawa sees as a development rooted in the splintering of the wealthy classes throughout East Asia. Kamikawa offers “Mahāyāna Buddhism” as the concept to counter the tendency to analyze Buddhist history in terms of Buddhist institutions, arguing that acknowledgment of the centrality of Mahāyāna in East Asia means understanding that the monastic and lay are equally part of the Buddhist world and together attempt to follow the precepts. He also suggests that the history of early Buddhism should be conducted as one aspect of a larger diplomatic history of Japan-within-East-Asia—one in which the public legitimacy of the Japanese sovereign (*tennō*) was directly grounded in the imperatives of rulership in East Asia.

In turning to medieval Japanese Buddhism, Kamikawa offers a reformulation of Kuroda’s and Taira Masayuki’s notion of *kenmitsu shugi* 顕密主義 (eso-exotericism) by attempting to answer the question of why “medieval religion” was essentially eso-exotericist Buddhism (*kenmitsu shugi Bukkyō* 顕密主義仏教), drawing upon the study of politics and diplomacy of East Asia. Interestingly, Kamikawa argues that these East Asian conditions were the basis upon which the Japanese ruling class newly “selected” (*sentaku shita*) Buddhism. Amidst the changing conditions throughout East Asia, eso-exotericist Buddhism in Japan came to permeate the social landscape with its all-encompassing esoteric character which included an ideological structure supportive of rulers. Among the notable studies by which Kamikawa attempts to demonstrate his view, we can take note of his emphasis on Chōnen’s 齋然 (938–1016) pilgrimage to and from the Song as an early moment in the development of medieval Japanese Buddhism, setting it directly within the East Asian context, and his attempt to similarly draw a direct connection between the next moment in that development, the appearance of rule by retired sovereigns (*insei*) and changes in East Asian political structures. Kamikawa takes the view that the notion of the sovereign (*tennō*) as a wheel-turning king was related to the evolving notion of the “realm of Nihon” (*Nihon koku*); he argues that eso-exotericist Buddhism supported kami worship as the ritual and internal feature of a combinatory ideology that also featured the notion of the wheel-turning king as a diplomatic feature (outwardly facing toward East Asia) and, by extension, supported the idea of Japan as a “kami realm” (*shinkoku*). His extensive argument for a connection between the development of monastic lineages and larger social changes, such as the development of patriarchal families and their inheritance practices—and, indeed, government by retired sovereigns (*insei*)—is also noteworthy.

Takeuchi Kōzen’s 武内孝善 *Kōbō Daishi Kūkai no kenkyū* 弘法大師空海の研究 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2006), written by one of the greatest historians of early and medieval Shingon Buddhism, is an exhaustive study of the background and life of Kūkai (774–835). Most provocative is Takeuchi’s extensive argument that Kūkai was originally from the capital area (Kyoto) rather than Sanuki 讃岐

(Zentsūji 善通寺 in Kagawa prefecture), based on a study of the earliest extant sources. Takeuchi also emphasizes the importance of Kūkai's early encounter with the *gumonjihō* 求聞持法 esoteric rite as a pivotal moment that served as a motivation to go overseas for study of esoteric Buddhism in the Tang. He then turns to consider Kūkai's relationship with Saichō and comes to the conclusion that the breakdown in their relations occurred earlier than has previously been thought—in 812, when they were previously thought to still have a good relationship. Takeuchi completes the study with an analysis of the reasons for Kūkai's selection of Kōya as the site for his monastery and explores the importance of the Niu clan and its kami to Kūkai's efforts to construct the complex.

Okano Kōji's 岡野浩二 *Heian jidai no kokka to jiin* 平安時代の国家と寺院 (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2009) is an essential contribution to our understanding of the relations between the Japanese government and temples, and though more limited in its focus than Kamikawa's study, offers important insights into the development of the novel system of clerical status that accompanied the appearance of new monastic lineages. As with Kamikawa, Okano criticizes the work of Inoue for its focus on *kokka Bukkyō* and follows in the footsteps of Taira Masayuki's and Yoshida Kazuhiko's trenchant critiques. Okano emphasizes that it is important to grasp the *relationship* between the government and Buddhism, and argues that the Ritsuryō legal and monastic system, the process of reception by leaders and those around them, and the prominence of the *chingo kokkā* (government protection) discourse continued beyond the mid-Heian period. The transition to "royal court governance" (*ōchō kokka* 王朝国家), as outlined by Sakamoto Shōzō 坂本賞三, from Okano's standpoint, can be seen positively as a shift to a different system in the tenth century rather than merely marking a "minus" or lack of the Ritsuryō state's effectiveness. Okano builds on earlier research of temple status (*jikaku* 寺格) in order to argue for a systematic accounting of its functioning and extensive analysis of examples over the course of the Heian period. We can particularly note Okano's contention that the major works on the connection between temple economic, legal, and social organizations and the increasing independence of the "power bloc monasteries" (*kenmon jiin* 権門寺院) from the government have, on the whole, failed to sufficiently account for the ongoing relationship (~dependency) between the partially independent power bloc monasteries and the government. To argue for what he sees as a continuing "double-sided" relationship, Okano highlights institutional structures such as the *sōgō* monastic system and its connection to monks' status within temples, the *zoku bettō* system, and social status within temples (for example, *gakuryo* 学侶 vs. *gyōnin* 行人/*zenshu* 禅衆/*dōshu* 堂衆, and so on), and focuses in the book specifically on two "keywords" he sees as exemplifying the relationship in the Heian period: the "system of [lay-] noble-administrators of monasteries" (*jiin shōkei sei* 寺院上卿制) and "monk-official status order" (*sōkan mibun*

chitsujo 僧官身分秩序). The former refers to the system of Heian government administration of the temples, which prototypically drew upon lay administrators such as high-ranking *shōkei* to oversee rituals and, in terms of the monastic institutions, nobles, chamberlains, and other figures were often designated “head administrators” (*bettō*) of one or more temples. Novel institutions such as the *gyōji-sho* 行事所 (ritual site) developed for rites, including both court rituals and monastic Dharma assemblies, led by the *shōkei* and carried out by lay figures like the *gyōji(no)ben* 行事弁 (rite controller). The early system took multiple forms in monasteries yet was organized in general in terms of *shōkei* ritual administration. By the early twelfth century the *shōkei*'s and *gyōji-sho*'s roles were increasingly eclipsed by that of the rite controller, a transition that became prominent with the set of six royal vow temples (Rokushōji 六勝寺) established in Higashiyama in the late Heian period and culminated in the Kamakura era with control of all rite operations (*benkan* 弁官, *shigyō* 執行) by the family of the rite controllers there at Rokushōji (that is, the Kajūjiryū Fujiwara-shi 勸修寺流藤原氏), figures who typically administered the rite on behalf of the retired sovereign.

In terms of the official monastic (*sōgō* 僧綱) system, Okano demonstrates that although it is often thought that Tendai's Enryakuji had to wait until the beginning of the retired sovereigns period (1086) to gain *sōgō* status (with the Hokkyō san'e 北京三会), the judge (*tandai* 探題) at the major Minazuki Assembly at Hiei was a Tendai monk by the late tenth century. This was a gateway to higher clerical status circumvented the traditional route of monastic success via the three major assemblies of Nara. Okano also makes a compelling argument that there were stark differences in the mid-Heian period between the Tendai and Shingon schools in terms of their internal administration and relationship with the government. Although the Tendai “abbot” (*zasu*) had administrative control over Hiei and nearby satellite temples and acquired regular *acārya* through government approval—demonstrated in the court ritual text *Shin-gishiki* 新儀式 (963)—Tōji had comparably little control over the vastly decentralized and spatially dispersed Shingon temples, and moreover, the Shingon school did not acquire regular *acārya* until the early eleventh century.

Okano concludes his work with an in-depth analysis of the vast increase of nobles who became monks within the temples and thus developed personal relations with monks and royal court members that were distinct from temple-government relations. Okano highlights the creation of new means by which nobles could succeed as monks and, by extension, benefit the lineages of their respective masters: royal orders for precept-conferral despite lack of monastic certificates (*mudoen senji* 無度縁宣旨); individualized conferral of *acārya* status (*isshin ajari* 一身阿闍梨); direct ascendance to monastic positions without the requisite preliminary clerical position (for example, royal: *gonshōsōzu* 權小僧都; northern house Fujiwaras/high officials: *hōgen* 法眼); and the unique positions

of Dharma Prince (*hosshinnō* 法親王) granted that transcended clerical status and, by the late Heian period, became in the case of Ninnaji home to the final official office of *sōgō* administration.

Uejima Susumu's 上島 享 *Nihon chūsei shakai no keisei to ōken* 日本中世社会の形成と王権 (Nagoya: Nagoya University, 2010) offers an overarching history—the cover says *zentaishi* 全体史—so the argument transcends religion. Nonetheless, insofar as Uejima is the leading temple archivist currently teaching and working in Kansai (Kyoto University) and a leading historian in medieval studies, it is important to consider this monumental work, which received the Kadokawa prize for historical studies, particularly since much of the argument is directly related to kami worship and Buddhism. It is especially in chapter 3 in the section on the development of medieval rule (*chūsei ōken*), “Chūsei shūkyō shihai chitsujō no keisei” 中世宗教支配秩序の形成,³ that Uejima proposes a view of medieval religious power which veers clearly away from the tendency of the approach of Kuroda Toshio, arguing that the exoteric (*ken* 顯) was more central to its development of religious governance than esoteric Buddhism (*mitsu* 密). As part of his argument, he concentrates on the exoteric Dharma assemblies (*hōe* 法会), and in doing so makes a connection between the sutra lecture Dharma assemblies (*kōkyō hōe*; including debates), which were often performed on behalf of the kami at the front of the adjoining shrine in monastic complexes, whereas the other major form, the repentance assembly, was not performed before kami. Moreover, monks of the various schools of Buddhism were invited in official invitation to participate in the major Hokke hakkō 法華八講 and Daijōe 大乘会 lecture/debate assemblies, and the funds were gathered from provinces across the land. Locally, the same template was reproduced annually on manors by the lords, who are thought to have called multiple monks together for the annual assembly called Shushōgatsu 修正月/Shunigatsu 修二月.

Arguing from *within* the eso-exoteric Buddhism historical examples, Takayama Kyōko 高山京子 has brought the study of medieval Kōfukuji to a new level with her *Chūsei Kōfukuji no monzeki* 中世興福寺の門跡 (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010). Takayama initially takes note of the fact that, from very early in its history, Kōfukuji combined public functions—such as the lay administrator there and the original *sōgō* office—with its status as the family temple of the Fujiwara northern house and the assignment of the same lay administrator to the Kangaku'in 勸学院 hall within the monastery. The focus of this study is on the two noble cloisters (*monzeki*)—Ichijō'in 一乗院 and Daijō'in 大乘院, which developed in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries and, by the late thirteenth century, experienced violent dissension and mutual rivalry, despite their leader-

3. He also discusses Kuroda in this context at the beginning of his “Chūsei kokka to Bukkyō” chapter, 412–14.

ship by the chieftain (*chōja*) of the Fujiwaras. Instead of considering Kōfukuji in terms of its connections to the political environs and lay society, Takayama follows Nagamura Makoto 永村 眞 and Inaba Nobumichi 稲葉伸道 in examining temple society and its transformations. Takayama examines the early history of the Kangaku'in and its connection to the Fujiwaras and, in doing so, attempts to clarify its administrative character and the nature of the Fujiwara chieftain's authority. The center of the study is her analysis of the social mechanisms within the two cloisters, including the transmission of the abbacy (*inshu* 院主), the status system of Kōfukuji monks (including those in the cloisters), the organization of Daijō'in of the Kamakura and Muromachi periods, and the views of monk-officials (*bōkan* 坊官)—here, the abbots—in the cloisters as expressed in their journals (*nikki* 日記 [*hinamiki* 日次記], *kiroku* 記録). Takayama demonstrates the fluidity of the monks and abbacy—Konō'es 近衛家 did not always dominate Ichijō'in nor did the Kujōs 九条家 always control Daijō'in, the same abbot sometimes governed both, and monks under the abbots sometimes changed cloisters. Interestingly, Takayama also makes it clear that, at least within Ichijō'in, the notion that the abbot gained authority through the transmission of the (esoteric) teaching of Buddhist logic (*inmyō* 因明) from the previous abbot gained currency by the latter half of the Kamakura period. Particularly compelling are her analysis of the status system, which offers an extensive study of the connection between family and class background of the monks and their position within their cloisters; her study of the decision-making groups (*hyōjōshu* 評定衆) within the cloisters, which she demonstrates included a combination of high-ranking *ryōke* 良家 (typically Seiga-ke 清華家) monks and *bōkan* administrators who took the central role in the selection of new abbots and even acted as lenders to the selected monks; and her analysis of monk-official journals that were handed down within specific monk-official families from the late Kamakura period and which, by preserving precedents (memory), enabled the cloisters to survive despite the ravages of the north-south dynasty era.

Although the historical study of Tendai's Enryakuji 延暦寺 (Mount Hiei) has made tremendous strides over the past decade, it is only with Mieda Akiko's 三枝暁子 *Hiei-zan to Muromachi bakufu: Jisha to buke no Kyōto shihai* 比叡山と室町幕府—寺社と武家の京都支配 (Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2011) that a major study has been conducted of the relationship between late medieval Hiei and the shogunate. Mieda focuses here on the relationship between Hiei and its affiliate Gion-sha 祇園社 (Yasaka jinja) and Kitano-sha 北野社 (Kitano Tenmangū) shrines, which together constituted the “Hiei temple-shrine force” *sanmonkei jisha seiryoku* 山門系寺社勢力 that governed medieval Kyoto as a metropolitan force. In particular, her argument is that Gion and Kitano, in developing the temple-town (*monzen*) areas at the edge of the royal capital (that is, in Higashiyama, Kitayama), acting as domain lords (*ryōshu* 領主), and within the rule by

the shogunate, developed their rule of scattered individual domains and merchants within the capital area (*rakuchū* 洛中). Thus the study of the “structure of rule” (*shihai kōzō* 支配構造), in her view, in and of itself makes clear the “structure of rule” of the medieval city of Kyoto. Building on earlier work by Satō Shin’ichi 佐藤進一, Mieda draws on power bloc theory to reframe the effort to explain the larger power structure of medieval Kyoto by incorporating an exhaustive analysis of Hiei and its affiliate shrines. After clarifying the primary-affiliate (*honmatsu* 本末) relationship between Hiei and the two shrines—including the development of the shogunal-family-sponsored post of ritual specialist with domainal authority (*ryōshuken* 領主権) within Gionsha (*oshi* 御師, 1385; distinct in character from those at Ise and Kumano), making possible Gionsha’s increased independence from Hiei (and strengthening the shogunate’s rule over Kyoto)—as well as Kitano’s connection with the shogunate and as a major landlord in Kyoto, she offers extensive light on the relationship between lower-level occupational groups like *jinin* 神人 (alt. *jinnin*; including *inu jinin* 犬神人) and *kunin* 公人 at the shrines and the structure of status in the medieval period. With regard to the later groups, what is striking is the multiple number of levels within and between these groups as well as their close connection with the major power-bloc monasteries such as Hiei (and the two shrines), Tōdaiji, Kōfukuji, and Tōji. A group like *kunin* was attached to the official document office (*kumonjo* 公文所) at the temple, and separated into at least three groups with varied tasks from the fourteenth century involving, for example, the serving of food and drink on special occasions, handling of offerings (including reception of certain coin-offerings), and the operation of lodgings for pilgrims. The forerunners of *inu jinin* were the *kiyomizu zaka hinin* 清水坂非人 in early Kamakura period texts, but with *inu jinin*’s development as an organization from the mid-fourteenth century onward they were assigned a series of tasks including service at the Gion festival and protection of Gion, the handling of the dead there, the policing and sometime destruction of homes and temples (Gion and Hiei), and cleaning (Gion and Hiei). The latter was typically paired with the *kunin* and sent out by Gionsha as policing support for Hiei in the area of the capital, prototypically in the period of divided rule in the fourteenth century. The *inu jinin* controlled the *hinin* group that included those with Hansen’s disease and, through direct support from Hiei in the latter fourteenth century (circumventing Gion), a group of the *inu jinin* came to be also called *sakamono* 坂者 and engaged also in commerce in the warring states period. Mieda argues that insofar as the *inu jinin* were distinct in significant ways from other *jinin* at Gion/Hiei—for example, active in areas even beyond those ruled by Hiei and Gion—they were *hinin* outside the status system of the power bloc system of rule (*kenmon no shihai chitsujo* 権門の支配秩序).

A collection of essays significant for the study of medieval temple life and archival investigations is Nagamura Makoto’s 永村真 edited work *Daigoji*

no rekishi to bunkazai 醍醐寺の歴史と文化財 (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2011). Nagamura is the leader of the main archival study at Daigoji (and Director of Kanazawa Bunko archives), which many scholars do not seem to realize has the largest extant temple collection in Japan (roughly 800 boxes of manuscripts; nearly 100,000 manuscripts), much of which is from the medieval period. (It has recently been designated a national treasure [*kokuhō* 国宝].) Although this is a small collection of works primarily by historians, the volume explores not merely a series of archival issues, such as what we can learn from metatextual sources like colophons (*okugaki* 奥書)—but, as in Takahashi Shinichirō’s 高橋慎一郎 essay, information about medieval life, but also the history of Buddhism there, including Nagamura’s essay on the sacred works and teachings of the influential abbot Seigen 成賢 (1162–1231) and Nishi Yayoi’s 西弥生 piece on esoteric rites and doctrinal study at Daigoji.

One of the most impressive contributions to the study of itinerant or socially semi-marginal religious practitioners is undoubtedly Ōta Naoyuki’s 太田直之 *Chūsei no shaji to shinkō: Kanjin to kanjin hijiri no jidai* 中世の社寺と信仰—勸進と勸進聖の時代 (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 2008). Ōta offers a brief yet invaluable overview of previous studies of holy ones (*hijiri*) and various ambulatory practitioners in his introduction, followed by an in-depth analysis of such practitioners at Mount Kōya, Tōji, and Kitano Shrine over the course of the medieval era. A salient point he makes is that despite claims of some scholars that a unique mark of the *hijiri* was the “temporary” character (*rinjisei* 臨時性) of their fund-raising and other practices, *hijiri* at sites such as Tōdaiji established permanent *kanjinsho* 勸進所 (*kanjin* bases) and residence from the Kamakura period onward. Ōta initially focuses on leading early medieval *kanjin* figures on Kōya such as Henjōkō’in’s Ryō’in 良印 (n.d.) in order to clarify that these figures typically came from the ranks of the larger monastic assembly (*shuto* 衆徒) even though, unlike in the Hōryūji case, these *kanjin* leaders were not from the top ranks of the scholar-monks (*gakuryō* 学侶). Turning to Kongōzanma’i’s Jitsuyu 実融 (n.d.), a precepts monk of Fujiwara rites-lineage pedigree who was appointed to the position of *daikanjinshiki* 大勸進職, Ōta clarifies that a unique factor in Jitsuyu’s appointment was the fact that he was recommended for the post by the monastic assembly rather than the royal court; Kōya, unlike Tōdaiji and Tōji, would not maintain the Daikanjin office on a long-term basis, attributable apparently to the qualms of the assembly over the presumed possibility of a threat to their autonomy. Ōta also turns to novel developments in the later medieval period of *kanjin* practice on Kōya.

Ōta sheds significant light on the developing character of kami-Buddha relations within Kōya (*vis-à-vis* Amano shrine) and of the Daikanjin post at Tōji. His discussion of the *hijiri* group at Tōji in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is particularly informative. Ōta demonstrates that the group chose each of its

“great fund-raisers” from a separate organization of holy ones variously called “wood-eating holy ones” (*mokujiki shōnin*) or “ten-grain holy ones” (*jikkoku hijiri*), referring in either case to their ascetical avoidance of grains. The *mokujiki* were, moreover, originally supported by both the royal court and the shogunate. The *mokujiki* dominated fund-raising for the *hijiri* groups at Tōji and also at Kōya, and in both cases focused on faith in Kōbō Daishi as the theme for their *kanjin* efforts.

If Ōta offers readers a new level of understanding of the development of the connection between semi-independent holy ones and the traditional *kenmitsu* institutions, Sekiguchi Makiko 関口真規子, in *Shugendō kyōdan seiritsu shi: Tōzan-ha o tōshite* 修験道教団成立史—当山派を通して (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2009) offers an overarching account of the development of an identifiable organization of mountain ascetics (*shugenja, yamabushi*), the so-called Tōzan-ha (Tōzan [Kami Daigo-affiliated] faction) affiliated with the mountain level of Daigoji monastery (southeastern Kyoto) of the Shingon esoteric lineages. Sekiguchi clarifies that the mountain ascetics, who had already been organized for a significant period under the leadership of major Buddhist institutions, possessed status on a level equivalent with that of various lower-ranking monastic figures such as the *dōshu* (temple assistant, also referred to as *zenshu* 禪衆, *gyōnin* 行人, and *gesu* 下衆). She traces the early history of the Tōzan ascetics, which was a group primarily under the umbrella of the temple assistants at Kōfukuji and, especially, the affiliate temples of the Kōfukuji Daijō'in and Ichijō'in cloisters along the Ōmine mountain range.

Sekiguchi uses the term *kyōdan* 教団 to refer to the Honzan 本山 and Tōzan groups of the medieval and late medieval periods respectively in order to distinguish them from the mountain ascetics who were affiliated with temples but did not organize themselves with regular mountain-entry practices (*nyūbu* 入峰). By the sixteenth century, the Tōzan ascetics, who were at both Kōfukuji and Tōdaiji, began to emerge from governance by the *dōshu* 堂衆 organizations, a shift partially connected with their unique expertise in mountain-entry as mountain guides (*sendatsu* 先達). It was in this context, Sekiguchi argues, that the Tōzan-kata, as it was originally called, actually needed the patronage (governance) of Daigoji's cloister, Sanbō'in 三宝院, in order to consolidate its position as a clearly defined and official religious organization on equal terms with the Honzan-ha led by the Tendai monastery Onjōji; it came to be referred to as Tōzan-ha after the transfer of leadership to Sanbō'in. For Sekiguchi, the notion that the “Kantō Shingon shū” 関東真言宗 was an umbrella organization for the Tōzan ascetics was not relevant until the Edo period, because they were no more associated with the Shingon lineages than with others that featured *tosō* practitioners prior to that era. Sekiguchi's research is buttressed by extensive archival study at the

massive Daigoji collection, and so her study arguably constitutes the most convincing study of a Shugenja organization in many decades.

Although a small book, it would be a mistake to underestimate the significance of Kikuchi Hiroki's 菊地大樹 new work, *Kamakura Bukkyō e no michi: Jissen to shūgaku, shinjin no keifu* 鎌倉仏教への道—実践と修学・信心の系譜 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2011), which skillfully blends leading historical scholarship and important theoretical questions in a reader-friendly format. Kikuchi's introduction, in which he outlines his hike through the Ōmine range 大峰山系—especially the area of Nabiki Hacchō 靡き八丁 (Ōmine okugakemichi 大峰奥駈道)—draws the reader into questions about the relationship between the experience of landscape, great and small ideas about religious reality, and the construction of religious traditions. Kikuchi counters the notion of a “basic religion” of the mountains by instead claiming that it was, in fact, the fluid character (*ryūdōsei* 流動性) of life in the shadow of the mountains that enabled people in the Japanese isles to produce, one after the other, new forms of religion, including varieties of what are now referred to as “forest asceticism” (*sanrin shugyō* 山林修行). The book charts the path, both discursive and practical, from early Buddhism to the novel strains of Buddhism later called “new Kamakura Buddhisms,” carrying us along the way from the early period, through significant changes in the retired sovereigns era, including the varieties of faith focused on sutras (including relics) to the “dreaming circles” (*yume miru sākuru* 夢見るサークル) from which significant sacred works (*shōgyō* 聖教) were put to paper.

New Avenues in the Study of Early and Medieval Religious Thought

A series of important works have been written in the history of Japanese religious thought, including works on figures like Shinran as well as on the implications of preaching and debates on Buddhist thought in the medieval period. Additionally, there have been great strides made in archival studies as well as literary analysis of religious thought and practice, which we will also treat in this section.

An extremely exciting set of discoveries have been made in the study of the titular founder of Rinzai Zen, Eisai (alt. Yōsai; 1141–1215). Archival investigations at the Shingon temple Shinpukuji (Nagoya), led by Abe Yasurō, resulted in the historian Inaba Nobumichi's realization that its collection, which includes a large volume of works transferred from Tōdaiji's Sonshō'in 尊勝院 and elsewhere, featured a series of works written in Eisai's hand. Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 was invited to join the investigation, which led initially to a research report, and which resulted in the publication in 2013 of the first volume of the projected ten-volume *Chūsei zenseki sōkan* 中世禅籍叢刊 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten), *Eisai shū* 栄西集. There is no need to rehearse here any of the contents of the facsimiles

(*eiinhen* 影印篇) or their printed versions (*honkokuhen* 翻刻篇), which constitute the bulk of the volume, but we can take note of Sueki's overview of their significance (*Eisai shū sōsetsu* 栄西集総説, 503–14). Although two previously unknown works by Eisai were published by the same group in *Chūsei sentoku chosaku shū* 中世先徳著作集 (*Shinpukuji zenpon sōkan dainiki* 真福寺善本叢刊第二期, vol. 3, Rinsen Shoten, 2006), two additional unknown doctrinal works are included in the new volume and respectively date (1175–76, 1187) from Eisai's period in northern Kyushu prior to his second trip to China. As Sueki emphasizes, it is most important to stress that these works are all specifically esoteric Buddhist (*mikkyō* 密教) in character; he also divides Eisai's religious development into the earlier esoteric Buddhist period and that after Eisai's second trip to China, when he incorporated (imported) Zen and precept (*ritsu* 律) teachings and practice.

Sueki points out that the image of Eisai as a “Zen monk” who introduced Zen to Japan was a product of the late Kamakura period, when schools of Japanese Buddhism became more clearly defined. He interprets Eisai as a figure who wanted to revive Japanese Buddhism as a whole, drawing upon a notion of the Zen “school” that was in line with the view held by most monks in his day—one of a multiple set of schools of beliefs and practices that should be cultivated. Eisai, as outlined by Sueki, must be seen as attempting to cultivate esoteric Buddhism, Zen, and the precepts in the latter part of his life to realize a synthetic or generalized Buddhism (*sōgō Bukkyō* 総合佛教) rather than as failing to realize a Zen perspective.

Minowa Kenryō 蓑輪顕量, in his *Nihon Bukkyō no kyōri keisei: Hōe ni okeru shōdō to rongi no kenkyū* 日本仏教の教理形成—法会における唱導と論議の研究 (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 2009), moves in a somewhat different direction from his earlier major research, which analyzed the teachings of those in the precepts movement in Nara. This book is an effort to clarify the function of the Dharma assembly in early and medieval Japan by turning to the development of “preaching” (*shōdō*, sometimes translated as “liturgical performance”) and debates (*rongi*), treating them both as outgrowths of the common practice of the Dharma assembly (*hōe*) in Japan and throughout the Buddhist world. Minowa traces the development of the Japanese version of the Dharma assembly—especially *shōdō*—to China's south dynasty, and stresses the influence of Confucian ritual. He then turns to the sutra homilies (*kōzetsu* 講説) common to Japanese assemblies and attempts to clarify whether and how there were differences in the presentation of doctrine between different schools of Buddhism and notes, for example, the earlier influence of Tiantai but also of Hossō 法相 (Ch. Fahsiang) exegetical practice on that used in the Tendai assemblies. Minowa stresses the importance of the little-known figure of the *dokushi* 読師, who had a very prominent role at assemblies from the ninth century onward; the role of these figures seems to have been to recite the title of the sutra and to repeat the sutra reading

following the lecturer (that is, re-recite the reading), and their increasing prominence—attested to the increased sizes of the offerings (*fuse* 布施) they received—is clearly related to the larger development of *shōdō*. Minowa throws light on the Nara tradition of preaching, and notes—somewhat surprisingly—that the Tōdaiji monk Enshō 円照 (1221–1277) and his family were precepts-movement recluses (*tonseimon* 遁世門) while at the same time prominent liturgical performers. To consider the development and character of debates, Minowa turns his attention to the prominent Hoshōji “eight lectures” (*Hoshōji mihakkō* 法勝寺御八講), in which Tendai monks (Hiei and Miidera [Onjōji]) and those of Nara (esp. Tōdaiji and Kōfukuji) were participants under the auspices of the retired sovereign (*in* 院). Among several conclusions, Minowa stresses that while debates developed very differently when conducted within schools, it is clear that insofar as respondents to lectures (almost invariably based on sutras central to the lecturer’s school) were often from completely different schools they were expected to have knowledge of—and hence were trained in—doctrine of the lecturer’s school.

The inheritor of Kuroda Toshio’s *kenmitsu* Buddhism theory, Taira Masayuki 平 雅行, released a book in 2001 that took a new direction, attending to the thought of a figure remembered as a founder of one of the new Kamakura Buddhisms, in *Shinran to sono jidai* 親鸞とその時代 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan). Although dated, it was an important shift, reflecting a position that built on the insights of Kuroda. It has also evoked responses, such as that of Koyama Satoko below, which reflect its continued influence. Taira sees the figure of Shinran as prototypical of the leader of a mode of Buddhism that was viewed as heterodoxy (*itan* 異端) in its day. The book goes into detail concerning the origins of the notion of the salvation of evil people (*akunin shōki* 悪人正機), proposing that while Shinran was consistent in his criticism of the efficacy of any effort to undertake good, his grandson, Kakunyo 覚如 (1270–1351), reinterpreted Shinran’s concept and phrasing to be more favorable to those who do good (*zennin* 善人) and, hence, compromised with the *kenmitsu* orthodoxy/establishment.

Koyama Satoko 小山聡子, in *Shinran no shinkō to jujutsu: Byōki chiryō to rinjū gyōgi* 親鸞の信仰と呪術—病気治療と臨終行儀 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2013), examines Shinran and his milieu to evaluate the contexts for his understanding of health and ritual practice. Koyama rightly laments that very little research has been done until recently about Buddhist monks’ views on health, and the fact that she chose Shinran is provocative, since Shinran’s teaching emphasized absolute reliance on the “other power” of the Pure Land Buddha Amida and, presumably by implication, de-emphasized ritual in general. Koyama turns first to Heian and early Kamakura period views on treatment for illness, and emphasizes the general attribution made by monks and aristocrats to *mononoke* spirits, the use of esoteric fire rites, and the use of spirit possession and “magical” (apotropaic) exorcism on such occasions; death rites (*rinjū gyōgi* 臨終行儀),

particularly those outlined by Genshin 源信 (942–1017) were the basis for addressing impending death. As Koyama demonstrates, Pure Land Buddhist figures like Shōkū 證空 wavered in their views concerning the proper approach to exclusive reliance on the *nenbutsu*, particularly when it came to death practices, as they typically continued long-standing practices promoted since Genshin. Shinran, for his part, very clearly expressed his views opposing any use of ritual, yet in the period of illness leading up to his death recited the Pure Land sutra *Muryōjukyō* in his efforts to address his own sickness, and his recorded words at the time seem to suggest he may have seen such practices as expressive of his belief in his own weakness and hence tendency to attach to ritual solutions (that is, based on *jiriki*, belief in self-power). At the time of his death, however, it is evident that death rites were not used. Shinran, oddly, had praised a disciple of Hōnen's for his realization of birth-through-suicide (*jigai ōjō* 自害往生); despite an apparent wavering in his views (*jigai ōjō* was thought to reflect belief in the efficacy of ritual) in this regard, Shinran seems to have been consistent in his refusal of any death practice at the time of his death.

Abe Yasurō, known along with Nagamura Makoto as one of the most productive and influential temple-archival researchers in recent history, has edited a major volume, *Chūsei bungaku to jūin shiryō/shōgyō* 中世文学と寺院資料・聖教 (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2010), which is part of a series that explores the relationship between literature and other fields, in this case between literature and religious texts. The guiding principle here is the “religious text” (*shūkyō tekusuto*), and similar to Minowa's discussion of Dharma assemblies, is an investigation of a particular topos in which Buddhist ritual was undertaken together with its productions—written, visual, and emotive—and, combined as a *mélange* of “ritual text” (*girei tekusuto* 儀礼テキスト) and “iconic text” (*zuzō tekusuto* 画像テキスト) and the inscribed “character text” (*moji tekusuto* 文字テキスト), accomplished their variegated distribution.

The book is separated into sections on the “diachronic coordinates” (*tsūjiteki zahyō* 通時的座標; = historical), “synchronic coordinates” (*kyōjiteki zahyō*; = categorical), “spatial coordinates” (*kūkanteiki zahyō* 空間的座標; = religious texts' topoi) and “subjective coordinates” (*shutaiteki zahyō* 主体的座標; = religious practitioners). There are important studies throughout this volume, but I would just like to take note of some which are especially noteworthy. In the first section, for example, Tomabechi Seichi 苔米地誠一 examines the early development of Kūkai's works as sacred works of the ancestral master, especially in connection with the appearance of the notion that Kūkai was a bodhisattva and the posthumous production of his Last Testament. Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典 offers a trenchant analysis of the contents and historical significance of the discovery of a pair of early Jishū works, including *Odori nenbutsu wasan* 踊念仏和讃, at Kongōji near Osaka. Araki Hiroshi's 荒木浩 study makes narrative and sym-

bolic connections between monks' dream records (*yumenoki* 夢記, return-to-life accounts (*soseiki* 蘇生記), and those of oracles (*takusen* 託宣). In the second section, Makino Atsushi 牧野淳司 offers an overview of the character and development of the Agui lineage's approach to preaching. Hashimoto Masatoshi 橋本正俊 analyzes the formal characteristics of and intentions informing the production of *kuketsu* 口決 esoteric texts—a transcribed form of oral transmission, *kuden*. The third section features notable studies such as Kawasaki Tsuyoshi's 川崎剛志 analysis of the connection between the production of legends and activities (construction, and so on) of religious sites on sacred mountains in Yamato; Fukushima Kaneharu's 福島金治 investigation of the role of Shōmyōji's Kanesawa (today, "Kanazawa") Bunko 金沢文庫 treasury as the axis of "knowledge" (*chi* 知) in the Kamakura region; Watanabe Mariko's 渡辺麻里子 consideration of scholastic interaction at Tendai seminaries (*dangisho* 談義所); and Koida Tomoko's 恋田知子 study of the religious texts in convents and nunnery-cloisters (*ama monzeki* 尼門跡). Among the notable articles in the final section are Chikamoto Kensuke's 近本謙介 study of the motives of the retired sovereign Toba, the Fujiwaras and related monks in the construction of the two major stūpas at Kasuga Shrine and, nearly a century later, of the retired sovereign Go-Toba, the later Fujiwaras, and figures like Jōkei in their reconstruction; and a compelling pair of articles on medieval monks' textual practices, one by Yamamoto Hajime 山本一 on the Tendai abbot Jien's discursive practices, and the other by Takahashi Shūjō 高橋秀城 on the connection between Shingon monks' training (*shūgaku* 修学)—especially Raiyu's—and their literary activities.

More recently, Abe Yasurō has published his study *Chūsei nihon no shūkyō tekusuto taikei* 中世日本の宗教テキスト体系 (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppan-shakai, 2013), which is an extension and deepening of his exploration presented briefly in the edited volume. Here, he explores religious texts by means of analyzing their connection with narratives and images associated with a religious legend (Shōtoku Taishi: section one), Buddhist sites for treasuring religious texts (*jiin kyōzō* 寺院経蔵: section two), the activity ("space") of religious ritual (section three), and in Jingi rites (section four). Indeed, the work might be described as a kind of comprehensive study of religious texts that undoubtedly set a new standard for such research within and without Japan. Although we do not have space to sufficiently examine the sections of the work, we can simply note that in his effort to offer a comprehensive analysis Abe has argued for the larger implications, both theoretical and historical, of the study at the beginning of each section. Moreover, the work incorporates the fruits of a virtually unparalleled career of examination of archival religious texts—especially at Ninnaji and Shōmyōji—so that Abe challenges all of us to think ever more broadly and deeply about the intertextual and interdisciplinary significance of both published and unpublished religious texts.

We would, at the same time, be remiss to ignore a major work by another leading scholar, Komine Kazuaki 小峯和明, on the influence of Dharma assemblies on literature, *Chūsei hōe bungei ron* 中世法会文芸論 (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2009), which similarly attempts a kind of comprehensive interpretation of medieval religious literature, though in this case to put forward the concept of “Dharma assembly literature” (*hōe bungei*). Thus Komine’s is also a performative perspective, but his focus is specifically on the literature growing out of the Dharma assemblies, and he begins by focusing on the earliest relevant works, such as the early Heian *Tōdaiji fujumon kō* 東大寺諷誦文稿. His second section turns entirely to the Agui oeuvre of preaching literature, although he also includes the related work by Kōfukuji’s Jōkei 貞慶, a relative of the Agui masters. Komine goes on to focus in his next section on pronouncements (*hyōbyaku* 表白) and petitions (*ganmon* 願文), prayers written respectively by performing masters and lay literati. His last two sections are an analysis of literature—*waka*, but also specific larger works—in its connection to the ritual space of Dharma assemblies followed by a discussion of the study of source materials (*shiryōgaku* 資料学) in which he argues for the use of *hōegaku* 法会学 to refer to the emerging field of study of works and against the continued use of terminology such as “Buddhist literature” (*Bukkyō bungaku* 仏教文学).

Recent Studies of Early and Medieval Kami Worship (Kami-Buddha Relations)

It would not be an exaggeration to describe the past ten years of premodern Jingi/“Shinto” research as a renaissance in such studies. Archival research has made an important contribution, as has the increasing interest of scholars in the fields of the history of religions and Japanese studies around the world.

Initially, we can take note of a short work that engages some of the most important questions and research about medieval kami-Buddha relations: Sueki Fumihiko’s *Chūsei no kami to hotoke* 中世の神と仏 (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2003). He starts by asking what is Shinto, and reminds his readers that a thinker as early as Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 (1873–1961) took note of the continental roots of the term long before Kuroda Toshio did in his rightly celebrated studies, in which—among other insights—he tied the notion that Shinto is Japan’s “ethnic religion” (*minzoku shūkyō* 民族宗教) to modern Japanese nationalism.

After having clarified the varied interpretations of the mutual status of kami and buddhas in the early periods, as well as the roots of the notion of kami-Buddha combinatory relations in continental East Asia, Sueki takes note of a novel view among some scholars that there were actually kami-kami combinatory relations (*shinjin shūgō* 神神習合) in premodern Japan rather than simply kami-Buddha combinatory relations (*shinbutsu shūgō* 神仏習合). Sueki thus emphasizes that in the earliest circumstances the Buddha was recognized as

one among multiple foreign kami that had been introduced from the continent, and stresses the implicit necessity of an initial perception of Buddhas as kami for the religion to take root in the Japanese isles; he suggests that the Buddha was originally seen as a “visitor” spirit, a *marebito* マレビト. Eventually, as Sueki notes, Buddhism followed continental East Asian Buddhism in incorporating spirit worship (*jingi sūhai* 神祇崇拜) into its cosmological framework that included multiple modes of divinity, which scholars typically describe as kami-Buddha combinatory relations—relations that incorporated kami into the Buddhist cosmos but recognized them as originally beings existentially different from Buddhas and bodhisattvas. The shift began in esoteric lineages (Taimitsu 台密, Tōmitsu 東密) and soon spread to others in Nara and in the newer lineages emerging in the Kamakura period and thereafter. The book then turns to specific examples of such relations in the medieval era, focusing first on the Sannō 山王 system at Mount Hiei and offering a succinct explanation of the respective status of the “original” Buddhas (*honji butsu* 本地仏) there—Śākyamuni, Yakushi, and Amida—their symbolic association with the three main districts (Saitō, Tōtō, Yokawa), and enshrinement in the major Sannō shrines. His analysis of the connection between Sannō worship and the Yōtenki’s 耀天記 (thirteenth century) theory of the kami as traces Buddhas provided to Japan as an inferior land helps to bridge the gap between the early notion of Japan’s inferiority and its status as a “kami realm,” which would develop in very different directions later, is particularly compelling. Equally noteworthy is his overview of the centrality of “recorders” (*kike* 記家) to the construction of sacred Sannō works and the early example of “reverse” *honji-suijaku* thought expressed in *Keiran shūyō shū*, where Sueki draws attention to the connection to original enlightenment discourse and the development of an arguably Japan-centric interpretation of the Buddhist cosmos. We can also take note of Sueki’s discussion of “Ryōbu Shinto” in the section on Ise Shinto, where he calls into question its specific association with the Shingon “school” (*shū* 宗), given Tendai’s influence on its development, as well as its comparatively decentralized character in contradistinction to Sannō belief and practice; and his analysis of the institutionalization of specific types of “Shinto” in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Sueki’s study offered a welcome and well-argued overview of kami-Buddha relations in the medieval period, but Satō Hiroo’s 佐藤弘夫 *Amaterasu no henbō: Chūsei shinbutsu kōshō shi no shiza* アマテラスの変貌—中世神仏交渉史の視座 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2000) provided a comparatively in-depth study of the changing image of the royal kami Amaterasu. Although we will see below that Itō Satoshi has made a monumental and exhaustive contribution to the study of Tenshō daijin 天照大神 (Amaterasu) faith, Satō’s work constituted, in a different way, an important intervention in the development of the study of kami-Buddha relations. Satō begins by pointing out that arguably the most “popular” of images

of Tenshō daijin prior to the modern period was as the youth *Uhō dōji* 兩宝童子 (in some other sculptures also portrayed as a male), and moves on to outline how Amaterasu shifted from a cursing kami (*tatarigami* 祟り神) to a deity that meted out punishment. Satō goes on to emphasize the double-sided character of kami and Buddhas which informed the belief in the efficacy of the thought of enlightenment (*hosshin* 発心) and the development of the notion of “Buddhas of Japan” (*Nihon no hotoke* 日本の仏) in what was perceived to be the Latter Age of the Buddha Dharma (*mappō*). He also later analyzes the character of the connection between Amaterasu, the notion of Japan as a “kami realm,” and the views on kami of the leaders of the new “Kamakura” Buddhist movements.

Itō Satoshi’s 伊藤聡 *Chūsei Tenshō daijin shinkō no kenkyū* 中世天照大神信仰の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011)—winner, like Uejima’s, of the Kadokawa award for historical studies—arguably offers the most in-depth and comprehensive study of medieval kami worship and *shinbutsu* combinatory relations to date. Itō, the leading archival researcher in medieval kami worship studies, devotes his study to the development of kami worship at Ise, with its close connection with Buddhism. He makes it clear from the outset that Buddhism was an intimate part of life at Ise Shrine from very early on. The context for any separation of kami and buddhas was the Dōkyō incident (eighth century), whereupon the shrine of Amaterasu prohibited Buddhist practice. Yet, as Itō emphasizes, even the kami-worshipping officials (*shinkan* 神官) of the inner shrine were Buddhist outside those walls and Ise shrine, as with other shrines, featured original ground-manifest trace (*honji suijaku* 本地垂迹) belief from the mid-Heian period onward—beginning with identifications with the bodhisattva Kannon and, a bit later, the Buddha Dainichi.

At the same time, Itō stresses that, indeed, the unique character of Ise shrine, including the polarity between the inner and outer shrines and its status as home to the mausoleum [ancestral]-deity (*sōbyōshin* 宗廟神) of the royal family provided the basis for the development of new discourses in its immediate environs. However, while Itō emphasizes that Ryōbu Shinto and Ise Shinto are well-known products of the shrine’s inspiration, the shrine’s influence was not only felt on monks and kami-worshipping priests but also those involved in poetic, Noh, and even military arts (*hyōhō* 兵法). Itō turns first to analyze the character of the discourses equating Amaterasu and the Buddha Dainichi and the inner/outer shrines with the two basic mandalas of esoteric Buddhism, the first spark of which was the Shingon Ono lineage monk Seizon’s 成尊 (1012–1174) *Shingon fuhō sanyō shō* 真言付法纂要抄. From there he analyzes the evolution of the notion Seizon originally expressed—that Japan is Dainichi’s original realm (*dainichi no honkoku* 大日本国). Itō argues that a series of didactic-narrative (*set-suwa*) motifs—such as Dainichi’s *inmon* 印文 (often interpreted as his *mudrā*), the *vajra* and mandala along with the *vajra*-shaped maps of Japan attributed to

Gyōki—developed to argue for the special place of Japan despite its ancillary character in earlier discourses and cosmographies. Itō also addresses the even more ancient equation between Amaterasu and a Buddhist divinity, which was actually the Kuse Kannon 救世観音, and explains in detail the role of Daigoji's Rishō'in lineage 理性院流 in the promotion of the notion of Amaterasu's identification with the Futama Kannon 二間観音 worshipped by guardian monks (*gojisō* 護持僧) next to the sovereign's sleeping chamber in the Seiryōden residence, a view told directly to the Tendai Enryakuji abbot Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), who spread the word. The common identification of Amaterasu with Kūkai technically began with an aside at the end of Seizon's work noted above, but it would be quickly incorporated into the Daigoji Sanbō'in lineage teachings. By roughly the latter half of the fourteenth century, Kūkai's spirit would also be described as having moved the site of his repose in meditation (*nyūjō* 入定) from Kōya's Oku-no-in to a shrine connected to the Outer Shrine at Ise, a view that would be taken up quickly in the Ise area.

We can take special note of two other major sections of the work. One is his analysis of the relationship between medieval “Shinto” and annotations on *waka* (*waka chūshaku* 和歌注釈), in which discourses equate *waka*—and by extension the Japanese language—with dharani (=Sanskrit), including an important study of Jien's influence on such notions and textual practices. The other is Itō's trenchant study of the development of the *Shintō kanjō* 神道灌頂 initiations and surrounding discourses stemming from Shingon, which draws even more on a whole series of archival sources rarely studied historically and helps us to understand the ritual world in which the tantric Shinto lineages developed. The numerous *kanjō* texts such as *Reiki ki* invariably tied the Shingon lineages to earlier Japanese sovereigns—variously through attribution of authorship (Daigo) and/or lineage-transmission charts. The Shingon lineages making such claims were also many, although Itō takes particular note of the Sanbō'in and Hoju'in (Hirosawa) lineages, most influenced by Daigoji and Ninnaji. Indeed, the claims were so varied that Itō concludes, “many of the examples [we have examined] build fiction based on fiction” (*kyokō no ue ni sara ni kyokō o kasaneru to iu jirei mo ōi* 虚構の上にさらに虚構を重ねるといふ事例も多い; 366), a comment undoubtedly meant to evoke the world of creative sacred-work (*shōgyō*) production—otherwise referred to as *gisho*—of the late Kamakura period onward, in which religious specialists attempted to adjust themselves to a changing political landscape and to new visions of the meaning of sovereign, realm, and religion in an increasingly decentralized cultural landscape.

Itō has also edited a major volume, *Chūsei shinwa to jingi/shintō sekai* 中世神話と神祇・神道世界 (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2011), in the same series as Abe Yasurō's edited work discussed above. The four sections cover, respectively, larger issues concerning medieval Kami discourse, the formation and development of “medi-

eval Shinto,” the evolution of the Jingi-related “classics” (*koten* 古典), and prominent features of medieval mythology. There are numerous important articles contained in this collection by the leading scholars of Jingi/Shinto studies in Japan, so we will simply take note of some of them here. The first section starts with an important study by Satō Hiroo on the changes in cosmological ideas about the kami during the medieval period, and also features Ōkubo Ryōshun’s 大久保良峻 analysis of the impact of original enlightenment (*hongaku*) ideas on the evolving views of the relationship of Buddha and kami. The next section includes, for example, Itō’s very clear overview of the development of the multiple lineages of Shinto and Anya Andreeva’s study of the evolution of the Miwa-ryū 三輪流.

The third section features a study by Saitō Hideki 齊藤英喜 on the emergence of the medieval *Nihongi* out of the early “*Nihongi* lectures” (*Nihongi kō* 日本紀講); an investigation by Kadoya Atsushi 門屋温 on the relationship between the *Kuji hongei* 旧事本紀 and the appearance/disappearance of mythological narratives; Ogawa Toyoo’s 小川豊生 exploration of the intersection between *shakubyakunitai* 赤白二滯 and *wagō* 和合 sexualized esoteric discourse and the development of the late thirteenth-century work *Ise monogatari zuinō* 伊勢物語髓腦; and Suzuki Hideyuki’s 鈴木英之 study of the role of medieval scholastic monks—focusing on Shōgei 聖間 (1341–1420) of the Pure Land school—in the tradition of *Kokinshū* exegesis. Among the exciting studies in the final section are Abe Mika’s 阿部美香 analysis of the mythological world of Sōtōzan 走湯山 and its influence on the development of myths throughout Eastern Japan; and Ochiai Hiroshi’s 落合博志 study of the Tendai jingi-related medieval collection *Shintō zatsu zatsu shū* 神道雑々集.

Funata Jun’ichi’s 船田淳一 *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* 神仏と儀礼の中世 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011) is the other notable work on Kami-Buddha relations of the past several years. Although it attends briefly to questions related to Shingon esotericism and Tendai’s Mount Hiei, the focus of this work is primarily on the intersection between kami and Buddhas in the Kamakura period, especially in connection with the prominent Kōfukuji and Kasugidera prelate Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213), the precepts movement, and Kasuga shrine faith. Funata begins with an extensive discussion of previous studies of medieval religious ritual (*shūkyō girei* 宗教儀礼) for kami and Buddhas, and offers a rare example in Japanese scholarship of an explicitly theoretical argument concerning such practices and their historical meaning. Funata, extrapolating on points originally made by Komine Kazuaki and Abe Yasurō argues that the officiating monk (*dōshi* 導師) at Dharma assemblies (*hōe* 法会) was a shaman, effectively acting as a mediator of the ritual space. Funata takes the core of the “cultural expression” (*bunka hyōgen* 文化表現) referred to as “ritual” to be the following set of components: the use of ritual space (that is, in a Dharma assembly), as in the case of Kōfukuji,

would be undertaken in an area understood as sacred in character (for example, the power-bloc temple and the surrounding area, Nara itself) and, by extension, a spiritual boundary where all manner of sacred beings—including Buddhas, bodhisattvas, and Buddhist protective heavenly divinities (*ten*) as well as Japanese *jingi*—gathered. The dynamism of ritual can be grasped by recognizing that the participants thereby experienced the reality of the beings’ spiritual majesty (*rei’i* 靈威). Funata traces his approach to religious rites to his study of *kōshiki* 講式 rites, to the analysis of which he devotes much of the book. Although he turns specifically to a series of *kōshiki* by Jōkei later in the book, Funata also uses *kōshiki* in his interpretation of the work *Kasuga gongen genki*’s 春日權現驗記繪 depiction of Jōkei’s connection to the Kasuga deity as a “shamanic” figure who came to be possessed by the deity, channeling its oracle. Funata follows Abe Yasurō in seeing an intimate connection between the protocol of Jōkei’s own *kōshiki* to Kasuga Gongen and the invitation (*kanjō* 勧請) of the deity into the ritual space. Another notable feature of this study is Funata’s analysis of the little-known ritual text *Sōsō kanjō* 葬送灌頂, which is part of the Miwa lineage (Shingon Shinto) text *Nihongi miwa-ryū* 日本紀三輪流, and depicts a shrine funerary rite in which the departed is initiated, his/her impurity is exorcised, and the deceased is enabled to realize Buddhahood (*jōbutsu*); the text seems to date to as early as the late Kamakura period at Suwa shrine, and had some influence on the shrine community at Ise by the Muromachi period, when the monk Dōshō 道祥, formerly an Ise Inner Shrine priest, copied this and other works which he received from Shingon-precept-lineage monks from Saidaiji in the early fifteenth century. Indeed, Funata suggests that the text *Sōsō kanjō* can be accurately described as a “Jingi version” 神祇版 of the *Kōmyō Shingon* 光明真言 rite as outlined by Myōe 明恵 (1173–1232) and, later, Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226–1304).

[to be continued]