Japanese Journal of Religious Studies 38/1: 161–179

Mikaël Bauer

The Yuima-e as Theater of the State

This article analyzes a twelfth-century session of the Yuima-e at Kōfukuji as a stage of history to determine the institutional and factional background of its participants. In order to do this, the format of the Yuima-e as it was held in the twelfth century is presented, followed by a study of primary materials related to the 1196 session of this annual ritual. The article then examines the *Sanne jōichiki*, the personal notes of the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō, and diaries, to conclude that these sessions can indeed be considered "theaters of the state" in which the connection between Kuroda Toshio's concepts of *kenmon* and *kenmitsu taisei* can be found.

keywords: Kōfukuji—Yuima-e—Hossō—Kenmitsu Buddhism

Mikaël Bauer is a PhD candidate at Harvard University and researcher at the Catholic University of Louvain.

In his analysis on the relationship between Nara's Kōfukuji 興福寺 and mountain asceticism (Shugendō 修験道) in premodern Japan, Royall Tyler (1989, 174) points out that the great Buddhist institutions of Kōfukuji and Tōdaiji 東大寺 were primarily identified with the construct "Nara Buddhism" although the Buddhism practiced at these sites *after* the Nara period was still poorly understood. While several historians, basing their research mainly on the works of the late Japanese historian Kuroda Toshio, have since addressed the continuous political influence of these temples, or *kenmon* 権門 (gates of power) throughout the Heian (784–1185) and Kamakura (1185–1333) periods (Adolphson 2000), the doctrinal and institutional evolution of the "Nara Schools" throughout these eras has not been adequately addressed. Since the 1990s, Japanese scholars such as Ihara Kesao and Uejima Susumu have either challenged Kuroda in significant ways or, as in the case of Oishio Chihiro, have addressed individual exoteric-esoteric thinkers such as Kojima Shingyō 子島眞興 (934–1004) (Oishio 1995). However, it seems that the link between worldly power and Buddhist doctrine, in this case Kenmitsu Buddhism 顕密仏教 (exoteric-esoteric Buddhism), has remained largely overlooked by both Japanese and Western historians and buddhologists.

The goal of this article is to consider a particular ritual, the *Yuima-e* 維摩會 at Kōfukuji, as a stage of history in which sociopolitical players play their part, thus considering the composition of the ritual as a reflection of the society in which it was held. I will make use of primary sources that deal directly or indirectly with the ritual under consideration, and show that both the composition of its participants and the content of the ritual itself are no coincidence. This way, I hope to reconsider the link between the *kenmon* and its alleged ideological framework, exoteric-esoteric Buddhism. First, I will briefly introduce the format of the Yuima-e, and second, I will address a 1196 session of this ritual as recorded by the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1292).

The Yuima-e

It is said that Fujiwara no Kamatari 藤原鎌足 (614–669) established the Yuima-e in the seventh century after having recovered from illness. In the *Kōfukuji engi* (ke),[1] the courtier Fujiwara Yoshiyo 藤原良世 (823–900) describes the origins of the Yuima-e. According to this origin chronicle, Kamatari recovered from severe ill-

1. This text is also introduced in Horiike 1988,vol. 2, 195.

ness after a nun from the Korean Peninsula (Paekche) chanted the *Yuimagyō* (Skt. *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*).[2] While this story should be met with historical skepticism, it is beyond doubt that many other sources such as the *Yuima-e hyōbyaku* connect the beginning of the Yuima-e with the figure of Fujiwara no Kamatari (YH, 254). However, the very nature of this source (an *engi* or "origin chronicle") might not be historically accurate. In his article *Kōfukuji Yuima-e no jōritsu to sono tenkai*, UEDA Kōen (1980, 33–34) refers to Kamatari's devotion as the historical origin of the Yuima-e, a version also mentioned by Paul GRONER (2002, 129). Ueda bases his account on an analysis of several primary sources such as the *Seiji yōryaku* 政事要略 and the *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記. The close resemblance between these sources and the *Kōfukuji engi* mentioned here has indeed been pointed out by TAKAYAMA (1997, 64), but why should a Hossō temple prefer to lecture on the *Vimalakīrti Sutra* (a scripture *not* part of its traditional Hossō corpus) and organize around it a ritual in which the unity of the exoteric and the esoteric is symbolically expressed through the usage of a *Goshishi nyoi* 五師子如意[3] in the presence of an imperial emissary? In addition, there is the significant fact that the Yuima-e seems to have been discontinued for thirty years after Kamatari before being revived by his son Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659–720) (UEDA 1980, 36; GRONER 2002, 130). When reading later diaries such as the *Chūyūki* 中右記 written by the courtier Fujiwara no Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062–1141), one is immediately struck by the many references to ceremonies or sutra recitations focusing on the *Ninnōkyo* 仁王経 (Sutra of the Benevolent Kings, T nos. 245 and 246). As its title implies, this text addresses the concept of the Buddhist monarch and the values for governance of a Buddhist state (BKD 8: 384–85), a fact that explains why it was so often recited at the Retired Emperor's office.[4] So, if there was a need to incorporate esotericism into the ritual (as demonstrated by the *Goshishi nyoi* mentioned above), then why was the *Vimalakīrti* chosen? In addition, we should also note that the Yuima-e focused on *only one* scripture, and thus was different in nature and purpose in comparison to several other later established rituals such as the Daijō-e 大乗会 at Shirakawa's 白河 (1053–1129) Hosshōji in Kyoto (KAN 1994, 10).

The reason for choosing the *Vimalakīrti* might well be different from the one provided by Fujiwara no Yoshiyo. In order to find an answer it might be use-

2. This account is mentioned in both Japanese and Western scholarship (TAKAYAMA 1997, 63–64; HORIIKE 1988, 195; GRONER 2002, 129).

3. This ritual implement symbolizes both the exoteric and the esoteric. It is composed of two main parts: the *shishi* 師子 or "lion" stands for the exoteric, whereas the *sanko* 三鈷 or "trident" expresses the esoteric (MD 1968, 1734).

4. One only has to look at the *Chūyūki* entries of the second or the seventh month in which a so-called Benevolent King Gathering (*Ninnō-e* 仁王会) was held. For example: the entries for the second month of the years 1089, 1090, 1091, or for the seventh month of the years 1091 or 1094 (CYK 1965).

ful to look for clues in the period the *Kōfukuji engi* was written. Therefore, we now turn to the *Sanne jōichiki* for the years 850–900 to examine the different schools engaged in the actual ritual and its question-answer sessions. We find the lecturer belonged to Hossō in thirty-three cases, Sanron in nine, Kegon in eight, and Tendai in one case. Shingon is not included in the list, which might lead one to conclude erroneously that Shingon monks were mainly excluded.[5] However, the example of the (Tōdaiji) Hossō *and* Tōji monk Sanshū 三修 (SJ, 6), lecturer in 894, suggests otherwise. Later cases such as Kojima Shingyō[6] or the better-known fourth abbot of Tōji, Jōshō 定昭 (906–983),[7] show that many high ranking Hossō clerics were equally ordained in the Shingon tradition (TCB, 646–712), thus combining an exoteric and an esoteric lineage. A reading of the *Sanne jōichiki* and the commentary written by a monk who acted as lecturer of the Yuima-e might provide us an alternative answer as to why the *Vimalakīrti* was chosen. In his *Personal Notes on the Truth of the One Vehicle* (*Ichijō gi shiki* 一乗義私記) Kojima Shingyō, lecturer at the Yuima-e in 1003 (SJ, 302), addresses the relationship between the exoteric and the esoteric by referring to the *Hokkekyō* 法華経 (*Lotus Sutra,* Skt. *Saddharma puṇḍarīka sūtra,* T 262) and the *Shōmangyō* 勝鬘経 (The Sutra of Queen Srīmālā of the Lion's Roar, Skt. *Srīmālādevī sūtra,* T 353) (IGS, 163). Why would he, as a "Nara monk" and founder of the Kojima lineage, center of combined Hossō-Shingon thought (ABE 1999, 427), discuss the *Shōmangyō* in his definition of the categories "exoteric" and "esoteric"? The answer is that he selected scriptures that belonged to the corpus of his opponent and intended to excel in his opponent's specialty. We should not forget that the "debate" was an integral part of the Yuima-e and that it was of great importance to do well and "win" over one's opponent. The presence of the *Vimalakīrti* and the *Śrīmālā Sutra* in a Hossō context thus clearly shows that its main doctrinal

5. A combinatory study of the *Sanne jōichiki*, the *Kōfukuji bettō shidai* and the *Tōji chōja bunin* 東寺長者補任 would explicitly confirm that many Hossō monks who became lecturer of the three gatherings and entered the Sōgō belonged to the Shingon lineage as well, as exemplified by many Kōfukuji monks combining their positions with the head abbotship of Tōji.

6. "At the age of fourteen, in Tenryaku three (949), he lived at Kōfukuji in Nara. After having terminated the study of the basic teachings, he entered the golden light of the secret teachings of Shingon and studied with the priest Ninga of mount Yoshino…" (KKE, 41). The lineage between Ninga 仁賀 and Shingyō is shown from Mahāvairocana through Kūkai and finally till Ninga and Shingyō in the *Kechimyaku ryuijūki* 血脈類集記. The same source mentions that Shingyō passed the teachings to eleven disciples. The fact that Ninga also resided at Kōfukuji illustrates that many Kōfukuji monks were Shingon clerics, complicating a correct interpretation of the *Sanne jōichiki*.

7. Tomabechi Seiichi summarizes Jōshō's career based on a comparative study of the *Kōfukuji bettō shidai*, the *Tōji chōja bunin*, and related sources. Jōshō received the Abhiseka 伝法灌頂 in 964 from Kangū 寛空 at Rendaiji 蓮台寺 at age fifty-nine, two years after he had been lecturer at the Yuima-e (TOMABECHI 2003, 386–92).

opponent was the Sanron school, placing this part of Japanese Buddhist history in the larger context of East Asian Buddhism and its inherent doctrinal conflict between Madhyāmika (Sanron) and Yogācāra (Hossō). This is a fact clearly illustrated by the main Chinese commentaries on this text by Jízàng 吉藏 (549–623) of the San-lun (Sanron) school and Kuījī 窺基 (632–682) of the Fǎxiàng (Hossō) school (WAYMAN and WAYMAN 1973, 10). This is substantiated by one of the main issues of the *Śrīmālā Sutra*, the Tathāgatagarbha theory ("womb of the Buddha"; Jp. *nyoraizō* 如来蔵), a conceptual framework centering around the notion that all sentient beings have the inherent capability of realizing buddhahood, in clear contrast to the Hossō school's emphasis on the *ālayavijñāna* (storehouse consciousness, 阿頼耶識) and its stance on particular beings' exclusion of enlightenment (the *icchantika* theory).

Thus, a centuries-old doctrinal dispute is transmitted to a heavily institutionalized ritual, as participation was a necessary prerequisite for monks to advance to the Ministry of Monastic Affairs (Sōgō 僧綱). In other words, it was necessary for Hossō monks to apply Hossō's specialty—logic (*inmyō* 因明)—to typical Sanron scriptures in debates, and by doing so excel over their opponents. For this reason, the Yuima-e centers around the *Vimalakīrti*. The opposition between Hossō and Sanron in a ritual in which knowledge of the exoteric-esoteric is displayed illustrates well the necessity to redefine "Kenmitsu" in relation to Kōfukuji into "Hossō-Mikkyō" and "Sanron-Mikkyō," two different lineages with corresponding factions, monastic institutions, and doctrinal strife to which I will return below in my analysis of a specific Yuima-e session. By the middle of the Heian period, when the Yuima-e's ritual function of "judge" (*tandai* 探題) is by decree reserved for the Kōfukuji abbot,[8] Hossō will also institutionally dominate the ritual while focusing on its adversaries' doctrinal specialty. It is here in the depths of commentaries such as Shingyō's, or debate preparations such as Sōshō's (see below), that institutional and doctrinal history became intrinsically linked. In this light, the choice of the *Vimalakīrti Sutra* as a topic of discussion for a Hossō ritual might seem more plausible than the sickness of Kamatari. While one could indeed argue that the format of the Yuima-e developed significantly over time, one cannot deny the fact that the doctrinal (and in extension institutional)

8. The *Sanne jōichiki* mentions that the combined position of "Kōfukuji Abbot-judge" started in the first year of Ōwa (961) when Engū 延空 held the position and the Sanron monk Anshin 安進 of Gangōji became lecturer at age fifty-two. Of note here is that the doctrinal opposition Sanron vs. Hossō translates in the institutional opposition Gangōji vs. Kōfukuji; see the entry for the first year of Ōwa (SJ, 299). The KBS mentions that Engū, resident of Kōfukuji's Saitōin, became abbot in 961, and had been lecturer of the Yuima-e in 948 at age fifty-nine (KBS, 5). Interestingly, Anshin, Engū's "opponent," in fact replaced the Hossō monk Chōshu 長守 of Kōfukuji who had died after having been appointed (and his position thus had been taken by the opposing Sanron faction). *Sōgō bunin* 僧剛補任 and *Yuimaekōshi kengaku shidai* 維摩會講師研学次第, in DNS vol. 1/10, 920.

oppositions found in Kojima Shingyōs writings (late ninth century) interestingly are the same as those found in the scriptures mentioned in the well known *Nihon shoki*[9] for the reign of Empress Suiko 推古 (592–628).

Yuima-e Format

First, one should realize that the Yuima-e was part of the larger whole of *Hōe* 法会 (Dharma gatherings). It was one of twelve Kōfukuji gatherings and one of the three so-called *Sanne* 三会 (three gatherings) whose lectureship was a necessity to advance to the Office of Monastic Affairs (Sōgō). These three were considered of utmost importance and consisted of the Yuima-e, the *Misai-e* 御斎会, and the *Saishō-e* 最勝会 (Kusunoki 2001, 137). An examination of the *Sanne jōichiki*, the *Bettō shidai*, or Sōshō's notes, confirms the established insight that those who had a successful monastic career had to act as lecturer for all three of these rituals. The case of Sōshō himself illustrates this well: after having entered Tōdaiji at age thirteen in 1214, he became Gon-Risshi 權律師 at forty in 1241, indicating that he had by then completed the requirement of having served at all three (Hiraoka 1958, 539).[10] His notes and preparations on the discussion sessions of these three rituals show their importance for his monastic career. The actual broader context of the entire examination system in connection with the Misai-e and the Saishō-e exceeds the goal of this article and would require an entire study in itself. As has been mentioned by Groner in connection with the audience present at the ritual, what is important to us is that the shifts in the actual composition of the participants reflects "The transition of the Yuima-e from a private into a public ceremony" (Groner 2002, 132).

Second, the Yuima-e was not one monolithic event but consisted of several types of debates, these being the "lecture-question debates" (*Kōmon rongi* 講問論義), the "candidate debates" (*Ryūgi rongi* 竪義論義), and the "alternating debates for the imperial emissary" (*Chokushibōban rongi* 勅使坊番論義) (Takayama 1997, 83), a structure that seems to have been fixed from the latter half of the Heian period but changed from the fourteenth century on (Takayama 1997, 68).

The analysis below will be based on monastic primary sources such as the documents of Sōshō of Tōdaiji, the "Appointments of the Ministry of Monastic Affairs,"[11] the "Record of Appointments of the Three Gatherings"[12] and the

9. The *Nihon shoki* states that in the seventh month of 606, Empress Suiko instructed regent Shōtoku Taishi to lecture on the *Shōmangyō* and that she rejoiced in him having lectured on the *Hokkekyō* in the same year.

10. Sōshō became lecturer at the Yuima-e in 1239. It is indicated that Sōshō of Tōdaiji from the Kegon school, residing at Sonshōin 尊勝院, was the lecturer (SJ 340, entry for Enō 1 延應元年; 1239).

11. *Sōgō Bunin*, DNB, vol. 123, 61–288.

12. *Sanne Jōichiki*, DNB, vol. 123, 289–432.

"Order of Kōfukuji Abbots."[13] By using non-monastic sources such as diaries or government documents, the ritual will be approached from its doctrinal, political, and social actors. First I would like to briefly introduce the actual format of the Yuima-e. Apart from my own reading of the *Yuima-e hyōbyaku* 維摩会表白 from 1247,[14] this abbreviated overview also draws from the meticulous scholarship of NAGAMURA (2000) and TAKAYAMA (1997).

On the first day, the Yuima-e is introduced by the imperial emissary. Holding a text, he reads out loud the more "practical" issues such as the conferred positions and replacements, followed by an opening statement (*kaibyaku* 開白) in front of the central statue of the Buddha (*honzon* 本尊). Following the abbot (*bettō* 別当) of Kōfukuji, the officially designated audience (*chōshū* 聴衆)—forty monks from the year 900 onwards (GRONER 2002, 132)—line up with the imperial emissary to eventually arrive at the Lecture Hall. Thereupon this audience enters the hall, while the imperial emissary, the head of the Fujiwara Clan, and the abbot take their places in seats in front of the hall. After having performed vows, the audience is seated in four rows to the left of the central image of worship. The lecturer (*kōshi* 講師) and the reader (*dokushi* 読師) then take their places on high seats in front of the central image of the Buddha. Interestingly, the monks seated in these four rows are lined up in order of importance, thus representing the monastic and, as most of them were from the high nobility, worldly hierarchy. In connection with Groner's statement mentioned earlier that the number of people in the audience reflects a shift from private to public function, it is clear that an analysis of the participants and the audience's position within the ritual could provide us with a clear sense of the sociopolitical sphere from a new angle.

The schedule of the following six days is identical. In the morning and the evening a lecture and debate session is held but while the actual lecture is the same for both sessions, the evening part ends with a debate in which the disputator, *rissha* 竪者, having taken his place on the high seat, reads and answers questions as prepared by the judge, who likewise has taken his place on the other high seat. The imperial emissary changed seating as well, moving now to the inside of the Lecture Hall. The disputator now attempts to answer five questions, previously prepared by the judge. These question-answer parts are followed by criticism formulated by the examiner, *shōgisha* 精義者,[15] and approval or disapproval by the judge. After this session the day ends, a procedure that is the same for the first six days of the Yuima-e. The judge undoubtedly was in control

13. *Kōfukuji bettō shidai*, DNB, vol. 124, 1–60.

14. This text and other related Kōfukuji documents are printed in the appendix to TAKAYAMA 1997.

15. Literally "Those whose mastery of doctrine was detailed" (GRONER 2002, 132).

FIGURE 1. The Yuima-e's debating participants flanked by the four rows of the official audience and the imperial emissary (from the *Kasuga gongen genki* 春日権現験記, items 11-012 and 11-013; courtesy of the National Diet Library).

of the Yuima-e from the moment his function became reserved for Kōfukuji's abbot from the middle of the Heian period when abbot Engū 延空 combined both positions in 961 (SJ, 299).

However, the order of the sixth day is different. After the usual morning session is over, a different session starts immediately. Having encircled the Lecture Hall, the imperial emissary, the reader, and the audience are seated on seats in front of the Golden Hall, where a ritual is held assessing the merit of monks and the (symbolic) granting of yearly ordinands. After this session, a ceremony directed at the imperial emissary is held, and the "alternating debates" (*chokushibō banrongi* 勅使坊番論議) take place. These sessions took place at either the residence of the abbot, in case he resided in one of the imperial residence temples (*monzeki* 門跡), or at the imperial emissary's residence. Seven pairs of discussions took place, after which the sixth day ended.

While lecturer and reader take their places again during the two sessions on the seventh and final day, no discussions take place during this last part. Concluding vows are performed, and the first ten members (*isshō chōshu* 一床聴衆) of the following year's Yuima-e and the outgoing judge are discussed. The present year's first ten members address the position of the following year's lecturer, which is then decided by "personal voice" (*sasayaki* 私語). Seated in the *Hosodono* 細殿 hall, the members of the Fujiwara clan, the imperial emissary, and the abbot's officials put food offerings in front of the abbot's seat.

The following Yuima-e session examined in this article is drawn from the records of the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō as edited by Hiraoka Jōkai in 1960. Born as the son of Fujiwara no Takakane 藤原隆兼 (?–?), Sōshō entered Tōdaiji in 1214 at age thirteen (TSS, 3) and became Great Master of the Dharma, Daihōshi 大法師, in 1220 (TSS, 537). He took the position of lecturer at the Yuima-e in 1239, the following year at the Saishō-e (TSS, 537), and was promoted to Hōin Gon Daisōzu 法印權大僧都 in 1249 (TSS, 549). His assembled writings are of great importance for the study of Tōdaiji and Kōfukuji rituals and debates, as he took meticulous notes in order to prepare for them. Apart from Yuima-e related materials, he gathered information on many other events such as the *Kongōmyō-e banrongi* 金光明会番論議, the *Hoshōji go-hakkō* 法勝寺御八講, and the *Seshin kō* 世親講.

Imperial emissary: Middle Controller of the Left Fujiwara Chikatsune 藤原親経
Lecturer: Gon-Shōsōzu Ryōen 良円 *from Kōfukuji, Hossō.*

First Day-Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Kankō 寛幸 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

First Day-Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Ryūyū 隆祐 *from Tōdaiji, Hossō.*

Second Day—Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Gyōin 行伊 *from Yakushiji, Hossō.*

Second Day—Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Shūe 秀恵 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

Third Day—Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Egyō 恵経 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

Third Day—Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Jūki 重喜 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

Fourth Day—Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Shōzen 聖詮 *from Tōdaiji, Kegon.*

Fourth Day—Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Kanzen 寛詮 *from Tōdaiji, Kegon.*

Fifth Day—Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Hankaku 範覚 *from Yakushiji, Hossō.*

Fifth Day—Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Raie 頼恵 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

Sixth Day—Morning Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Hankaku 範覚 *from Yakushiji, Hossō.*

Sixth Day—Evening Session
Questioner: Great Master of the Dharma Raie 頼恵 *from Tōdaiji, Sanron.*

Kenkyū 7 (1196) (TSS 407)

In order to interpret the Yuima-e session provided above, it is necessary to contextualize the major participants and examine not just what is present, but also what is absent in comparison to other sessions. The two main issues to be examined are the background of the imperial emissary and the lecturer, and the institutions behind the participants.

Imperial Emissary and Middle Controller 左中辨 of the Left Fujiwara Chikatsune (1151–1210) took on this function for the first time in 1168 when he held the position of Lesser Controller of the Right, and he would end up doing so six times in his career (TAKAYAMA 1997, 367). It was not unusual, in other words, to be appointed several times in one's lifetime. His father Fujiwara no Toshitsune 藤原俊経 (1113– 1191) took on this role twelve times between 1160 and 1173, and Fujiwara no Sanemitsu 藤原実光 (1069–1147) took it on eleven years in a row (1121–1131) (TAKAYAMA 1997, 363–66). Chikatsune appears for the first time in the *Kugyō bunin* in 1200, four years after his role as imperial emissary. He was appointed Fourth Lower Rank Advisor in 1200 (KB, 1934–1939) two years after he acted as a lay official of Kōfukuji's library (*Goshodokoro no bettō* 後書所別当), and having been appointed *In-no-bettō* 院別当 in 1198, head of the Fujiwara bureaucratic center Kangaku-in 勧学院. He was the second son of Fujiwara Toshitsune who, as mentioned above, acted many times as imperial emissary himself and entered a temple afterwards, probably Kōfukuji or one of its branch temples. It is

therefore theoretically possible that while his son took his position at the Yuima-e, he was among the monks of its host institution, possibly even in the officially designated audience of the ritual. This situation shows that it would be a mistake to see the (Fujiwara) nobility and the clergy as two distinct categories as the same person could spend one half of his life as a bureaucrat, and the other as a monastic, thus illustrating the complicated web of bureaucratic and monastic factions.

Lecturer Ryōen was the son of Fujiwara (Kujō) Kanezane 藤原兼實 (1149–1207) (SJ, 327), author of the diary *Gyokuyō* 玉葉. An examination of his family relationship yields an interesting result: at a certain point, father and son were monks at the same time, the former belonging to Kōfukuji and the latter to Hosshōji, as Kanezane became a monastic there in 1202 (DNS 4: 9, 366). This family combination becomes even more intriguing when we take into consideration that Kanezane's brother—and thus Ryōen's uncle—was Shin'en 信円 (1153–1224), a monk who had also been head abbot of Kōfukuji *and* Kinpusen 金峰山, the mountain temple it competed with in the eleventh century.[16] Ryōen himself became lecturer at age nineteen, and Kōfukuji abbot in 1207 (DNS 4: 9, 490), and died in that function in 1219 thus having witnessed the reconstruction of Kōfukuji after its destruction by the Taira three decades earlier. As by this time the Kōfukuji abbot was automatically assigned the role of judge at the Yuima-e, this means that he should have acted in this function during his tenure as abbot. Interestingly however, he took this position only one time, the year of his death (SJ, 334), while his predecessor, Abbot Ga'en 雅縁, had taken the position automatically as usual.[17] Ryōen resided at Ichijōin, next to Daijōin one of Kōfukuji's two major Imperial Residence Temples or *monzeki* 門跡.

The judge of this session was, as usual, the Abbot of Kōfukuji, Hangen 範玄 (SJ, 327), who had also been the abbot of Hōryuji since 1191 (DNS 4: 3, 679). The Ryūgi were Yūshin 有信, age fifty-one, Chōshun 長俊, and Son'ei 尊永. Tōdaiji was represented by Jitsuen 實淵 and Gyōchū 行忠. This composition clearly shows the overwhelming Kōfukuji-Tōdaiji presence at the ritual.

But how would the above composition of the Yuima-e represent the political situation of its day? First, several conclusions are immediately apparent. Imperial emissary Fujiwara no Chikatsune would become a monk later in his career while at the same time his son was a higher ranking Kōfukuji monk, a situation that clearly shows how closely connected noble government bureaucrats and

16. Shin'en resided at Ichijōin and became lecturer at the Yuima-e in 1172. The text also mentions that Kanezane's and Shin'en's father also entered Hosshōji (KBS, 24–25). He was the student of Jinpan 尋範 (SJ, 322). For recent work on Kinpusen see BLAIR 2008.

17. Abbot Ga'en actually took the position for the first time in 1198 as vice-abbot after Abbot Hangen was unable to continue his position. Hangen became abbot the following year, in 1199 (SJ, 327; KID, 62).

clerics were. Also, a comparison of the years 901–910 and 1187–1196 shows that the average age for the Yuima-e lecturer was sixty-five in the former case and thirty-six in the latter, illustrating the already established insight that young sons of higher nobility were strategically "placed" at monastic centers by the era of this particular Yuima-e session. By looking at whose children held the position of abbot or lecturer, one thus gains insight into the power relations of the higher bureaucracy.

However, a less obvious observation concerns the lecturer Ryōen and in particular the fact that his father was Kujō Kanezane. His position as lecturer in 1196 and his father entering Hosshōji shortly thereafter in 1202 might be explained as an expression of the aftermath of the complicated factional strife that characterized the five preceding decades. In 1151, when Shirakawa's 白河 (1072–1086) grandson Toba 鳥羽 (r. 1107–1123) made Fujiwara no Tadamichi the regent (Kanpaku 関白) and Fujiwara Yorinaga the *Nairan* 内覧 (imperial examiner), a position close in power to the regent, two factions initially developed within the Fujiwara clan, thus reinforcing factional strife within the regent's line (*sekkanke* 摂関家) (Motoki 1996, 171–77). One faction was formed by the tonsured Tadazane 忠実 (1078–1162) and his son Yorinaga 頼長 (1120–1156) against Tadazane's other son Tadamichi 忠通 (1097–1164); and Bifuku Mon'in 美福門院 (1117–1160), originally belonging to the large Zuryō line of the Fujiwara no Sueshige 藤原末茂流 and close to the retired emperor (Motoki 1996, 59).

We cannot go into the entire situation that led to the Hōgen and Heiji disturbances of 1156 and 1159 following this factionalism, but it is important to realize that Yorinaga became estranged from Kōfukuji and that Kujō Kanezane was Tadamichi's son. From 1152 to 1153 Yorinaga sent imperial police captains (*kebiishi* 検非違使; taken from Adolphson 2000, 90) to Kōfukuji in order to control its followers, which estranged him from the temple. When Taira no Kiyomori 平清盛 (1118–1181) then aligned himself with Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's faction to which Tadamichi belonged, capital politics would from then on be dominated by their faction. After the demise of the Taira several decades later, when Kanezane's son became lecturer of the Yuima-e and his father entered Hosshōji, we see the remnants of the previous conflicts. The Kujō line (direct from Tadamichi) then still controlled the Southern Rituals, based on "intra-Ritsuryō" temples[18] (institutions founded under the body of law adapted in the eighth century), through the Yuima-e. Kanezane entering Hosshōji could be interpreted as having a presence in the "extra Ritsuryō" temples. Interestingly, if this is a pattern, this would extend the Ritsuryō vs. non-Ritsuryō opposition, a characteristic for the later Heian period, into the following Kamakura age, thus raising again the question of periodization. In addition, we should note that

18. The terms "intra-" versus "extra-" Ritsuryō are taken from Abe 1999, 367–70.

these extra Ritsuryō monasteries, such as Hosshōji, where Kanezane entered, or Onjōji where he sponsored the construction of the buildings, were both esoteric in nature, exemplifying the theory that "the spread of Esoteric Buddhism seems to have directly contributed and accelerated, rather than been induced by, the process of the disintegration of the Ritsuryō system…" (ABE 1999, 367).

Returning to the larger context of the Yuima-e session of 1196, interestingly documents mention that Kanezane built Daijōin at Mudōji located at Enryakuji for Fujiwara no Kiyoko 藤原聖子 (1121–1182) who took the name *Kōka-mon'in* 皇嘉門院 when entering the palace in 1150 (TK, vol. II, 16). Whether or not pious reasons were present, both Hosshōji, where he entered, and Mudōji at Mount Hiei where he founded the Daijōin (DNS 4: 17, 103), belonged under the Tendai umbrella. This way the line from Tadamachi to Kanezane kept its presence at Kōfukuji, the Yuima-e, and the Southern Rituals on the one hand (where no Tendai monks participated anymore by this time), and Tendai on the other. The Tendai side of the story can be even further refined. Keeping in mind the Onjōji -Enryakuji conflict, Kanezane might have attempted three things: to keep his line's presence in Kōfukuji and the Yuima-e through his son Ryōen; to influence Enryakuji through the establishment of Daijōin at Enryakuji; and by keeping Fujiwara's influence at Hosshōji—the branch temple of Enryakuji's rival Onjōji—by retiring there as a monk after he resigned as prime minister.

While the background of the imperial emissary and the lecturer thus provides information regarding the political context in which the ritual operated, the composition of the questioners during the debates, the factions, and/or the temples they belonged to likewise are an expression of the sociopolitical matrix of which the composition of the ritual is an expression. However, it is in the content of the debates, or the commentaries that served as their preparation, that the link between doctrine and politics can be found.

In 1196, the composition of the question-answer sessions was as follows: out of twelve sessions, nine were from Tōdaiji: six from Sanron, two from Kegon, and one from Hossō. Three were Hossō monks from Yakushiji. Other examples from Yuima-e sessions from the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries reveal similar compositions. In 1174 (TSS, 402), lecturer Jōsen 勝詮 from Kōfukuji was confronted nine times by a Sanron monk from Tōdaiji, and two times by a Hossō monk from Yakushiji. Also, in the Yuima-e session of 1224 (TSS, 425) in which Sōshō participated, Hossō monk lecturer Kenshin 賢信 from Kōfukuji (SJ, 335) was confronted four times by a Sanron Monk from Tōdaiji, four times by a Kegon monk from Tōdaiji, and twice by a Hossō monk from Yakushiji. It can clearly be seen that Enryakuji and Tendai monks are absent from the Yuima-e by this time, as they now participated in the Three Northern Rituals initiated by Shirakawa. This alternative route to the Ministry of Monastic Affairs centered around the Daijō-e (大

乗会) at Hosshōji 法勝寺,[19] a temple founded as an apparent attempt by Shirakawa to suppress Fujiwara Michinaga's earlier Hōjōji 法成寺 (Motoki 2002, 16).

We should realize that in the session presented (and likewise in 1174 and 1224), a Hossō-Kegon opposition is apparent, and that those participating Sanron monks resided at Tōdaiji. In 904, the monk Shōbō 聖宝 founded the Tōnan'in 東南院 on Tōdaiji premises and made it a center for the combined study of Sanron and Shingon. The *Sanne jōichiki* mentions in several instances that the Yuima-e lecturer, despite being a Hossō monk from Kōfukuji, resided in this Tōnan'in as well. Juxtaposed to the fact that many Hossō monks took positions at Tōji, we can now discern a pattern of Kōfukuji placing monks at the center of Sanron-Mikkyō at Tōdaiji on the one hand, and Hossō-Mikkyō at Tōji on the other. Since many Tōdaiji abbots were taken from the Tōnan'in, and many Hossō monks at Tōji became abbot there, we can now discern a power network centering around Kōfukuji. There are many examples of Kōfukuji monks holding important positions, and some even became abbots at Tōji. Guse 救世 (890–973) of Kōfukuji underwent Shingon initiation, and became abbot of Tōji in 965 (Tomabechi 2003, 412–14). He was a contemporary of the better-known Kōfukuji monk Jōshō, son of Fujiwara no Morotada 藤原師尹 (920–969), who became lecturer at the Yuima-e in 962, abbot of Kōfukuji in 971, abbot of Kinpusen in 978, and finally abbot of Kongōbuji and Tōji as well in 979 (Tomabechi 2003, 386–92).

An examination of the composition of several Yuima-e sessions in the years surrounding his lectureship points to attempts by Enryakuji to infiltrate the Yuima-e and thus achieve monastic and political promotion. While Enryakuji is completely absent from the 1196 example (due to the creation of the Northern Rituals), Enryakuji monks were appointed lecturer during Jōshō's lifetime, namely in 955, 963, 967, 977, and 990.[20] If one adds the presence of Sanron Tōdaiji's monks—presumably connected to Tōnan'in and/or Gangōji 元興寺 as it is there they would specialize in Esoteric Buddhism—the picture becomes one of heightened monastic strife. Indeed, in Jōshō's time, Sanron monks from either Tōdaiji or Gangōji were appointed lecturer seven times.[21]

19. Not to be confused with Hosshōji 法性寺, the branch temple of Onjōji.

20. The Tendai lecturers at these dates were Bōzan 房算, age fifty-seven; Zengei 禅藝, age sixty-two; Zenyu 禅愉, age fifty-nine; Ungen 運源, age forty-six; and Keiun 慶雲, age fifty-three (SJ, 298–301).

21. Byōei 平叡, age sixty-eight, in 957; Anshin 安進, age fifty-two, in 961; Hōen 法縁, age sixty-three, in 969 (interestingly replacing an earlier appointed Enryakuji monk); Engei 圓藝, age sixty-six, in 970; Hōren 法蓮, age sixty-five, in 974; Zenbi 禅微, age sixty-eight, in 978; and Chōryū 長隆, age sixty-five, in 981 (SJ, 298–301).

In this session of 1196, the presence of Hossō and Sanron monks, and the absence of Enryakuji monks, shows us the reality of the competition between the Northern and Southern Rituals, the persistence of the *kenmon* (thus downplaying the value of 1185 and the Kamakura period as an important turning point), and the opposition between intra- and extra-Ritsuryō temples. At the core of these issues lies not only a ritual in which the exoteric-esoteric is displayed, but the actual "Kenmitsu" can here be further refined in Sanron-Shingon vs. Hossō-Shingon, reminding us of the larger East Asian doctrinal opposition between Madhyāmika (Sanron) and Yogācāra (Hossō).

How did these conflicts between monastic institutions translate into doctrinal issues? To answer this question, we can refer to the notes and commentaries written by monks in order to prepare themselves for the Yuima-e lectureship or to instruct their disciples to improve their debating skills. Examples of these are found in Sōshō's writings, and that he saw it necessary to write down information concerning the Yuima-e passed down through his teacher, Bengyō 辨暁. In his notes his interest in Hossō, Sanron, and Esoteric Buddhism as a Kegon monk from Tōdaiji's Sonshōin 尊勝院 (SJ, 340) is apparent. Just like Tōnan'in, this Sonshōin was located in proximity of Kōfukuji on Tōdaiji's premises, but while the former focused on Sanron and Shingon, the latter was a center for the study of Kegon. The fact that every evening *dhāraṇī* were chanted to Dainichi 大日 and Sonshō 尊勝 in addition to reciting the *Sutra of Benevolent Kings* next to the *Perfection of Wisdom* (TSS, 99) clearly shows its Kegon-esoteric character. For example, notes from the year 1240 show Sōshō's actions in both the Northern and Southern Rituals and his participation in debates and rituals of his "adversaries," Kegon (Tōnan'in at Tōdaiji) and Hossō, centering around the mastery of exoteric-esoteric Buddhism. In the first month of 1240, he authored the "Record of Question and Answer of the Misaie and the Saishōe" and was present at the Yuima-e (Southern Route) in the tenth month (TSS, 18 and 31), while he had participated in the "Eight Lectures of Hōsshōji" (Northern Route) in the seventh month. In the second month of the same year, he authored "Record of Tōnan'in" (the other exoteric-esoteric faction within Tōdaiji centering around Sanron), and in the twelfth month notes of both the "Eight Lectures of Tōnan'in" and the "Thirty Lectures of the Sanron School" (TSS, 41). Finally, he acted as lecturer at the Shōman-e 勝鬘會 at Hōryūji 法隆寺 in the eleventh month (TSS, 38).

This ritual is mentioned here as it displays the Hossō-Sanron relationship in the same manner as Kōfukuji's choice of the *Vimalakīrti Sutra* as ritual topic. As pointed out above in the context of Kojima Shingyō's commentaries, the *Shōmangyō* is taken from the Sanron repertoire and became the topic of debate at a Hossō temple. Questions and answers raised in this smaller ritual would clearly have prepared Sōshō better for the Three Southern Rituals.

Conclusion

The introduction to this article stated that its objective was to consider a 1196 Yuima-e session as a stage of history. By looking at the topics of discussion, temple affiliations, and family background of the participants of this ritual, I have shown that we are dealing with "theaters of the state"[22] on which the main players of the socio-historical context are represented. By looking at doctrinal conflicts apparent in the composition of the participating monks, or as addressed in their preparations, it has become clear that the link between Kuroda's *kenmon* and *kenmitsu* is to be found within the ritual itself. While acknowledging the value of the *kenmitsu* model, it has been stressed that the *kenmitsu taisei* theory needs to be thoroughly reformulated by making the distinction between Hossō-Shingon on the one hand and Sanron-Shingon on the other.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

BKD *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大辞典. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1974–1988.

CYK *Chūyūki* 中右記. Zōhō Shiryō Taisei, vols. 9–15. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.

DNB *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912.

DNS *Dai Nihon shiryō* 大日本史料. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjō, 1926–.

IGS *Ichijō gi shiki* 一乗義私記. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 20. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912.

KB *Kugyō bunin* 公卿補任. Kokushi Taikei, vol. 53. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1934–1939.

KBS *Kōfukuji bettō shidai* 興福寺別当次第. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 124. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912.

KE *Kōfukuji engi* 興福寺縁起. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912.

KGE *Kōfukuji garan engi* 興福寺伽藍縁起. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū, vol. 27/2. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1930.

KID *Kōfukuji inge den* 興福寺院家伝. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 124. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.

22. I took the term here from Moerman 2005, 139–80, who uses this concept when referring to Clifford Geertz.

KKE *Kojimasan Kangakuji engi* 子島山勸覚寺縁起. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.

KR *Kōfukuji ryūki* 興福寺流記. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 123. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912.

MD *Mikkyō daijiten* 密教大辞典. Tokyo: Hōzōkan, 1968.

SB *Sōgō bunin* 僧綱補任. Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 123. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.

SDN *Shichi daiji nenpyō* 七大寺年表. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū, vol. 27/1. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1930.

SJ *Sanne jōichiki* 三会定一記 . Dai Nihon Bukkyō Zensho, vol. 123. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai.

T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経. 100 vols. Ed. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.

TCB *Tōji chōja bunin* 東寺長者補任. Zoku Gunsho Ruijū, vol. 3. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1930.

TK *Taiki* 台記. Shiryō Taisei, vol. II. Kyōto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.

TSS *Tōdaiji Sōshō Shōnin no kenkyū narabini shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人之研究並史料. ed. Hiraoka Jōkai 平岡定海. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, 1958–1960.

YH *Yuima-e hyōbyaku* 維摩会表百. In Takayama 1997, appendix.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abe Ryūichi

1999 *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Adolphson, Mikael S.

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

Blair, Heather

2008 Peak of Gold: Trace, Place and Religion in Heian Japan. PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.

Ford, James

2006 *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geertz, Clifford

1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Grapard, Allan G.

1992 *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Groner, Paul
2002 *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hérail, Francine
2006 *La Cour et l'Administration du Japon à l'époque de Heian*. Genève: Librarie Droz.

Hiraoka Jōkai 平岡定海
1958 *Tōdaiji Sōshō shōnin no kenkyū narabi ni shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人之研究並史料. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai.

Horiike Shunpō 堀池春峯
1988 Yuima-e to Kandō no shōshin 維摩会と閑道の昇進. In *Chūsei jiin shi no kenkyū* 中世寺院史の研究, ed. Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄, 2 vols., 193–256. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Hurst, Cameron, iii
1976 *Insei: Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan, 1086–1185*. New York: Studies of the East Asian Institute, Columbia University.

Ihara Kesao 井原今朝男
1995 *Nihon Chūsei no kokusei to kasei* 日本中世の国政と家政. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō.

Itō Takatoshi 伊藤隆寿
1979 *Kōfukuji Yuima-e to shoshū* 興福寺維摩会と諸宗. *Komazawa Daigaku bukkyōgaku ronshū* 10: 180–196.

Izumiya Yasuo 泉谷康夫
1997 *Kōfukuji* 興福寺. Tokyo : Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kan Mashiro 管 真城
1994 *Hokkyō sanne no seiritsu* 北京三会の成立. *Shigaku kenkyū* 206: 1–20.

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄
2001 *Ōbō to buppō: Chūseishi no kōzu* 王法と仏法—中世の構図. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Kusunoki Junshō 楠 淳證
2001 *Hossō rongi no keisei to tenkai* 法相論議の形成と展開. In *Girei ni miru Nihon no Bukkyō: Tōdaiji, Kōfukuji, Yakushiji* 儀礼に見る日本の仏教—東大寺,興福寺,薬師寺. Ed. Nara Joshi Daigaku Kodaigaku Gakujutsu Kenkyū Sentaa Setsuritsu Junbi shitsu 奈良女子大学古代学学術研究センター設立準備室. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

Moerman, D. Max
2005 *Localizing Paradise: Kumano Pilgrimage and the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan*. Harvard East Asian Monographs 235. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

MOTOKI Yasuo 元木泰雄
1996 *Inseiki seiji shi kenkyū* 院政期政治史研究. Shibunkaku Shuppan.
2002 *Insei no tenkai to nairan* 院政の展開と内乱. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

NAGAMURA Makoto 永村 眞
2000 *Chūsei jiin shiryō ron* 中世寺院史料論. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

OISHIO Chihiro 追塩千尋
1995 *Chūsei no Nanto Bukkyō* 中世の南都仏教. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

OOMS, Herman
2009 *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

TAKAYAMA Yuki 高山有記
1997 *Chūsei Kōfukuji Yuima-e no Kenkyū* 中世興福寺維摩会の研究. Tokyo: Benseisha.

TOMABECHI Seiichi 苫米地誠一
2003 Heian ki Kōfukuji ni okeru Shingonshū ni tsuite 平安期興福寺における真言宗について. *Bukkyō bunka ronshū* 9: 383–483.

TYLER, Royall
1989 Kōfukuji and Shugendo. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16: 143–80.

UEDA Kōen 上田晃円
1980 Kōfukuji Yuima-e no seiritsu to sono tenkai 興福寺維摩会の成立`とその展開. *Nanto Bukkyō* 45: 33–68.

UEJIMA Susumu 上島 享
1996 *Chūsei zenki no kokka to Bukkyō* 中世前期の国家と仏教. *Nihon rekishi kenkyū* 403: 31–64.

VERMEERSCH, Sem
2008 *The Power of the Buddhas: The Politics of Buddhism During the Koryo Dynasty (918–1392)*. Harvard East Asia Monographs 303. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

WAYMAN, Alex, and Hideko WAYMAN
1973 *The Lion's Roar of Queen Srīmālā: A Buddhist Scripture on the Tathāgatagarbha Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

YOSHIKAWA Shinji 吉川真司
1998 *Ritsuryō kanryōsei no kenkyū* 律令官僚制の研究. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō.