

REVIEWS

Allan G. GRAPARD, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992. 295 pages. Hardcover, \$45.00. ISBN 0-520-07097-6.

Kasuga Shrine is the shrine of the Fujiwara family and had a close relationship with the family temple, Kōfuku-ji. Both temple and shrine were established during the time the capital was in Nara, and both have endured, through times of grandeur and times of distress, to the present day.

The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History (hereafter *Protocol*) presents the cult of Kasuga as a structural model of Japanese culture. It is a long-awaited book. According to the preface the author began work on this subject in 1978, pursued his research in Japan in 1981–1982, and finished writing in 1985. Published late in 1992, the book takes its place later than the author expected among the small number of monographs that treat medieval Japanese religion. It also joins two other studies of the cult of Kasuga 春日信仰—that of Royall TYLER (1990) and my own (1992).

Suspicious of being critical because of my engagement with the same subject, and also aware of the tendency to criticize work done in English in this difficult area for what it does *not* do rather than praise it for what it *does* do, I was able to accept my poor opinion of *Protocol* only after considerable effort. Having intended to engage with the author's ordering of the material and his ideas, I found myself frustrated by his use of sources, which I found so careless and distorting as to invalidate his entire enterprise. We all make mistakes and are limited; all scholars have noticed errors in their work, while many have seen errors exaggerated by long delays and by editing that inadvertently skewed the meaning of a sentence. However, when I investigated things in *Protocol* that struck me as odd, they turned out time after time to be fraught with problems. This left me in doubt about what I found odd but could not investigate.

It should first be noted that few references are made in *Protocol* to any work published after 1985, when the author finished writing, and that Grapard argues valiantly for points of view that he himself has already championed so successfully that they are orthodox. He also appears to avoid mentioning work, published before 1985, of scholars whose concerns bear closely on his own. References to the *Shintō taikēi* volume of Kasuga documents, published in 1985 (NAGASHIMA, ed.), are absent.¹ Grapard uses passages of Kasuga documents quoted in secondary sources.

Protocol is full of long passages without relevant notes. It is also common to find in *Protocol* notes that refer the reader to a secondary work (often difficult to obtain), where the reader only then finds a reference to the original text. Such secondary work is not always acknowledged or used accurately. For example, having written on the art of Kasuga I was immediately intrigued by a

¹ There is a reference to the entire series in the bibliography.

passage on page 79 of *Protocol*:

...the *Sadanobu-kō ki* (Journal of Fujiwara no Tadahira, which covers the period from 907 to 948) states that in 924 the Grand Minister of State (Tadahira) requested that a painted representation of the Kasuga “Bodhisattva” be made, and in 927 he ordered that rites dedicated to it be held.[#] The same rites were dedicated in 935 at the time of the rebellion of Taira no Masakado, and again in 938, for a reason that is unclear. The chieftain of the Fujiwara house in 1016, Michinaga, states in his diary that the only *kami* qualified as a bodhisattva was Hachiman...

The note at [#] refers the reader to the following passage from MIYAI 1978, pp. 384–85.

貞信公記抄をみると、延長二年(九二四)十一月、忠平は万慈悲像を因せしめ、翌三年(九二五)三月、万慈悲供をおこなっている。承平五年(九三五)平将門が乱をおこし、同八年(九三八)すなわち天慶元年(九三八)には、空也が平安京に念仏を勧進して、承平七年(九三七)あたりは、忠平が太政大臣として死屍山野にあふれたのに心をいため、万慈悲供を必要とせるときであった。この時にも万慈悲供をおこなった記録が存在したのかもしれない。現存の貞信公記抄はこの辺が欠けている。あるいはこれがもとで菩薩号の慈悲万行菩薩があらわれたのかもしれない。

This follows a passage in which Miyai discusses the bodhisattva name of the *kami* of Kasuga. In the diary *Sadanobukō-ki* 貞信公記 (correctly read *Teishinkō-ki*) the first reference to the image of Manjihi 万慈悲 (without the word *bosatsu*) appears in the entry for Enchō 延長 2 (924) 11.23. “Manjihi” is not so close to “Jihimangyō Daibosatsu” 慈悲万行大菩薩 (the Kasuga deity’s bodhisattva name) that one can assume the two to be the same; and the context does not suggest that this is the deity of Kasuga. The second reference to Manjihi is in the entry for Enchō 3 (925) 3.18 (not 927). Again, neither the entry nor the context suggest that this is an image of the deity of Kasuga. The index of the diary lists no other entry for Manjihi, who is otherwise unknown. The other dates Grapard gives for Manjihi rituals (935 and 938) are actually the dates for the rebellion of Taira no Masakado and for Kūya’s preaching of the *nenbutsu* in the capital. Miyai speculates that Tadahira might have recorded the performance of rituals for Manjihi, or even used the name Jihimangyō Bosatsu, during this period of stress, and that no such entry has come down to us because there is a break in the diary during this period. In the process of being transferred to *Protocol*, however, Miyai’s speculation has, like a rumor, become garbled and turned into fact. The reference to Fujiwara Michinaga’s 藤原菊長 diary at the end of the above passage from *Protocol* is also wrong. It is taken from MIYAI (1978, p. 384; no reference in *Protocol*) who writes that Michinaga’s opinion that only Hachiman 八幡 has a bodhisattva name appears in an entry for the fifth month of 1016 in *Sakei-ki* 左経記. *Sakei-ki* is not Michinaga’s diary.

This is a sample of the sort of problem I found while reading *Protocol*. But what of the author’s thoughts? His interests, thesis, and purpose are clearly

stated, most succinctly so in the conclusion. The author considers his work on Kasuga to present a possible model “for interpreting the multiplex-based aspects of Japanese social and religious history” (p. 256). He proposes, first, “that Japanese religiosity is grounded in specific sites at which beliefs and practices were transmitted within specific lineages”; second, “that Japanese religiosity is neither Shinto, nor Buddhist, but combinative”; and third, “that those combinative systems were linked to social and economic structures as well as concepts of power, all of which were embodied in rituals” (pp. 256–57). He then says that “the fundamental hypothesis of this work is that sites of cult are the best symbolic representatives of the cultural systems that determined in great part the evolution of Japanese history: they are a nexus in which the forces responsible for that history are clear” (p. 257).

Although I am sympathetic with many of the author’s ideas and interests, I find his propositions overstated. While the value of place in Japanese culture is high, the life histories of Myōe 明恵 and Hōnen 法然 suggest less the value of place than the importance of these individuals’ intelligence and character. Although lineage may be said to be vitally important at Kasuga and in Japanese history, and although the author often substitutes “lineage” for “sect” or “family,” his advocacy of lineage accomplishes little because he does not explore the significance of lineages composed of named individuals. As for the second proposition, moving from naming Japanese religiosity “Shinto” or “Buddhist” to naming Japanese religiosity “combinative,” when Grapard presents this combinative religiosity as ahistorical and inherent, is indeed a change, but not an advance. As for the third proposition, the structure set up to verify it is both unconvincing and distorting. Finally, the thought that history and cultural patterns may be observed in a major religious site seems commonplace, but the hypothesis that religious sites are the “best” representatives of cultural “systems” that “determined” Japanese history is unacceptably exaggerated.

Throughout *Protocol* effort is made to organize all aspects of the cult of Kasuga to fit a crystalline model that, as the title of the book suggests, allows every element a single, unchanging, meaningful place. The full shape of this model can be illustrated with this quotation from the chapter “Transcendence at Kasuga”:

The result of combinations at the liturgical and political levels was the application of the natural embodiment of cosmographies to Japan as a whole, which came to be seen as a sacred land under the ideal rule of the imperial line backed by powerful cultic centers dedicated to combined divine entities.... It was grounded in shrines and temples that had evolved the sociopolitical structures of the classical state. Connections were established between several cultic centers to form a sacred geography of immense complexity; each major cultic center was the natural embodiment of various Buddha Lands and Pure Lands, and all were thought to be parts of a gigantic mandala ruled by the Solar Buddha (*Dainichi nyorai*) and its Japanese hypostasis, Amaterasu, the divine originator of the imperial lineage. The mental maps alluded to earlier in this study materialized at the political and

ritual levels: Japan was seen as a cultic object consisting of parts of metaphysical lands that had flown to the islands and thence became the major cultic centers supported by the imperial lineage. (p. 218)

Saying that the whole universe was seen in medieval Japan as the field of the Buddha is not wrong in itself, and it is true that the national structure was viewed as following this Buddhist model, which was accepted as universal. However, the level of organization proposed by Grapard's model is one that can exist only within an individual's mind: it does not match any history and it has been applied to Kasuga in *Protocol* only by insistent repetition.

The effect of these propositions and this hypothesis, and of the author's interest in pressing his material into the shape of the model, has caused distortion and error that go beyond differences of opinion. For example, Grapard writes that

the organization of the Kasuga Shrine is, therefore, a spatial reflection of the structure of the concept of rule that was embodied in the other institutions of government...[and] displays in its architectural arrangement a miniaturized representation of the world held by the Fujiwara house and the state at large, and it is, therefore, a socio-cosmic symbol. (p. 47)

This grand overstatement appears to be the reason for distortions that include the forced clustering of events in shrine history at around 859. This clustering is at one point supported by a critical error—the addition of a single word in the translation of a passage of *Jōgan gishiki* 貞觀儀式 (completed in 872). This is an important text for, among other things, determining which buildings were present at Kasuga at the time of its writing, or perhaps by 859, the beginning of the Jōgan era. The author quotes the text from Kuroda Noriyoshi's *Kasuga taisha kenchiku-shi ron*, p. 10. I do not have access to this book, but I was able to find the text of *JOGAN GISHIKI* (1928). The translation in *Protocol* reads, “The Chieftain of the House enters the sacred area of the shrine through the Southern Gate in the western corridor...” and “the sacral woman...passes through the Northern Gate in the western corridor”(p. 58). The original, on the other hand, has 西方南門 (p. 63; “southern gate on the west side”) and 西方北門 (p. 64; “northern gate on the west side”). The substitution of “corridor” (*kairō* 回廊) for “side,” which could, out of context, be considered an innocent elaboration, is a problem because documentary evidence shows that the outer corridor was built in 1179. The date of the inner corridor and gate is unclear, but the earliest date that has been suggested is the late eleventh century. Twelfth-century dates for both inner and outer corridors are most likely. Since the corridors are essential to the present appearance of the shrine, when the author says, “In 859, for example, the Kasuga Shrine was considerably enlarged: it was then that the four main buildings were built and numerous other buildings added, thus giving the shrine the appearance it has today” (p. 128), he appears to be building in part upon his own mistranslation of *Jōgan gishiki*. Although the *honden* 本殿, fences, simple gates, and some buildings were in place by the time of the writing of *Jōgan gishi-*

ki, the date these structures were first built remains in doubt, while a considerably later dating of the corridors and gates is firm. If Kuroda Noriyoshi has proved radically different dates, his argument should have been presented.²

The date 859 is of such great significance in *Protocol* that it comes up frequently. For example, when speaking of the *jingūji* 神宮寺 and the practice of reading sūtras for kami, the author writes (without providing a reference),

...the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa sūtra* was read as early as 859 in front of the four shrines of Kasuga. That date is important, for it is at that time that the four Kasuga shrines were erected as we know them today and state-sponsored rites were instituted. The *jingūji* of Kasuga must have been erected for that occasion. (p. 73)

This amounts to exhortation. Such use of conjecture as fact occurs throughout *Protocol* in regard to this and other matters.

In reading *Protocol* I often had the sense that history was being distorted to make sure that only one item occupied one significant position in the model. For example, we are told extraordinarily little about the Fujiwara relationship to the emperor, only about Fujiwara concern with their own, apparently autonomous, power. The author's treatment of Hossō 法相 and Shingon 真言 at Kōfuku-ji 興福寺 is another symptom of this problem. In spite of the importance of *kenmitsu bukkyō* 顯密仏教 in medieval Japan, the author, although he several times mentions the importance of Shingon at Kōfuku-ji and for the Fujiwara (on page 74, for example), largely ignores *kenmitsu bukkyō* and the role of Shingon at Kōfuku-ji. He insists that the Fujiwara chose Hossō because, since they lived a dream-like life and were elitist, they were attracted to the Hossō belief that reality is a dream and that few beings can become enlightened (pp. 68–69). This appears to explain the choice, but in the process it distorts Hossō thought, ignores history, makes the Fujiwara into cartoon aristocrats, and explains nothing about Shingon.

One of the more important aspects of the cult of Kasuga is the association of the kami with Buddhist deities. The author's propositions and hypotheses are brought to bear on this as well. He says, "The associations between the *kami* of the shrines and the buddhas/bodhisattvas of the temples were not arbitrary but obeyed what might be called rules of combination. Such rules have to do with linguistic rules of association in that those cultic centers were universes of meaning that expressed opinions concerning the existential situation" (p. 9). Having read the book carefully, I still cannot understand what he means. The author's view of the systematic, planned, almost conspiratorial nature of the identifications of kami and Buddhist deities appears to be supported by a passage from *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* 興福寺濫觴記 which he calls "typical of the medieval reasoning concerning associations." However, I was struck by how very unlikely the following part of his translation sounded:

² Figure 1 in *Protocol*, p. 30, titled "The Kasuga Shrine after the 859 Reconstruction" is identified as a computer-assisted rendering of KURODA 1978, plate no. 32. It shows the inner corridor. However, the reader does not know whether to accept this as a fair representation of a diagram, so labelled, in Kuroda's book.

Since the First *kami* of Kasuga came from Kashima mounted on a white deer, this animal became its messenger; it was decided that these two divinities would be associated through this communication device. This is a most profound rationale for the relation between the two divinities. (p. 92)

When I looked up the original text (*KOFUKU-JI RANSHŌ-KI* 1972, p. 318b)³ I found that, apart from the first line, this translation is mostly a product of the author's imagination. For one thing, the deer is not "white" in the original (all deer are white in *Protocol*, though not in the source documents). Furthermore, the original is shorter than the translation, and means something closer to:

From the first sanctuary of Kashima, Takemikazuchi-no-mikoto moved to the woods of Mikasa-yama. The fact that the Kasuga deer is his messenger is due to an ancient bond and has deep meaning.

又自鹿島一御殿武雷槌尊。三笠山森移御。春日鹿ヲ使者坐事。皆以昔縁深習意アル也。

This passage contains no trace of any decision about associations. Later on the same page (92), in further discussion drawn from the translated passage of *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki*, I was also surprised to read that

the Fujiwara believed that their cultic center was a transcendental space, a cosmic zone of dwelling, part of a metaphysical land that had flown to and landed in Japan. Thus the cultic center of the Fujiwara house was an otherworldly "isle" set in the midst of the ocean of transmigration...

Grapard's translation says, "The Pavilion originated when parts of that mountain were displaced from their original location and appeared in this country" (p. 92). The original text (此御堂彼山ヲ移シテ造立) means that the Pavilion (the Nan'en-dō 南円堂) is Fudaraku 補陀落 (Kannon's paradise) "transferred" (metaphorically) to Kōfuku-ji. No "parts" of Fudaraku are ever said in Kasuga materials to have "flown to" Japan. This one-to-one, physical identification is a feature of *Protocol*, not of the cult of Kasuga, in spite of the repeated appearance of the "parts" of Fudaraku in *Protocol*, as in the passage I quoted above from page 218.

The author suggests (p. 81) that the worship of the forerunners of the branches of the Fujiwara controlling the *monzeki* 門跡 determined the choices of Buddhist identifications of the *kami* and that these Buddhist identifications were limited to deities already in Kōfuku-ji. However, although this is an attractive idea, what is known about the identifications made by the founders of the family branches is at variance with it. Nor is it at all clear that the *honji butsu* were necessarily deities worshipped in Kōfuku-ji.

When carried out in relation to actual identifications of *kami* with *honji butsu*, the author's scheme is not effective. The identification of Fukūkenjaku

³ Grapard's note refers to the entire document, thirteen pages of triple-column text.

Kannon with Takemikazuchi was not necessarily “immediate, logical, and irrefutable” (p. 83) because of the association of both with deer. The author writes that some Kasuga paintings show Fukūkenjaku on a deer and that the symbolism of the Deer Park “was used by the multiplex to indicate that Kasuga was in fact the Deer Park in Japan” (p. 83). Actually, paintings show the sculpture of Fukūkenjaku in the Nan’en-dō on a deer vehicle because an equation is being made between Takemikazuchi, who rode a deer to Kasuga, and the sculpture of Fukūkenjaku in the Nan’en-dō. Although one finds occasional evidence that the plains between Kasuga and Kōfuku-ji (which were in front of Tōdai-ji 東大寺) could be considered, because of the deer, to be reminiscent of the Deer Park, this was not because of any connection with Fukūkenjaku Kannon: *there is no connection of any sort between Fukūkenjaku and the Deer Park*. Since documents do not support any serious equation between Kasuga and the Deer Park, that Kasuga should be identified as the Deer Park repeatedly in *Protocol* is a wild exaggeration at best. Extensions of this claim—for example, the claim that Mikasa-yama was identified as Vulture Peak (the paradise where the transhistorical Buddha is preaching the *Lotus Sūtra* this very minute) because the deer suggested the identity of the Kasuga Plain and the Deer Park, where the historical Buddha preached (p. 211)—are not supported by any evidence whatever.

On page 211 the author says:

All other *kami* [other than Takemikazuchi, who was already identified as Shaka] enshrined at Kasuga might be seen as hypostases of Shakamuni, ultimately, and that is the reason why the Kasuga Pure Land mandala of the Nōman-in represents a Pure Land with Shakamuni in its center, flanked in four corners by the buddhas and bodhisattvas of the four shrines. (p. 211)

There is no evidence that the *kami* of Kasuga were ever all “hypostases of Shakamuni.” Moreover, the center figure in the Nōman-in 能満院 painting is not flanked by the “buddhas and bodhisattvas of the four shrines.” There is also some doubt concerning the identification of these figures with particular *kami* (S. TYLER 1992, pp. 178–82).

The above passage about the vision expressed in the Nōman-in painting brings us relentlessly back to Grapard’s model. Certainly Kasuga Shrine was considered a Pure Land; however, the elaboration of this image in *Protocol* is false. On pages 214–15, for example, this Pure Land is described as follows:

People with this mindset [of belief in Kasuga as a paradise] could, therefore, go on a pilgrimage to Kasuga, where they would see sculpted representations of Kannon in the Southern Round Hall, meditate until they could envision its presence, and see Kasuga as a Pure Land in which buddhas and bodhisattvas were worshiped through the performance of music and dance.... Paintings of the Pure Land of Kasuga show that in front of the main temple, there was a lake covered in part by platforms where *bugaku* dances were performed.... These performances not only served as a support for envisioning the Pure Land but were intended to be performances played in the Pure Land

itself.... Consequently, the ritual life of the multiplex was believed to be a replica of life in the Pure Land.

This vision is largely a creation of the author; he provides no proof that the medieval Japanese imagination worked in this way. In particular, the Nōman-in painting, which is the one referred to here (the note gives the wrong plate number), does *not* show that, “in front of the main temple, there was a lake covered in part by platforms where *bugaku* dances were performed.” It shows an imaginary paradise of Kasuga above the landscape of the shrine (Kōfuku-ji is not shown). The painting does not show *bugaku* 舞樂 dances at all—it shows *apsaras* dancing in paradise.

One might ask, what is the worth of a model that at its most general includes everything, and that in detail is mostly wrong?

In order to give as clear as possible an impression of *Protocol*, I will consider one discrete section in more detail. This section, “Echoes of Camphorated Maritime Music” (pp. 151–55), may serve as a model of the entire book, except that it is unusually well annotated and its sources easily accessible. It is a subsection of chapter 3 (“Protocol: The Sociocosmic Organon”) and is apparently meant to explain why the koto is so important in Kasuga ritual—although since the koto does not have a *special* role at Kasuga, explaining why it does is pointless in the first place.

I will now follow the author’s progress through this section step by step, commenting on problems that show up in just these few pages. Grapard begins with the story of “a boat that was made in Izu out of camphor wood. This boat, known by the name of Kareno, had been famous for its great speed. After wood taken from that boat had aged for thirty-one years, it was treated with fire and a *koto* was made out of it” (p. 151). The stories of the boat Karano 桔野 (not “Kareno”) in *Nihongi* 日本記 (ASTON, book 1, pp. 268–69, *NIHON SHOKI* 1967, vol. 1, Ōjin 応神 31.8, pp. 376–78) and *Kojiki* 古事記 (PHILIPPI pp. 322–23 [not, as in *Protocol*, 116–17; 117 is the chapter]; *Kojiki* 1958, Nintoku 仁徳, p. 283) do not say that the wood of the boat was camphor, a feature the author treats, for reasons he never explains, as critical to his discussion. This wood was not “aged for thirty-one years” or “treated with fire”—this is a garbled version of the *Nihongi* account for the *thirty-first year* of the emperor’s reign, in which it is recorded that the wood of the boat was used as firewood to make salt; the part that did not burn was considered special and made into a koto.

The next story (*Protocol*, pp. 151–52) concerns Buddhist images, later enshrined at Yoshino 吉野, made from a floating log. However, although the *Nihongi* story of 553 (ASTON, book II, p. 68; *NIHON SHOKI*, vol. 2, Kinmei 欽明 14, pp. 103–104) does concern a camphor log, it does not tell us, as the author of *Protocol* does, that the statues made from it “were slightly burnt” (p. 151). In fact, it says nothing about fire. In the version of the story in *Nihon ryōiki* (NAKAMURA 1973, pp. 111–12; *NIHON RYŌIKI* 1967, pp. 81–88) a camphor log had been struck by lightning, but there is no suggestion that the sculptures made from the wood “were slightly burnt.” The story in *FUSŌ RYAKKI* (1932, p. 39; no reference in *Protocol*) is revealing. It says that in 595 (Suiko 推古 3) a

log emitting an unknown perfume (*Protocol* suggests it was camphor) landed on the shore of Awaji. The log was offered to the court, but not realizing this the islanders mixed it with their firewood and burnt much of it. (The account in *Protocol* stops here.) Shōtoku Taishi then explained to the empress that it was *jinsuikō* 沈水香 (沈香 is commonly translated as aloes-wood incense), and that *jinsuikō* is sandalwood (*sendan* 梅檀) that has been submerged for a long time in water.

The author then describes (p. 152) archaeological discoveries of several camphor wood koto that “bore traces of scars left by fire” as evidence corroborating these stories (although it is not clear what the stories are supposed to prove). By this time the reader is in some doubt that his source actually says this. At any rate, he goes on to suggest that “camphor wood taken from boats to make musical instruments would have to be dried with fire.” Next, he proposes that a more important reason for using fire in the process of making koto is the symbolism of the role of fire in facilitating the passage from nature to culture. Having described the type of koto unearthed and the antiquity of the use of the koto in Japan, he then goes on to say:

Legends associating the coming of Buddhism to Japan with the *koto* allowed the country to readily accept the Buddha as if he were a *kami* whose will was ascertained through the medium of music, an emblem of divination and ordered rule. (p. 152)

By this time I have lost patience with the author, with his muddled account of stories that show a highly questionable “connection between camphor and boat” (p. 153), and with his further discussions linking deer and the sea. I do not believe the author’s conclusion that:

Thus, medieval authors reinforced the sense of ritual and national unity by cleverly recalling myths and legends that associated, in the universe of Kasuga, boats, deer, *koto*, camphor, and Buddhist statues, and they combined the symbolic and mythical realms of the Kasuga and Hachiman universes of meaning. (p. 155)

Echoes of “Echoes” appear scattered throughout this book as though they are evidence for this conclusion, but they are not—they are derived from it.

It could be said that “Echoes of Camphorated Maritime Music” is a brief and relatively unimportant part of *Protocol* and that the author’s need to explain complex stories in a limited space could easily lead to some confusion. However, although no one could be fonder of these stories than I am myself, or more eager to see them connected ingeniously with each other and with the cult of Kasuga, no part of this section is reliable or interesting. “Echoes of Camphorated Maritime Music” begins with unsupported conjecture, explains its meaning with distortion, error, and more unsupported conjecture, and concludes with a proposition that does not follow from the discussion. In this it is a model of the book itself.

REFERENCES

- ASTON, William G.
 1972 *Nihongi*. Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company.
- FUSŌ RYAKKI 扶桑略記
 1932 *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai* 新訂増補国史体系 12. Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美, ed. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- JŌGAN GISHIKI 貞観儀式
 1928 In *Zōtei kojitsu sōsho dai yon kai* 増訂故実叢書第四回. *Dairi gishiki gai shishu gappon* 内裏儀式外四種合本. *Zōtei sōsho henshū bu* 増訂叢書編輯部, ed. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- KŌFUKU-JI RANSHŌ-KI 興福寺濫觴記
 1972 In *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教善書 84. Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujuitsu Zaidan 財団法人鈴木学術財団, ed. Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujuitsu Zaidan. Or volume 119 of the 1915 edition, Bussho Kankō Kai, ed. Tokyo: Bussho Kankō Kai.
- KOJIKI, NORITO 古事記 祝詞
 1958 *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* 日本古典文学大系 1. Kurano Kenji 倉野憲司 and Takeda Yūkiichi 武田祐吉, eds. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- KURODA Noriyoshi 黒田昇義
 1978 *Kasuga taisha kenchiku-shi ron* 春日大社建築史論. Kyoto: Sōgeisha.
- MIYAI Yoshio 宮井義雄
 1978 *Ritsuryō kizoku Fujiwara-shi no ujigami* 律令貴族藤原氏の氏神. *Ujidera shinkō to sobyō saishi. Jingi shinkō no tenkai to Nihon jōdokyō no kichō* 氏寺信仰と祖廟祭祀. 神祇信仰の展開と日本浄土教の基調, 2 vols. Tokyo: Seikō Shobō.
- NAGASHIMA Fukutarō 長島福太郎, ed.
 1985 *Shintō taikai* 神道体系 48, *Jinja-hen* 神社編 13, *Kasuga* 春日. Tokyo: Shintō Taikai Hensan Kai.
- NAKAMURA, Kyoko Motomichi, trans. and ed.
 1973 *Miraculous Stories from the Japanese Buddhist Tradition: The Nihon ryōiki of the Monk Kyōkai*. Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series, vol. 20. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- NIHON RYŌIKI 日本靈異記
 1967 *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* 70. Endō Yoshimoto 遠藤嘉基 and Kasuga Kazuo 春日和男, eds. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- NIHON SHOKI 日本書紀
 1967 *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* 67–68. Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎, Ienaga Saburō 家永三郎, Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞, Ōno Susumu 大野 晋, eds. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- PHILIPPI, Donald L., trans.
 1969 *Kojiki*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- TEISHINKŌ-KI 貞信公記
 1956 *Dainihon kokiroku* 大日本古記録. Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensan Sho 東京大学史料編纂所, ed. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

TYLER, Royall

1990 *The Miracles of the Kasuga Deity*. New York: Columbia University Press.

TYLER, Susan

1992 *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through Its Art*. Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies 8. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Japanese Studies.

Susan Tyler

THE AUTHOR REPLIES:

I knew that *Protocol* would invite criticism and had hoped it would be constructive. I did not expect it to be for the reasons advanced by the author of this review, which has inexplicably found its way into the *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*.

The defamatory character of the above review has forced me to answer some of its points, taking a threefold approach. First, since Susan Tyler claims that I treat sources in a cavalier manner, I assume she will have no objection to my using her own reading technique on her review. Second, since she claims that my “careless and distorting use of sources invalidates [my] entire enterprise,” she ought to accept the logical consequence, namely, that her treatment of the very same sources might invalidate her attempt to discredit my scholarship. And finally, since she believes that my alleged misreadings allow her to generalize, and thus claim that the entire book suffers from distortion, she ought to have no problem with my proposing the same about her review if I can show distortions on her part. I should add, lest I be misunderstood, that I have not read Susan Tyler’s book, and that I have absolutely no vested interest in “turf.”

This is not my idea of fun, nor is it what I like to do. I will therefore keep this answer short and to the point, beginning with the issue of the white deer in the Kasuga cult, because it provides the best insight into the reviewer’s disingenuousness.

At issue is my writing that the kami of Kasuga came to Mount Mikasa on white deer, and my translation of a passage from the *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* 興福寺濫觴記 (page 318b), which is itself the citation of a document entitled *Shun’ya shinki* 春夜神記, the oldest extant version of which is a copy dated 1437, and the title of which cannot be translated (as the reviewer does in an article on the subject), as “Secret Record of a Spring Night” (TYLER 1989, p. 234, note 4), because *shin* 神 has never meant “secret.” Had the reviewer, however, done like the author(s) of *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* and read for herself the *Shun’ya shinki* in question, it is fair to presume that she could not have possibly missed the following words at the beginning of the text in question—以白鹿為御馬 (using white deer as mount; p. 181 in *Shintō taikēi*)—and thus would have known that the author(s) of *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* did not need to repeat the qualifier “white” a few lines later. What, then, have I misread or mistranslated in that line? Nothing. I have merely forgotten to put “white” in

brackets, but that oversight is enough for the reviewer to claim that I perversely distort all my sources. That is not all, however. The same *KOFOKU-JI RANSHŌ-KI*, quoting a certain *Gen'yōki* 元要記, states (p. 325b) that the *chinju* shrine Ukigumo Daimyōjin is placed on the spot where the Kasuga divinities landed after their departure from Kashima, and that the statue(s) of the *white* deer placed there was (were) made by Kōbō Daishi. Furthermore (and in support of my view, attacked later in the review, that Kasuga was associated with the Deer Park in India), *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* states on the same page (325a) that the deer in question were buried beneath the two five-storied pagodas which used to grace the plain between the Kasuga Shrine and the Kōfuku-ji. These two pagodas were collectively called Roku'on-in 鹿園院, "Deer Park Temple," and it is said (325b) that one of them contained effigies of the five *honji* of Kasuga believed to have been commissioned by Fujiwara no Yoshifusa in 859 (Jōgan 1; more about that contentious date in a few moments). It is, of course, impossible for Yoshifusa to have done so, for the fifth shrine (Wakamiya) was built only in 1135; but it is clear that by the time the *Gen'yōki* quoted in *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* was written, leading sacerdotal officiants and ecclesiastics held these statements to be true.

Let us see, then, what other and older sources have to say in that respect. The first to come to mind is *Genpei seisuiki* 源平盛衰記 (authored between 1247 and 1249), where it is said (in *kan* 25) that the kami of Kasuga came from Kashima on white deer 白々鹿. There is also the document authored by Suketaka, a member of the Nakatomi sacerdotal lineage of Kasuga, entitled *Nakatomi Sukekata Kasuga onsha engi chūshinbun* 中臣祐賢春日御社縁起注進文 (卷子本), dated 1269 (in *Shintō taikēi*, vol. 13, p. 52), and in which we read 乘三疋之白鹿 (mounted on three white deer). The same phrase is contained in the 1275 copy (冊子本) of the same document, p. 58 of *Shintō taikēi*. The document entitled "Amendments to the Kasuga Shrine Records" (春日神社記改正) and dated 1624 provides, it is true, the following statement suggesting that not all Kasuga deer were thought to be white, but that statement is immediately qualified: "The *Gochinzaki* says, ...[Takemikazuchi-nomikoto] used a deer (some say 'a white deer') as a mount" (御鎮座記日, ...以鹿(或作白鹿)為乗物).

The same document, however, adds on the following page (218) a passage from the 社司注進狀 (another name for the above-mentioned document dated 1269): 乘三疋之白鹿 (mounted on three white deer).

If these kinds of sources do not convince the reader that the medieval deer cult of Kasuga (as distinct from the Kasuga cult in general) was overwhelmingly based on the famous classical Chinese symbolism of the white deer—even though there were indeed representations of brown deer—we might call on paintings and statues associated with the cult to provide us with further clues, but I shall refrain from giving more examples lest I be accused of quibbling. The issue of the white deer raised by Susan Tyler is a white elephant.

As for the connection of the Kasuga deer and the Deer Park in India, I shall take as my authority the Nō drama *Kasuga ryūjin*, in which we read:

Distressed that His Perfect Teaching was of no benefit to those of small capacity, “he removed his necklace and fine garments, put on a coarse robe,” and taught the Four Noble Truths. And the Deer Plain where this transpired was this very site. On Kasuga Plain where the animals rouse themselves or recline—is this not the Deer Park? (MORRELL 1982, p. 194)

Now, if the deer is connected with the Deer Park on the one hand, and with Fukūkensaku Kannon on the other hand, what wrong is there in assuming that, together with Śākyamuni, they were related in a single constellation of symbols? Consider the fact that Takemikazuchi-no-mikoto was conceived to be associated with either Fukūkensaku Kannon or Śākyamuni (as in *Shichi daiji narabi Kōfuku-ji shodō engi* 七大寺并興福寺諸堂縁起, in *Dai Nippon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 84, p. 294). Or take, for example, the statement found in *Keiran-shūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集 (T #2410, 76.778–79) in a paragraph discussing why the *Go-ō* 牛王 (Ox king) ritual was sometimes called *Roku-ō* 鹿王 (Deer king) ritual: “Why is it called Deer king ritual? Because the Buddha Śākyamuni taught the Four Noble Truths...long ago in Deer Park, and thus established a bond with the body of the deer.” It is clear that the multifaceted symbolism of the deer was on the mind of many people during the medieval period. As for the issue of deer sacrifice raised later in the review, I can only ask the reviewer to read the *Goke shidai* 江家次第, in which it is stipulated that waterfowl were to replace deer offerings while pheasants would replace wild boar, and I also urge her to read YABUTA Kaichirō (1967), who suggests that deer were indeed sacrificed in early times at Kasuga. There are also the frequent cases of deer-skin offerings on the part of the Urabe sacerdotal lineage (INOUE 1980, p. 179). MIYAI Yoshio himself writes that deer and wild boar must have been customarily offered before various interdictions were enacted (1978, vol. 2, p. 47), although he does not state that these offerings took place at Kasuga. He does, however, leave the door open for speculation. If the reviewer allows herself to speculate on no basis whatsoever that the Fukūkensaku Kannon statue of the Nan'en-dō was covered with an actual deer skin (as she does in her article on “*Honji-suijaku* faith,” 1989, p. 236), then she should grant others the right to speculate.

Now to the rest of the translation of the passage in question. I was a little more than surprised to be accused of imagining words by someone who then merrily goes on to ignore the presence of the term *shū* 習 in the phrase *shin shū-i* 深習意 in the same text. The term *shū* is found with at least three meanings in the medieval period, but the reviewer does not seem to be aware of that fact. First, as a technical Buddhist term it refers to a type of causality; second, it refers to a secret transmission; and third, it refers to the combinatory practice, in which case it is found in a huge number of documents either alone or followed by the term *hō* 方 or *ji* 事. I thus translate *i* 意 as “rationale” (because that is the meaning the word had in sacerdotal circles—as in *Shintō dai-i* 神菊大意, which it would be wrong to translate as “the great meaning of Shinto”); I translate *shin* as “most profound,” and *shū* as “association,” opting for the third meaning of the term. This, naturally, does not explain why the

explanatory words “it was decided...” and “between the two divinities” are not in brackets, as they should have been *and* were in my original manuscript, and this is a matter causing me some grief. The only reason I can offer is that the original manuscript was typed on a mainframe computer and transferred onto a tape in ASCII format, which was then reformatted by university offices and put onto IBM floppy disks; when I looked at the text on my new machine, however, all punctuation and diacritical marks had disappeared, and every line of the 1,000-page document was separated from the following one by paragraph and other symbols, including brackets. I thus had to delete them all, and must have failed to replace some of the brackets. Be that as it may, one thing is sure in my mind: I do not invent medieval documents.

Native and foreign deities were associated, I maintain, on the basis of a rationale that deserves investigation at the semiotic level, if only because they were part of a social practice that swept across Japan and had a rather intricate history. The reviewer claims in her already-mentioned article (1989) that the *honji-suijaku* phenomenon is “based on an extremely simple concept” (p. 237). How could that be? *Honji-suijaku* was inscribed, and functioned within, a formidably complex epistemological realm embodied in a number of no less complicated institutions, and it is a study of the epistemology beginning with a study of the semiotic apparatus that was available to the people of the time, that will shed some light on the practice in question. A dominant aspect of the theory of signs used at the time was the predication of essential and formal resemblances, and much of the *honji-suijaku* rationale is to be found right there. The *Ōnakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en ra chūshinbun-sha* 大中臣時盛春日御社本縁等注進文寫 contained in *Shintō taikai*—to which I wish I had had access while studying in Japan—offers on page 18 a remarkably rich example of that modality of intellectual operation, as does some of my previously published work. I will leave judgment of this issue to readers more per-spicious than the reviewer.

The reviewer also takes issue with the date 859 (Jōgan 1) as having no special importance; this proves she has little knowledge of the political and institutional history of multiplexes, because if there was one turning point in the Heian period at large, this is it. Maybe she has never heard of the various coups the Fujiwara house engineered in order to enhance their political power over the imperial lineage; Fujiwara no Yoshifusa organized the first one in 859, and succeeded in placing his own grandchild on the throne (the emperor later known as Seiwa). It was for that occasion that he supported the creation of the Iwashimizu Hachiman multiplex, an institution that had significant effects on much of Japanese culture—but Tyler cannot grasp its centrality. The *Jōgan gishiki* was ordered during Yoshifusa’s tenure as regent, and that document is important in terms of the relations between some Buddhist circles and the imperial house in particular, and between them and shrines in general. The “corridor” issue is thus used by the reviewer to avoid analyzing the momentous events that occurred in the Jōgan era. If the reviewer had more than an exceedingly narrow definition of the term corridor in mind (the term does not refer to architectural features only, but to strips of

land, lanes, territorial features, and avalanche paths as well), she would not raise the issue to begin with. She is obviously concerned with the architectural features of the Kasuga Shrine—something I have nothing against—but she is equally ignorant of why the year 859 must be underscored. To her, the creation of multiplexes such as Yoshida and Iwashimizu, the elevation of the ranks of various shrines at the time, and many other features (including the addition of the Kasuga Shrine's main buildings—which are far more important than the corridor), are incidental and not to be thought of as evidence of shifts in practices and understandings at the highest levels of contemporary Japanese society.

In a similar vein, the reviewer does not seem to fathom the complexity of the Fujiwara (political) and Nakatomi (sacerdotal) structures I evidence in my comparison of the Hiraoka and Kasuga shrines; does she think that the orientation and order of the sanctuaries in those shrines are signs of a lack of intelligence on the part of those people? And what does the reviewer mean when she accuses me of “exhortation” (has she checked the meaning of the word)? The *Gen'yōki* quoted in *Kasuga jinja-ki kaisei* 春日神社記改正 (in *Shintō taikai*, *Jinja-hen* 13, NAGASHIMA 1985, p. 221) states that Fujiwara no Fuhito ordered that east-facing shrines be changed to face south; I personally think that decisions like that were reached on the basis of a rationality embedded in the System of Codes, and that the political leaders of the time took these issues quite seriously. Scholars of Chinese and Japanese architectural history, such as Nancy Shatzman STEINHARDT (e.g., 1991), indicate that spatial arrangements and ordering in relation to ritual were crucial.

I will not take time to discuss the issue of the *koto* instrument (Susan Tyler entertains the notion that no one can or is entitled to like some Japanese stories as much as she does), and simply recommend that the reviewer avail herself of INOUE Tatsuo's (1980) deeply researched book on sacerdotal lineages and their relationship to imperial legitimacy, already mentioned above; she will find there an interesting discussion of the importance of the *koto* for members of the Nakatomi sacerdotal lineage.

What I do find offensive in the review is not that entire pages are spent entirely on a specific type of details (I am not saying they are trivial or that I have not made mistakes—monkeys also fall from trees), but that the thesis and purport of the book are dealt with in one-liners and obloquies, a fact that suggests that my approach to the Kasuga cult is the real issue, because it is diametrically opposed to the approach taken by the reviewer in her own work. *Protocol* demonstrates that in the overall picture of Japanese history sites of cult such as the Kasuga-Kōfuku-ji multiplex were at least as important as individuals like Myōe or Hōnen; that “religious” institutions were predominantly economic and political powerhouses; and that the interplay of their ritual, political, and economic activities provides the best insight into cults as cultural systems. Had that not been the case, it is impossible to understand why the multiplex under consideration was for a significant period of time the governor and largest landholder of Yamato Province while it is today a group of separate entities that are a mere shadow of what they were in the past, or why Mount Hiei was destroyed during the Sengoku period, or why

the Ishiyama Honganji was subjected to a long siege and then razed. If, as the reviewer alleges, my model is (of all things!) ahistorical, what does she think I was doing when I examined the destruction of multiplexes during the Meiji period, a fact that nobody had ever analyzed in the West? I am showing precisely that history is of the essence. But she prefers to glance over that issue, hoping thereby to maintain her notion that the *honji-suijaku* phenomenon is a “faith,” and thus avoids problematizing it and suggesting, as I do, that it was an agonistic social practice. It is only by dirtying one’s hands and looking at the history of the diverse and competing social groups attached to shrines and temples that one can begin to see in the associations between buddhas and kami much more than religious belief or a simple trick, and can see them as a rationalization of relations of power that the *honji-suijaku* practice was trying to establish and maintain over the *longue durée*: sites of cult had everything to do with the production of social space. Susan Tyler’s unwillingness or inability to deal with this issue is what is lurking beneath the deleterious tone of her review. Furthermore, my insistence on lineages and economic practices—ignored by the majority of religious historians so far—prevents one from keeping the primacy of the subject as a privileged object of study, and it is clear that the reviewer does not wish or is unable to handle that topic either. I do not, as she claims, substitute “lineage” for “sect” or “family.” What I have shown in the book instead is that the term “sect” is mostly irrelevant in the case of Kasuga, and that the Kasuga cult had little to do with “family,” which was not even a Japanese concept or practice during the periods under consideration, but much to do with lineage. Nor do I present the Fujiwara house as “cartoon aristocrats”; that is a gratuitous smear. The truth is that I am not particularly impressed by princely abbots and their hold on positions of power that prevented many a good mind from reaching the higher echelons of the cultic site’s hierarchy. My analysis of Jinson’s world is anything but cartoonish: it suggests why the system functioned the way it did. It is those points that the reviewer refuses to consider, preferring instead to chicane and thus hope to detract attention from what is really at stake in my organization and interpretation of the material.

REFERENCES

[in addition to those cited in the review]

INOUE Tatsuo 井上辰雄

1980 *Kodai ōken to shūkyōteki bemin* 古代王権と宗教の部民. Tokyo: Kashiwa Shobō.

MORRELL, Robert

1982 Passage to India denied: Zeami’s *Kasuga Ryūjin*. *Monumenta Nipponica* 37: 179–200.

STEINHARDT, Nancy Shatzman

1991 The Mizong Hall of Qinglong Si. *Archives of Asian Art* XLIV.

TYLER, Susan

1989 *Honji suijaku* faith. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16: 227–50.

YABUTA Kaichirō 藪田嘉一郎

1967 *Kasuga shika mandara* 春日鹿曼陀羅. *Shintō bijutsu* 神術の美術 4: 1–25.

Allan G. Grapard

University of California, Santa Barbara

THE REVIEWER REPLIES:

This is not a dispute over “turf.” It is a disagreement over standards of academic research and argument. Grapard holds that his ideas and conclusions are more important than the evidence he cites to support them, and that their worth is not affected by my quibbles about precision. I, in contrast, hold that if conclusions are not supported by adequate evidence, no amount of repetition and imposing vocabulary can save them from being dubious.

This is why, for example, I objected to the clustering of events in 859 in *Protocol*. Although I am not unaware that the date itself is important in the history of the rise of the Fujiwara, many of the events that Grapard assigns in *Protocol* to this date are mentioned without citation, did not occur at that time, or, as far as one can tell, did not occur at all. Unverifiability is not irrelevant.

It is not nitpicking to ask that a concept should not control evidence. For example, if the word “white” does not occur in a text to describe the color of a deer, as it does not in the passages Grapard translated from *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki* or *Koshaki* 古社記 (26), he should not insert it because he intends “the medieval deer cult of Kasuga” to be understood as “overwhelmingly based on the...Chinese symbolism of the white deer.” Moreover, this symbolism is never mentioned in *Protocol*. Yes, the deer is described as white in *Shun'ya shinki*, which I used in my own work but which Grapard did not use in his. (Note that, throughout his rebuttal, Grapard seeks support from materials never cited in *Protocol*.) However, paintings show that there is no fundamental “whiteness” of the deer on which he may rely.

I have objected that Grapard’s use of both primary and secondary sources is unreliable. He continues to be inaccurate in his rebuttal (see, for example *Kōfuku-ji ranshō-ki*, p. 325). I do not have the space to discuss this in detail, but most telling is his complaint about the “issue of deer sacrifice raised later in [my] review.” It is telling first of all because that issue is not raised in my review but in someone else’s [see Richard Gardner’s review in *Monumenta Nipponica* 48 (1993), p. 521]. Since he mentions the matter, however, I will go through it. *Protocol* states (p. 78), without reference, that “In 1060 the Kōfuku-ji issued a prohibition against killing deer and other animals on the grounds of the cultic center, even if the killing was done for the purpose of making an offering to the kami.” Then, at the end of the paragraph, a note on another subject refers the reader to MIYAI (p. 380). The previous page in MIYAI (p. 379) mentions a Kōfuku-ji order, dated 1060, that the imperial envoy to the Kasuga matsuri, and his entourage, shall abstain from eating fish or fowl

while they are on Kōfuku-ji land; the order cites a prohibition, dated 862, against taking life within two *ri* 里 of the temple. It does not mention deer or deer sacrifices. Miyai (p. 47), to whom Grapard refers in his rebuttal, discusses a passage in *Gōke shidai*, but does not mention the 1060 document and also does not support the plausibility of the sacrifice of deer at Kasuga. Moreover, Grapard cites *Gōke shidai*, a source absent from *Protocol*, as though he, like Miyai, knows where this passage occurs. If he does, he could have given a page number. I have *Gōke shidai* on my desk, and it is 600 pages long.

My objections to *Protocol* do not prove that I am uninterested in the issues Grapard attempted to address in his book. They prove only that I do not believe Grapard has soberly addressed these issues. Since I may be the only reviewer of *Protocol* who has used some of the same sources and investigated some of the same questions as its author, it is my job to warn the reader to exercise care in accepting any evidence put forward in *Protocol* in support of the book's conclusions, and so to be skeptical about the book's conclusions themselves.

Susan Tyler