

The Enryaku-ji and the Gion Shrine-Temple Complex in the Mid-Heian Period

Neil MCMULLIN

One day in the fall of 974, so the story goes, the leaves of a maple tree that grew on the grounds of the Renge-ji were especially resplendent. The Renge-ji, a small temple in the Eastern Hills area of Kyoto, was a branch temple of the Enryaku-ji, the head monastery of the Tendai school of Buddhism. Nearby, to its west, was Gion which, at that time, was a branch temple of the Yamashina temple, the head temple of the Hossō school of Buddhism. The Yamashina monk Rōzan 良筭, a man of virtue, power, and authority whose words were heeded by all, was the administrator of Gion. On the day in question Rōzan, upon noticing the beautiful maple leaves of the Renge-ji's tree, sent one of his underlings to break off a branch of it for him. Reacting with indignation, the monks in residence at the Renge-ji said, "Although the Gion administrator is a man of virtue, that tree belongs to a branch temple of the Tendai school, and yet, without so much as a greeting, he broke off a branch of it. That is an absolutely outrageous thing to do."

When the Renge-ji monks' protest was reported to Rōzan he became angry and ordered a number of his underlings at Gion to go and cut down the tree that occasioned such an insult. Before the Gion people arrived at the Renge-ji, however, the monks there thwarted Rōzan by cutting down their own tree to its very roots. When Rōzan's people arrived they were surprised to find their work already done, so they returned to Gion and reported that turn of events to Rōzan. Foiled, Rōzan became even more enraged.

Meanwhile, the Renge-ji monks sent a messenger to the nearby Hosshō-ji to report the foregoing developments to the monk Ryōgen 良源, the head abbot of the Enryaku-ji, who was staying temporarily at the Hosshō-ji in order to perform some rituals there. When the Renge-ji monks made their report to him, Ryōgen and those with him were outraged. Ryōgen sent a messenger to Gion with the demand that Rōzan appear before him to

account for his action, but Rōzan refused to go to meet with Ryōgen and sent the messenger back to him with the reply, "I am an official of a branch temple of the Yamashina temple. Why should I have to report to the Tendai abbot?"

In response to that haughty reply, Ryōgen, in great anger, sent a messenger to the Enryaku-ji to instruct some officials there to have representatives of the lay members of the Gion community come to the Enryaku-ji and sign a declaration of their support of the Tendai school in its conflict with the Hossō school. Those lay people complied with that instruction. Then Ryōgen announced that thenceforth Gion was to be a branch temple of the Enryaku-ji, and that the present administrator, Rōzan, should be chased off right away. Fearing what might ensue, Rōzan elicited the assistance of the warrior Taira no Muneyori who sent some armed troops to Gion to lend support to Rōzan. On learning of that development Ryōgen sent a messenger to the Heinan-nobō, a residence in the Western Pagoda section of the Enryaku-ji, to summon the monk Eika 睿荷, who was renowned for his mastery of the martial arts, and the monk Nyūzen 入禪, who [by happy coincidence] was a younger brother of Taira no Muneyori. Ryōgen ordered those two monks to proceed to Gion and drive off Rōzan.

At Gion, in the meantime, Rōzan was encouraging the Taira troops not to hesitate to let their arrows fly at anyone who tried to interfere with him because he was the legal and proper administrator of that place. However, as Eika and Nyūzen approached Gion the Taira troops recognized Nyūzen and realized that it would be a grave error to shoot arrows at the younger brother of their master, and therefore they abandoned Gion and fled into the hills behind (to the east of) it. Then the two Enryaku-ji monks drove off Rōzan, and Eika was appointed the administrator of Gion in his place.

When that happened, the community of monks at the Yamashina temple became angry and appealed to the court to render a judgment that Gion should be reinstated as a branch temple of their temple at once. The Yamashina monks made that appeal a number of times but nothing came of it, so the entire assembly of monks advanced to Kyoto's Kangaku'in, the administrative office of the Fujiwara family, to have their grievance resolved. While that activity was taking place, Ryōgen died.

One of the leaders of the Yamashina temple community was the monk Chūsan 中筭 who was staying at a small residence near the Kangaku'in while his community was putting pressure on the government officials. One night, in the presence of a number of his disciples, Chūsan suddenly said that someone was approaching, but his disciples could see no one no matter how hard they looked. Nevertheless, shortly afterward the disciples could hear Chūsan conversing with someone, and when they asked him with whom he was speaking he replied that it was Ryōgen of the Enryaku-ji. The monks,

incredulous, exclaimed, “What are you saying? But, Ryōgen is dead! . . .” Then, realizing that it must be the departed spirit of the deceased Ryōgen that came to speak with their master, they became speechless with fear.

The next day Chūsan, saying that he felt ill, excused himself from attending the hearing on the Gion question. Without their leader, and recalling the eerie event of the preceding night, the monks of the Yamashina temple were confused and upset, and when the court failed to issue the judgment that they were hoping for, they quietly left Kyoto and withdrew to their home temple.

It was thus that Gion became a branch temple of the Enryaku-ji.

This curious account of the Enryaku-ji’s assumption of control of the Gion cultic complex and the incorporation of it into the Enryaku-ji’s growing network of “affiliated cloisters” (*betsuin* 別院) and “branch temples” (*matsuji* 末寺) is contained in the *Konjaku monogatari* 今昔物語, a large (31 *maki*) collection of stories that was compiled some time after 1106 in the early twelfth century, a century and a half after that purported event took place.¹ In the *Konjaku monogatari* story, the Enryaku-ji’s takeover of the Gion complex is depicted as having been a rather silly affair at the root of which was a childish quibble over a branch of a maple tree, and which involved the intervention of the departed spirit of Ryōgen (912–985), the eighteenth head abbot of the Tendai school of Buddhism (Tendai *zasu* 座主) in the period from 8/27/966 to 1/3/985.

The *Konjaku monogatari* story certainly cannot be considered to be a reliable historical account of the Enryaku-ji’s assumption of control of the Gion complex if for no other reason but that according to it Ryōgen died in 974 just as the takeover of Gion was occurring, whereas in fact he did not die for another eleven years. Moreover, Chūsan died in 969, sixteen years before Ryōgen did, and, for that matter, five years before the reported event took place. Although our story is historically unreliable, it can serve as a rough script whereby we might be able to uncover some of the issues that were involved in the matter of the Enryaku-ji’s assumption of control of the Gion complex. Those issues are: the nature of the cult that was located at the Gion complex, the institution at the center of the story; the conflict between the Enryaku-ji and the Yamashina temple (i.e., the Kōfuku-ji 興福寺, the head temple of the Hossō school of Buddhism) which is personified as a struggle between Ryōgen and Rōzan; the nature and role of the Gion complex’s “lay members” (*jinnin* 神人) in the conflict over their institution; the presence at the Enryaku-ji of military activity as represented by the monk Eika; the role of the monk Chūsan who replaces Rōzan in the story as the main figure on the Kōfuku-ji side in the conflict; and, finally, the role of Ryōgen’s departed

¹ This story, which is translated loosely here, is No. 24 in Folio 31 of the *Konjaku monogatari*. See Yamada 1963, pp. 289–92.

spirit in the story. The fact of the matter is, unfortunately, that we do not know exactly how or when the Enryaku-ji came to assert control over the Gion complex, or how and when the Kōfuku-ji first gained that control. Although it is not possible to resolve those questions, it is possible to discern some of the reasons why the Gion complex became a *betsuin* of the Enryaku-ji, or at least why that development would have come about and what issues were involved in it. Those issues are of a political, economic, and religious (doctrinal and ritual) nature.

The conflict over the Gion complex was not the first confrontation between the Enryaku-ji and the Kōfuku-ji for those institutions had been in competition with each other from the time of the Enryaku-ji's founding by Saichō (Dengyō Daishi, 766–822). In the late-eighth and early-ninth centuries Saichō engaged in a number of exchanges, mainly by way of monographs, with the Kōfuku-ji monk Tokuitsu 徳一 on the classical buddhological question of whether or not all sentient beings are capable of attaining buddhahood. Without denying the doctrinal dimension of the Saichō-Tokuitsu/Tendai-Hossō competition, what was mainly at stake was patronage by the state and the noble (i.e., powerful) families, and the doctrinal debates served as the vehicle whereby the two monks/schools demonstrated their worthiness of that patronage.² Competition for patronage is also at the heart of the conflict presently under consideration.

The Enryaku-ji/Kōfuku-ji conflict over the Gion complex must be understood against the background and in the context of the major changes that were sweeping over Japan in the late tenth century when that conflict took place. The single most important development in that period was that the *ritsuryōsei* 律令制, the political-economic-ideological structure that was established in 702 with the promulgation of the Taihō codes, was in a state of collapse. That event marked a major turning point in Japanese history, a point at which, in the words of Hirabayashi, Japan entered a new age.³ In terms of our present considerations, several sets of developments that accompanied and were caused primarily by that event are especially important. First, in the tenth century religious institutions were receiving comparatively little support from the state in the form of grants of finances and taxes from designated public lands. They received enough support for the livelihood of their members, but not enough to finance expansion, and therefore those institutions came to rely increasingly on patronage by the noble (i.e. wealthy) families. Second, the major religious institutions, like the powerful families and to a certain degree in competition with them, were assembling parcels of private estates that would serve as their economic support bases as well as

² For an English-language account of the Saichō-Tokuitsu exchanges see Groner 1984, pp. 91–106.

³ Hirabayashi questions the traditional periodization of Japanese history in his biography of Ryōgen (1976, p. 134).

the labor pools from which they drew people for *corvée* service. And third, the collapse of the *ritsuryō* structure spawned new religious beliefs and movements: the upset and dislocation that accompanied that major change in society gave rise to and was expressed in the increasingly popular belief that the world was entering the “age of the degenerate dharma” (*mappō* 末法). That belief, which pervaded the country from that time forward for a number of centuries, was the result as well as an expression of the upset that characterized the times.

The institution at the center of our story is the Gion complex which was, as it is today, located at the western foot of the “Eastern Hills” 東山 (Higashiyama), a ridge of hills that form the eastern rim of the shallow basin in which Kyoto is located. Even though in the modern period (since 1868) the Gion complex has been considered to be a Shinto institution called Yasaka Shrine (Yasaka *jinja* 八坂神社), in the early and medieval periods it was not simply a shrine but was what might better be called a shrine-temple complex. That is, it was a cultic center that combined elements of Buddhism and “Shinto,” the latter term of which indicates, at least for the period under consideration, a melange of Japanese and continental (especially Korean) beliefs and practices combined with Chinese *yin-yang* 陰陽 (Japanese, *onyō*), i.e., Taoist, beliefs and practices.⁴

The origin of the Gion complex is a debated issue, but the general consensus of modern historians is that Gion was founded in the mid-ninth century, probably in the year 876, by the monk Ennyo 円如 of the Jōjū-ji 常住寺 who built a temple called the Kankei-ji 観慶寺 on the Gion site. In that temple Ennyo installed as the central object of devotion Yakushi Nyorai, the Buddha of medicine. Shortly thereafter several “divinities” (*kami*) came to be enshrined at the Gion site, but it was not until 926, when there was constructed adjacent to the Kankei-ji a building called Tenjindō 天神堂 (Heavenly Divinities Hall), that those divinities were formally enshrined together at Gion. From that time the main Gion divinities were Gozu Tennō 牛頭天王, a divinity depicted as having the head (*zu*) of a bull (*go*) and the body of a man, Gozu Tennō’s spouse Barime no Miya 婆梨女宮, and their eight divine children, the Hachiōji 八王子. Thus by the time of our story there was established at Gion a cultic center composed of two integrated sets of beliefs and rituals based at two adjacent buildings—the Kankei-ji (the Buddhist component of the Buddhist-Shinto amalgam) and the Tenjindō (the Shinto component of that amalgam)—in a single compound.⁵

It should be noted, in the light of the foregoing, that the *Konjaku monogatari* story is not about the takeover of a Shinto institution (a shrine)

⁴ The best analysis in English of the meaning of the term “Shinto” is Kuroda 1981, pp. 1–21).

⁵ For material on the development of the Gion complex see Kubota 1974, pp. 4–84, and Takahara 1972, pp. 30–73.

by a Buddhist one (a temple or monastery), but the takeover of a Shinto-Buddhist complex (Gion) from a Buddhist-Shinto complex (Kōfuku-ji) by another Buddhist-Shinto complex (Enryaku-ji). In the tenth century, and down to the modern period, the Enryaku-ji on Mt. Hiei was intimately affiliated with the Hie Shrine which is located at the eastern foot of that mountain, and the two institutions formed in fact a single temple-shrine complex; similarly, the Kōfuku-ji was intimately associated with the Kasuga Shrine, its immediate neighbour in Nara, and together with it formed another great temple-shrine complex.

The rituals performed at Gion were directed to “disease-causing divinities” (*ekijin* 疫神)—namely the aforementioned Gozu Tennō, Barime no Miya, and the Hachiōji—and to the “departed spirits” (*goryō* 御霊) of deceased people. In ancient beliefs the *goryō*, especially the departed spirits of people who died untimely deaths by disease, drowning, etc., had the power to torment the living in the form of natural disasters, especially epidemics of such deadly diseases as smallpox, tuberculosis, dysentery, and others. By way of “departed spirit rituals” (*goryō'e* 御霊会) the troublesome spirits could be assuaged and placated, and the participants spared the diseases and calamities that they and the *ekijin* caused.⁶ Although in the tenth century Gozu Tennō, Barime no Miya, and the Hachiōji still maintained some of their ancient character of disease-causing agents, their character had become somewhat ambivalent in that they were increasingly looked upon as disease-preventing divinities who were worshipped for their power to save. In either case, the main ritual at Gion had to do with disease and death, matters of much concern to the Enryaku-ji and the other temple-shrine complexes in the tenth century.

Why Ennyo built the Kankei-ji at the Gion site is not clear, but in the Higashiyama section of Kyoto rituals directed to disease-causing divinities had been performed for a century or more before Kyoto was founded, and thus it appears that Ennyo built a Buddhist temple there in order to inject into that area a Buddhist element and to graft Buddhism on to the cult celebrated there. Moreover, the person and power behind the building of the Gion complex appears to have been Fujiwara no Mototsune (836-891) who is said to have donated a private residence in Higashiyama to Ennyo, and it was here that Ennyo established the Kankei-ji.⁷ Thus the Fujiwara family, to whom we must turn briefly, was involved from the first with the Gion complex.

Toward the end of the ninth century the Fujiwara family managed to oust

⁶ *Goryō* related beliefs and practices are discussed in various works on early Japanese religion. See the works mentioned in note 5 above and especially the collection of essays in Gorai 1979.

⁷ See the *Shake jōjō kiroku*, a document that was composed in 1306, contained in Yasaka Jinja Shamusho 1942, p. 575.

most of its rival noble families from the center of political power and the northern branch (*hokke* 北家) of the family was gaining supremacy over the other branches. One sub-branch of the northern Fujiwara began to establish the “regency system” (*sekkkan seido* 摂関制度) of government whereby members of that sub-branch of the family who held the office of *sesshō* 摂政 (the regent during the rule of an under-aged emperor) or *kanpaku* 関白 (the regent during the reign of an adult emperor) ruled the country through the reigning emperors, the great majority of whom had Fujiwara mothers and wives. Mototsune, who was *sesshō* from 873 to 880 and then *kanpaku* until his death, was, in the words of George Sansom, “the first of the great Fujiwara autocrats” (Sansom 1958, p. 140). In the latter part of the tenth century, with the collapse of the *ritsuryōsei* and the ascendance of the Fujiwara, the main objects of the patronage competition among the temple-shrine complexes were the high-ranked members of the Fujiwara family, especially the leaders of the northern branch and most especially the leaders of the *sekkanke* sub-branch of the northern branch, among whom, in the mid-to-late tenth century, were Fujiwara no Morosuke (908-960) and his sons/successors.

In the competition for Fujiwara patronage, the Kōfuku-ji had the edge on the Enryaku-ji for several reasons. The Kōfuku-ji’s roots go back to the late seventh century when its predecessor, the Yamashinadera, was built by the wife of Fujiwara no Kamatari (614–669), the patriarch of the Fujiwara family. In the early eighth century the Yamashinadera was moved to Nara by Kamatari’s son Fubito and renamed Kōfuku-ji. The Kōfuku-ji was thus the family temple (*ujidera* 氏寺) of the Fujiwara. Moreover, the Kōfuku-ji was affiliated with the Kasuga shrine which is where the ancestral and tutelary divinities (*ujigami* 氏神) of the Fujiwara family were enshrined. In the mid-tenth century the major ambition of the Tendai abbot Ryōgen was to bump the Kōfuku-ji/Kasuga complex from first place of the roster of institutions that received Fujiwara patronage and to have the Enryaku-ji take its place. Although it is not clear that Ryōgen realized that high ambition, he did manage, by way of establishing intimate relations with Fujiwara no Morosuke, to have the Enryaku-ji placed very near the top of that roster, if not at the very top, in terms of the patronage that it received from the *sekkanke* branch of the family.⁸

Because Enryo, the founder of the Gion complex, was a monk of the Jōjūji, it is likely that the complex was under the authority of that temple for some period of time. At some point in the late ninth or the early tenth century the Kōfuku-ji, in a way and for reasons unknown, acquired some authority over Gion. From that time the Gion shrine-temple complex was considered to be a *betsuin* of the Kōfuku-ji, which meant that the Kōfuku-ji

⁸ For material on Fujiwara no Morosuke’s patronage of the Enryaku-ji see Hori 1964, pp. 24–55, 1966a, pp. 1–34, and 1976, pp. 26–42.

had the right to appoint and dismiss the Gion “administrators” (*bettō* 别当).⁹ The term *betsuin* appears for the first time in the classical Japanese literature in 797, and therefore religious institutions were forming dependency relations with one another long before the Kōfuku-ji did so with the Gion complex. As early as 839, when the Tado 多度 Shrine in Ise province was made a Tendai *betsuin*, the Enryaku-ji began to acquire a number of affiliated temples and shrines. Between 840 and 882 it established *betsuin* relations with eleven temples, some of which were located in such far-off provinces as Mutsu and Shinano (Kubota 1974, pp. 94–97). How these relations were established is not clear: in some cases it appears that the temples that became Tendai *betsuin* were founded by Enryaku-ji monks on their travels throughout the country, and in other cases Enryaku-ji monks would build small hermitages or residences at already existing temples or shrines and, by way of those newly developed connections with the Enryaku-ji, those temples and shrines would come to have *betsuin* relations with it.

It is also not clear what the *betsuin* relation implied, but it appears to have been primarily one of an economic nature whereby the buildings and land holdings of an institution that was the *betsuin* of another one were controlled and administered by that other. In other words, a *betsuin* was little more than an estate controlled by a temple, as is demonstrated by the fact that the names of a temple’s *betsuin* were customarily included in that temple’s list of its estates (Kuroda 1980, p. 52). There seems to have been little, if any, of what might be called doctrinal affiliation between a temple and its *betsuin* given, as was mentioned above, that the Enryaku-ji had *betsuin* relations with a shrine (the Tado Shrine) in the mid-ninth century. Moreover, it is apparent that the *betsuin* relation was not a permanent one as is evidenced by the fact that the *betsuin* relation that the Enryaku-ji established with the Tado Shrine in 839 ceased two years later. In 849 that shrine became a Shingon *betsuin*, and thus the Gion case was not the first in which there was a transfer of *betsuin* relations from one institution to another (Kubota 1974, p. 105).

Although the Gion complex is spoken of as a *matsuji* of the Kōfuku-ji in the *Konjaku monogatari* story, the home temple (*honji* 本寺)–branch temple (*matsuji*) system (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度) did not develop until the eleventh century, and thus the term *matsuji* was not used at the time in question. The main differences between a *betsuin* and a *matsuji* (or *massha* 末社) are that a *matsuji* had a stricter and more subordinate relation with its *honji* than a *betsuin* had with the institution with which it was affiliated, and that whereas in the case of a *betsuin* its administrator was appointed by the state and could have been a monk who belonged to an institution other than the one with which the *betsuin* was affiliated, or could even have been a lay

⁹ The Kōfuku-ji’s establishment of *betsuin* relations with the Gion complex, which may have taken place as early as the 880s, is discussed in Kubota 1974, pp. 90–91.

person, in the case of a *matsuji* the abbot of that institution was invariably appointed by the *honji* and was a member of that *honji's* community (see Kubota 1974, pp. 92–96; Kuroda 1980, pp. 154–58; Toyoda 1973, pp. 30–40). Also, there was more of a doctrinal component in the *honji-matsuji* relation than there was in the temple/shrine-*betsuin* relation. Eventually Gion did become a *matsuji* of the Enryaku-ji and a *massha* of the Hie Shrine.

It is known that the Enryaku-ji took control of the Gion complex from the Kōfuku-ji some time in the 970s, but exactly when it did so is not certain. The classical literature offers three different dates for that event: one document (the *Shosha kongenki* 諸社根元記) says that Gion became a branch shrine of the Hie Shrine in 972 (see Kubota 1974, p. 87); three other sources state that Gion became a Tendai *betsuin* in 974 (see Yasaka Jinja Shamusho 1942, p. 576); and according to the *Tendai zasuki*, the Kankei-ji Kanshin'in 感神院 became a Tendai *betsuin* in 979 (Shibuya 1939, pp. 44–45). It is also not clear whether it was all or just one of the components of the Gion complex that became a Tendai *betsuin* in the 970s, and whether the Gion complex or only a component thereof established *betsuin* relations with the Enryaku-ji complex per se or with just one of its components. As mentioned above, the *Shōsha kongenki* says that Gion established *betsuin* relations not with the Enryaku-ji itself but with the Hie Shrine, and according to the *Tendai zasuki* it was the Kankei-ji Kanshin'in that became a Tendai (i.e., Enryaku-ji) *betsuin*.

There is some question of what the names Kankei-ji and Kanshin'in referred to at the time in question. According to Kubota (1974, pp. 2–26), the name Kankei-ji originally referred to the entire Gion complex, but gradually it came to be restricted to only the main hall (*hondō*) that housed the statue of Yakushi Nyorai. Some time in the mid-ninth century, possibly in compliance with the wishes of the aforementioned Fujiwara no Mototsune, the Gion complex came to be referred to as the Kanshin'in. By the late tenth century the names Kanshin'in and Gion-ji were used interchangeably for the whole Gion complex, and the name Kankei-ji took on the more limited usage mentioned earlier (see Shibuya 1939, p. 44). Thus the *Tendai zasuki* seems to imply that it was the Kankei-ji component of the Kanshin'in that became a Tendai *betsuin*. Whatever the exact nature of the Enryaku-ji/Hie-Gion/Kankei-ji/Kanshin'in relation might have been, there is little doubt about the fact that the Enryaku-ji did control the Gion complex from the 970s.

Although it is not known how the Enryaku-ji managed to take control of the Gion complex, it is not likely that it would have done so in the way described in the *Konjaku monogatari* story according to which the Enryaku-ji more or less simply seized control of Gion, because the Fujiwara rulers, to whom an appeal is made by the Kōfuku-ji monks in that story, would have

had a major role in the affair. In the latter half of the tenth century the aforementioned Fujiwara no Morosuke and his family were deeply involved with religious institutions, especially with the Enryaku-ji. They financed the construction of a number of sub-temples and cloisters on Mt. Hiei, especially at the Yokawa section of the mountain where Ryōgen had his residence and a community of several hundred disciples, and also in the Higashiyama section of Kyoto. For example, Morosuke financed the construction of the Hokkezanmaidō, the Shingondō, and other buildings at Yokawa; Fujiwara no Kaneie, Morosuke's third son and the most powerful person in the country in the 980s, financed the construction of the Eshin'in at Yokawa in memory of his father; and in 925 Morosuke's father, Fujiwara no Tadahira, built the Hosshō-ji 法性寺 in Higashiyama not far from the Gion site.¹⁰ Significantly, it was at the Hosshō-ji that Ryōgen was staying, according to our story, when the Gion incident started.

These institutions served as Morosuke's family's *bodaiji* 菩提寺, which term indicates a temple at which rituals were performed for the *bodai* (i.e., buddhahood, or salvation) of the person to whom the temple was dedicated.¹¹ At the *bodaiji* various other rituals were performed for the successful acquisition of power and glory on the part of the living descendants of that person, and for the confusion of their enemies.¹² The person responsible for assuring that those rituals were properly performed was the head of the family, and thus the monk who was commissioned to perform them had a close and important relation with that powerful person. The role of performing such rituals for the Fujiwara was held traditionally by the Kōfuku-ji/Kasuga complex, but in the latter part of the tenth century that role was increasingly assumed with respect to Morosuke's sub-branch of the family by the Enryaku-ji which was closer to the center of power than was the Kōfuku-ji/Kasuga complex in Nara, and which looked down on the city from its high perch on Mt. Hiei immediately to the northeast of the capital, the direction from which destructive forces were believed to come. The institutions built by Morosuke's family in the mid-tenth century were staffed by members of Ryōgen's community of disciples at Yokawa, and those appointments were jealously guarded. Indeed, it was over the issue of the appointment of the

¹⁰ These building projects are discussed in three articles by Hori (1964, 1966a, and 1976) and in Hirabayashi 1976. See also the *Jie Daisōjō den*, a biography of Ryōgen that was written by one of his disciples forty-six years after his death, in Folio 69, vol. 5 of the *Gunsho ruijū* (Hanawa 1930, pp. 553-63).

¹¹ The great importance of *bodaiji* in Japanese history is discussed in Wada Kenju 1973, pp. 84-89.

¹² Accounts of such rituals fill the literature of the Heian period (794-1185). See, for example, Hirabayashi 1976, the biography of Ryōgen mentioned above, and another biography of him, the *Jie Daishi den* which was written in 1469, in Folio 213, vol. 8 of the *Gunsho ruijū*, Hanawa 1927, pp. 734-42. Several such rituals that Ryōgen performed for Fujiwara no Morosuke are discussed in my forthcoming "The *Lotus Sutra* and Politics in the Mid-Heian Period."

Hosshō-ji abbot that a major confrontation developed in the Enryaku-ji community in 982.¹³

The reason why Fujiwara no Morosuke and his family were engaged in such large-scale temple building projects is that they were attempting to create a new institutional-cultic network of Buddhist-Shinto complexes in the Kyoto area where that sub-branch of the northern Fujiwara had its power base, a network that would be separate from the older Kōfuku-ji/Kasuga one, directly under the control of Morosuke's sub-branch of the family, and dedicated to serving its particular ritual needs. The Enryaku-ji, according to an arrangement made between Ryōgen and Morosuke in 954, was to be the nucleus of that newly created network.¹⁴

In creating that network Morosuke and his family not only constructed new institutions, but they also absorbed into the network temples and shrines that had a special role vis-à-vis the Fujiwara dead, and, accordingly, those institutions were made *betsuin* of the Enryaku-ji. Thus, for example, the Tōnomine 多武峯, a shrine-temple complex that had ancient and intimate relations with the Fujiwara in that it housed the mausoleum of Fujiwara no Kamatari, was absorbed into that network as a *betsuin* of the Mudō-ji 無動寺, one of the sub-temples of the Enryaku-ji on Mt. Hiei.¹⁵ According to Hori (1964, pp. 31–32), Morosuke repaired the Tōnomine and made it a Tendai *betsuin* in fulfillment of his promise to convert to and support the Ennin line of monks at the Enryaku-ji, the line to which Ryōgen belonged and of which he was the leading member in the mid-tenth century.

The Gion complex, as the major site for the performance of *goryō* rituals from the early to mid-tenth century, fit naturally into that new institutional-cultic network. Although the *goryō* rituals were originally and essentially folk rituals that expressed, at least to some degree, distress and discontent with the world and thus had a political critique built into them, in the late-ninth century the ruling elite and specifically the Fujiwara family took over the *goryō* cult and incorporated it into the canon of official cults that served the state. As I have said elsewhere, the *goryō* rituals were transformed in such a way that they would serve to placate the departed spirits of deceased people who had been enemies of the northern Fujiwara, people whom those Fujiwara had good reason to fear in their *goryō* state.¹⁶ It is not known whether Fujiwara no Morosuke ever had rituals performed on his behalf at Gion, but he appears to have had rituals that served to placate the departed spirits of deceased enemies performed by Ryōgen at the Enryaku-ji.¹⁷

¹³ For an English-language account of that event see McMullin 1984, pp. 96–97.

¹⁴ See my forthcoming "The *Lotus Sūtra* and politics in the mid-Heian period."

¹⁵ One account of the Tōnomine's development of *matsuji* relations with the Enryakuji in 947 is No. 21 in Folio 21 of the *Konjaku monogatari* (Yamada 1963, pp. 288–89).

¹⁶ See my forthcoming "On placating the gods and pacifying the populace: The case of the Gion *goryō* cult."

¹⁷ See my forthcoming "The *Lotus Sūtra* and politics in the mid-Heian period."

While Fujiwara no Morosuke was developing a network of institutions that served the ritual needs of his family, Ryōgen was making every effort to assure that he and his disciples would staff those institutions. Ryōgen appears to have been fully aware that the way to the hearts (and coffers) of the Fujiwara was through their ancestors, and thus it was crucial for him to take control, so to speak, of the Fujiwara dead. By being master of the institution that included under its control such places as the Hosshōji, Gion and Tōnomine, Ryōgen would be and in fact was the main ritualist for deceased members of the *sekkanke*, and in that capacity he had much influence with the living members of that family. They needed Ryōgen for his ritual powers as much as he needed them for their financial powers. Thus I suspect that it was a deliberate policy on Ryōgen's part to have those institutions become affiliated with the Enryaku-ji, but how he actually went about doing so is not clear. Undoubtedly that enterprise involved the compliance, if not the direct support, of Morosuke and his family.

From a broader perspective, in the tenth century the ruling elite, specifically the *sekkanke*, were bringing together a complex network of temple-shrine institutions that served not only their immediate ritual needs but that, in the words of Paul Wheatley, "functioned as instruments for the dissemination through all levels of society of beliefs which, in turn, enabled the wielders of political power to justify their goals in terms of the basic values of that society, and to present the realization of class-directed aims as the implementation of collectively desirable policies (Wheatley and See 1978, p. 15). Significantly, it was in the latter part of the tenth century that there was established the system of twenty-two shrines, a system that was at the heart of the Japanese politicoreligious ideology for many centuries to come, and two of those twenty-two shrines, Gion and Hie, were intimately linked to the Enryaku-ji (Grapard 1986).

In the mid-tenth century Fujiwara no Morosuke both contributed to the development of the Enryaku-ji and took steps to assert control over it. The way he went about the latter task was by sending the eleventh of his twelve sons to the Enryaku-ji to become a disciple of Ryōgen with the agreement that that sixteen-year-old boy, who took the name Jinzen 尋禪 (943-990), would eventually succeed Ryōgen as the master of the Yokawa section of Mt. Hiei where Morosuke had invested much money.¹⁸ Another of Morosuke's sons, Jinkaku 深覚 (955-1043) became the abbot of the Tō-ji, the main Shingon institution in Kyoto, and a third son, Takamitsu, became a monk at the aforementioned Tōnomine.¹⁹ The major religious institutions were, in

¹⁸ Jinzen's career at the Enryakuji is examined in Hori 1966b, pp. 1-11, pp. 52-65.

¹⁹ For information on Jinkaku see Ienaga 1980, p. 337, and for discussion of the relation between Jinzen and Takahikari—the former, in collusion with Ryōgen, would not allow Takahikari, his brother, to join the Yokawa community—see Hirabayashi 1976, pp. 65-69.

other words, being subjected increasingly to direct Fujiwara control. My suspicion is that the Gion complex was put under the authority of the Enryaku-ji as one part of that general process.

Although the Kōfuku-ji lost control of the Gion complex in the late tenth century it did not give up the fight to get it back. As late as the Kamakura period (1185-1333) there came to be circulated a story that Ennyo established the Gion complex back in the ninth century by transferring to that site the Kōfuku-ji's *mizuya* (water purification font) divinity (*mizuya myōjin* 水屋明神), and thus there was created a history that provided an intimate relation between the Kōfuku-ji and Gion from the very first (see Kyōto-shi 1970, p. 417, and Kubota 1974, p. 88). Nevertheless, the Kōfuku-ji never did regain control of Gion.

With regard to the Gion complex's "lay members," who are indicated in the story by the term *jinnin* 神人 (or *jinin* or *kamibito*), we are confronted with a matter on which there is no historical documentation for the period in question. By the time that story was composed a group of people known as *inujinnin* 犬神人 was affiliated with the Gion complex, but it is generally thought that that group did not form for a century or more after the Enryaku-ji took control of Gion. There is no mention of those people in the classical literature before the eleventh century, but I suspect strongly, on the basis of the functions that they performed, that there were such people in the Gion area in the tenth century. A brief consideration of these people might shed some light on economic and military reasons for the Enryaku-ji's conflict with the Kōfuku-ji over the Gion complex.

The *inujinnin* were the lowly members of Japanese society. They appear to have had approximately the same status as people who worked the land in the provinces, but as urban dwellers they were not involved in agriculture. Instead, they engaged in trades, crafts, and manual labor, and it appears that those *jinnin* who were associated with the Gion complex did especially menial and odious work: they were responsible for cleaning the grounds of the complex, and, most importantly, for collecting and disposing of the corpses of deceased people and the carcasses of dead animals and birds in Kyoto.²⁰ Thus they were the morticians and gravediggers of their day. The Gion *jinnin* were not monks or priests, but had a status somewhat equivalent to that of a lay brother or a member of a confraternity in medieval European Christianity. Despite the lack of textual corroboration, there should be little doubt that such persons existed in the tenth century if for no other reason but that, to put it rather woodenly and obviously, the kind of work that they are said to have done had to be done by somebody or other. It is likely that the people

²⁰ The Gion *jinnin* are discussed in Kyōto-shi 1970, 1, pp. 522-25, and 1971, 2, pp. 449-56. Oddly, the corpse-collecting role of the *jinnin* is mentioned in various Japanese dictionaries and encyclopedias but not in the standard histories, and no indication of the source of that information is offered.

who did this work would have been associated with one or more of the religious institutions in the Higashiyama section of Kyoto, because it was there that cultic centers associated with disease and death causing divinities and the departed spirits of the deceased were concentrated.

Subsequently—it is not known when—a myth was created to explain the origin of the *inujinnin* and to rationalize their connection with the Gion complex. According to that myth, when Gozu Tennō descended from the heavenly realm to take up residence at the Gion cultic site he was accompanied by two white dogs (*inu*). Those dogs eventually mated and produced an extraordinary pup which, as it matured, gradually transmuted into a man who was the first *inu* (dog) *jin* (divine) *nin* (person) and the progenitor of that class of people. To earn a living the first *inujinnin*, according to the myth, took up the work of making bows, bowstrings and arrows.²¹

That myth assigns a profession to the *inujinnin* that is different from the ones mentioned earlier (mortician and gravedigger) and that might have made the *inujinnin* attractive to the Enryaku-ji. The profession assigned to the *inujinnin* in the myth, that of weapon maker, might have some basis in fact because it appears that from some time in the early Heian period groups of workers in the area of the Gion complex engaged in the trade of making bows and arrows, and therefore the *inujinnin* might have been the descendants of people who produced weapons under the authority of the *hyōdefu* 兵衛府 or some other government office that had to do with military and police affairs and with which they would have been affiliated until some time in the middle of the Heian period when that affiliation was lost. From the late tenth century, with the collapse of the *ritsuryō* system, trade groups that had been under the control of one or other government office were set adrift, but gradually they came to be affiliated with, and under the control of, other institutions, often the temple-shrine complexes. By the end of the Heian period those groups came to have a guild (*za* 座) structure. It is not unlikely that the Gion complex was becoming the institution with which a proto-guild of weapon makers was affiliated in the late tenth century, a fact that would have made it attractive to the Enryaku-ji which, at that time, was becoming increasingly active militarily. Subsequently, from the early Kamakura period, guilds called *Gion no shoza* 祇園の諸座 developed in the area of the Gion complex, but the members of those guilds do not appear to have produced weapons (Takahara 1972, pp. 132-41; Kyōto-shi 1970, 1, pp. 155-57 and 1971, 2, pp. 455-57).

The Gion complex was located, and owned lands, in an area of Kyoto that was very important economically in the tenth century. From the ninth century there developed in the south-central area of the city, just below *shichijō* in the

²¹ This myth is recounted in a number of modern Japanese dictionaries and encyclopedias, but I have not been able to find its textual origin.

areas presently occupied by the Nishi Hongan-ji and Higashi Hongan-ji, two large *ichiba*. The word *ichiba* 市場 is usually translated into English as “market,” but the term designates a place where products were manufactured as well as sold. Toward the end of the tenth century the western *ichiba* waned, but the eastern one flourished and some industry, mainly cotton manufacturing, spilled over from it to the north and came to be established at the eastern end of *shijō* where the Gion complex owned some land and not far from where the complex itself was located.²² Although Kyoto is usually thought of as the government center of Japan in the Heian period, it was also the major industrial city in the country with a population that swelled to almost 200,000 people by the end of the tenth century. The Gion complex would have benefited economically from the growth of industry on its lands, and would have been, therefore, an attractive prize for the Enryaku-ji to win from the Kōfuku-ji. Thus there were, I suggest, good economic reasons for the Enryaku-ji's desire to control the Gion complex.

Like the professions of mortician and gravedigger, that of bowstring maker also required the handling of carcasses because the hide, gut, and possibly other parts of animal carcasses as well as the feathers of birds were used in making bowstrings and arrows. People who had anything to do with death were considered to be polluted according to both the native beliefs and the later-arrived Buddhist tradition, and, consequently, people engaged in such professions as bowstring making were relegated to the fringes of society. Nevertheless, since both the native traditions and the Buddhist tradition were very much involved with cults that had to do with the deceased, it was inevitable that some members of the shrine-temple communities deal with corpses. Other *inujinnin* who lived south of the Gion complex in the Eastern Hills section of Kyoto and who also dealt with carcasses in that they were leather workers later came to be associated with the Kennin-ji 建仁寺, a monastery of the Zen school that was built in that area in the early thirteenth century.

Whether or not the Gion *jinnin* were organized into a distinct group that had some level of group consciousness in the mid-Heian period is not known, but it is not at all improbable that they did because in the late tenth century both “farmers” (*hyakushō* 百姓) and *jinnin* began to form groups that had sufficient solidarity to enable them to present appeals on their own behalf to their overlords. The ruling elite were afraid of those *jinnin* groups because of their fear of the divinities and departed spirits with which the *jinnin* were believed to be associated, and thus those groups gained a certain leverage vis-à-vis their overlords. Evidently the Gion complex had some kind of organized community in the mid-tenth century because in 959 it engaged in armed

²² The development of the *ichiba* is discussed in various works. See, for example, Kyōto-shi 1970, 1, pp. 525–32.

combat with its neighbour to the south, the Kiyomizu-dera 清水寺, which at that time was also a *betsuin* of the Kōfuku-ji. Kubota (1974, p. 108) suggests that the conflict with the Kiyomizudera might have caused the Gion people to try to establish relations with the Enryaku-ji as a way of severing whatever ties it might have had with the Kiyomizudera through their mutual relation with the Kōfuku-ji, but it might have been the other way around: i.e., the Gion people might have come into conflict with the Kiyomizudera because of their efforts to get out from under the control of the Kōfuku-ji, and thus they might have welcomed the opportunity to declare their allegiance to the Enryaku-ji as they do in the *Konjaku monogatari* story. It may be for this reason that the *jinnin* are assigned a role, and a rather curious one, in that account of the Enryaku-ji's takeover of the Gion complex.

It is not improbable that Ryōgen would have encouraged whoever was living at the Gion complex and on the lands in the area that were owned by it to oust their Kōfuku-ji overlord for, as is well known, Ryōgen was not adverse to using muscle when the occasion seemed to call for it, and the event in question is described as such an occasion in the *Konjaku monogatari* story. Ryōgen rose to the occasion by sending the martial artist/monk Eika to do the job. Interestingly, whereas Ryōgen is commonly accused in the literature of being the person more responsible than anyone else for the development of "warrior monks" (*sōhei* 僧兵), in the *Konjaku monogatari* story it is Rōzan who first brought warriors into the fray, and Ryōgen is portrayed as having reacted to that intimidating escalation of the affair with considerable restraint.

The name of the monk Eika 睿荷 is curious in that the *ei* portion of his name is written with the same ideograph as the *ei* in the name Hiei, and the *ka* is written with an ideograph that means to carry a burden. Thus "one who carries the burden for Mt. Hiei" is the name of the person who carries the burden for Mt. Hiei in the story of its conflict with the Kōfuku-ji over the Gion complex. The coincidence of name and event is suspicious. Whether Eika was an historical individual or not, there were people like him — i.e., monks who engaged in military activities — at the Enryaku-ji in the latter part of the tenth century. It is well known that Ryōgen, in the twenty-six article set of regulations (*Nijūrokujō kishō* 二十六箇条起請) that he promulgated on November 16, 970, prohibited physical violence and the bearing of arms by the Enryaku-ji monks (Takeuchi 1967, pp. 431-40), which proves that there were such goings on at Mt. Hiei at that time. It is also true that Ryōgen at least condoned violent clashes between his supporters and that group of monks at the Enryaku-ji that eventually left the mountain and in 993 set up an independent Tendai community at the Onjō-ji which was located at the southeastern foot of Mt. Hiei in Ōtsu (see McMullin 1984, pp. 83-105). At that time, and for a century prior to it, the Onjō-ji was a *betsuin* of the

Enryaku-ji.

It is well known that toward the end of the Heian period the *inujinnin* served as part of the Enryaku-ji's army of "warrior monks" which was active from that period. Also, when the Enryaku-ji *sōhei* advanced on Kyoto to stage one of their euphemistically called "strong appeals" (*gōso* 強訴), the Gion complex served as a forward staging area in Kyoto for those *sōhei*; it was customary for them to bring to Kyoto with them the sacred carts that enshrined the Hie divinities and to deposit those carts at the Gion complex in preparation for the "appeal."²³ It cannot be demonstrated that armed conflict was involved in the case of the Enryaku-ji's takeover of the Gion complex, but it is suspicious that the Kōfuku-ji's community of monks advanced to the Kanshin'in, an event reminiscent of the "strong appeals" of later days.

A final reason why the major temple-shrine complexes were establishing *betsuin* relations with institutions like Gion in the tenth century was that it was by way of absorbing such institutions and their communities of *jinnin* that those major complexes could expand not only their landholdings but also their membership. Thus the Gion *jinnin* might be thought of as the expansionist front of the Enryaku-ji. That is, it was by the incorporation of *jinnin* groups that the Enryaku-ji could expand its community by including in it, or at least on the fringes of it, people who, unlike the members of the community on Mt. Hiei, were not monks.

The Enryaku-ji/Kōfuku-ji struggle for control of the Gion complex was the institutional dimension of a multidimensional struggle between those two major complexes, another dimension of which was a doctrinal/ritual one. That dimension of the Enryaku-ji/Kōfuku-ji conflict, to which we shall now turn, is hinted at in the *Konjaku monogatari* story by the figure of Chūsan. The meeting between Chūsan and Ryōgen's departed spirit in 974 was not the first meeting between those two people. Eleven years earlier, in the eighth month of 963, Chūsan was one of the monks who represented the Hossō school in a five-day-long doctrinal debate that was held in the Seiryōden 清涼殿 at the imperial palace. That debate, which is called the Ōwa Debate (*Ōwa shūron* 応和宗論) after the reign name of the era in which it took place, was initiated by Ryōgen and featured a series of exchanges between Tendai (Mt. Hiei) and Hossō (Kōfuku-ji) monks. Ryōgen's ostensible purpose in arranging for the debate to be held was to demonstrate the superiority of Tendai doctrine over Hossō doctrine, but such an ethereal concern was not his main one. Instead, as I have discussed elsewhere, the purpose of the debate was to afford Ryōgen the opportunity to display his intellectual prowess (the primary measure of a monk's potency as a ritualist) and thereby to win admirers and, more importantly, patrons who would fund

²³ Mt. Hiei monks first marched to Gion en masse (approximately one thousand strong) in 1079, ostensibly to worship the divinities there. The "strong appeals" are discussed in various works. See, for example, the major study by Hioki (1972).

him following the loss of his main patron, Fujiwara no Morosuke, who had died three years earlier.²⁴ Chūsan and Ryōgen did not confront each other directly in the Ōwa Debate, but Chūsan did debate with, and defeat, two of Ryōgen's disciples and thus, in an indirect way, he bettered Ryōgen. I suspect, therefore, that at least some of the motivation on the part of whoever composed the *Konjaku monogatari* story was to give Ryōgen a victory over Chūsan, and because Ryōgen never enjoyed such a victory when he was alive, the author of our story had to kill him off, even though in fact Chūsan predeceased Ryōgen, in order to give the Tendai hero, in his departed spirit form, another chance at Chūsan, one in which Ryōgen was victorious in that Chūsan withdrew from the struggle for control of the Gion complex.²⁵

Interestingly, in the *Konjaku monogatari* story Ryōgen's departed spirit functioned to some degree in the way departed spirits were believed to behave according to the *goryō* cult. That is, it caused Chūsan to become ill. The belief that Ryōgen's departed spirit was still active following his death did not originate with the *Konjaku monogatari* story for a legend began to circulate not long after he died to the effect that Ryōgen remained, in departed spirit form, at the Enryaku-ji in order to protect his beloved mountain.²⁶

It is doubtful that doctrinal/ritual concerns played much if any direct role in the Enryaku-ji/Kōfuku-ji competition over the Gion complex, but certain developments at the Enryaku-ji in the late tenth century did serve to create a doctrinal/ritual bridge between the Enryaku-ji and the Gion complex. Those developments had mostly to do with the famous Genshin 源信 (Eshin Sōzu 惠心僧都, 942-1017).

In 986, the year after Ryōgen's death, Genshin gathered together twenty-five Yokawa monks to form a group called the Nijūgo Sanmai'e 二十五三昧会. The members of that group met through the night of the fifteenth day of each month to practice the *fudan nenbutsu zanmai* 不断念仏三昧, i.e., the recitation of the name of Amida Buddha (the *nenbutsu*), and to offer prayers for rebirth in the Pure Land. The objective of that group, and of a similar one that Genshin founded in 988, was the attainment of "bodhisattva awareness" (*bodai shin zenchishiki* 菩提真善知識), and its members prayed "to seek after *bodhi* single-mindedly" (*ikkō ni bodai o motomen ga tame ni* 為一向求菩提). Some years later, in 1006 and again in 1007, Genshin founded two

²⁴ See my forthcoming article on the *Lotus Sūtra* and politics. The Ōwa debate is discussed at length in Hirabayashi 1976, pp. 69-82.

²⁵ According to Kubota 1974, p. 86, the *Konjaku monogatari* story of the Enryaku-ji's takeover of the Gion complex was preserved by the Kōfuku-ji monastic community, but be that as it may, the story appears to favor Ryōgen and therefore I suspect that its roots do not lie in the Kōfuku-ji tradition.

²⁶ See Hirabayashi 1976, p. 198. Another rumor had it that Ryōgen's departed spirit reincarnated in the famous twelfth-century warrior Taira no Kiyomori. See Hirabayashi 1976, pp. 206-7.

other groups—the *Raigō Gyōja no Kō* 来迎行者之講 at the Kedai'in and the *Reizan'in Shakakō* 靈山院釈迦講 at the Reizan'in—which, unlike the earlier ones, included nuns and lay people, both men and women, in addition to monks, and even “profligate and hardhearted” (*hōtō jaken* 放蕩邪見) people were welcomed into them.²⁷

The groups that Genshin formed tended their sick and dying members for whom they provided nursing care and solace, and were diligent in performing the proper rituals at the appropriate times for members who had died, all of whom were buried at the same grave site. Genshin instituted the practice of keeping “death registers” (*kakochō* 過去帳), i.e., calendars that recorded the names of the deceased members of the groups under the dates of their deaths. One such register, the *Nijūgo sanmai konpon kechienshū kakochō* 二十五三昧根本結縁衆過去帳, included the names of five hundred and fifty people (Eizan Gakuin 1927, pp. 671–75).

It is apparent that there was a strong affinity, one that would not go unnoticed in the tenth century, between the Gion *goryō* cult and the practices of Genshin's Amida cult in that both were concerned mainly with sickness (disease), death, and the afterlife. Although Genshin is commonly portrayed as a *sola Amida* devotee, that was not the case for there is evidence that he included in his groups' rituals the magical, esoteric practices of Kōmyō Shingon Buddhism which involved the chanting of *dhāraṇī* for the warding off of disease,²⁸ something that was of central importance to the Gion cult. Genshin himself incorporated those practices into his cult in the fourth of the twelve articles in his aforementioned *Yokawa Shuryōgon'in nijūgo sanmai kishō* 横川首楞嚴院二十五三昧起請 (Eizan Gakuin 1927, pp. 341–42).

Indeed, from the late tenth century the *goryō* rituals were giving way to and being replaced by Amida centered rituals and various esoteric Buddhist rituals that promised a more effective handling of departed spirits. On a great many occasions Ryōgen and the other Buddhist abbots performed various esoteric rituals for the cure of one or other sick aristocrat who funded those often very lengthy rituals, and for an end to epidemics.²⁹ Consciously or not, Genshin constructed a bridge between the Enryaku-ji and the Gion cultic center, and, at the same time, was developing the cult that would succeed the one at Gion. Moreover, it appears that Genshin deliberately infiltrated the Higashiyama section of Kyoto, the site where the *goryō* cult was centered, for

²⁷ See the set of regulations, the *Yokawa Shuryōgon'in nijūgo sanmai kishō*, that Genshin composed for that group in 988, in Eizan Gakuin, ed., 1927, 1, pp. 339–58). For detailed material on the nature and development of Genshin's groups see the two articles by Horii in Ōsumi and Hayami 1983, pp. 205–32 and pp. 263–301).

²⁸ See Wada Teiichi 1972, pp. 683–85. *Dhāraṇī* are strings of syllables, often with no apparent meaning, which if constantly repeated generate a power that protects their reciter from any and all dangers of both human and non-human origin.

²⁹ See, for example, Hirabayashi 1976 and my forthcoming “The *Lotus Sūtra* and politics in the mid-Heian period.”

he sent a famous statue of Amida Buddha that he carved for enshrinement in the Hōkan-ji, an ancient temple in Higashiyama that was deeply involved in the *goryō* cult.

Furthermore, an assembly of people who had devotion to the bodhisattva Jizō, a group called the Jizōkō 地藏講, was also started by Genshin. The significance of the Jizō cult in this context is that rituals were performed to Jizō, the bodhisattva of the present age (the one between the departure of Śākyamuni Buddha and the advent of Maitreya Buddha), for protection from disease.³⁰ According to Shiga (1981, p. 155), some early Japanese statues of Jizō portrayed him with the body of an adult but the face of a child, thus intimating a link between Jizō and the Hachiō-ji, the eight child divinities to whom rituals were performed at Gion for protection from disease. Also, the cult devoted to Jizō absorbed an earlier cult in which rituals were performed to “divinities of the crossroads” (*sae no kami* 岐神) who were believed to guard the roads and their intersections. Those *kami* were deeply involved in the *goryō* cult in that their task was to prevent the movement of troublesome disease-causing divinities and departed spirits.³¹ In several important respects, therefore, the central concerns of Genshin’s new Amida and Jizō cults and the traditional concerns of the Gion *goryō* cult were not that dissimilar.

In one major respect, however, they were quite dissimilar. In contrast to the *goryō* cult, Genshin’s way of dealing with the dead provided a relatively depoliticized cult in which one need not worry especially about one’s crimes against one’s fellow man, crimes that might, in the *goryō* belief system, be avenged by the departed spirits of deceased people whom one had wronged when those people were alive. In Genshin’s Amida cult there was the promise of rebirth in the Pure Land for all, murderer and victim alike, and thus the cult had a tinge of antinomianism. It is little wonder that it became so popular.

In addition to the doctrinal/ritual bridge that Genshin built between the Enryaku-ji and Gion, the Enryaku-ji community also produced material that justified the Enryaku-ji/Gion relation by way of *honji-suijaku* (original-trace) theory which equated Gozu Tennō, the main divinity enshrined in the Tenjindō, with Yakushi Nyorai, the Buddha enshrined in the Kankei-ji as well as the main figure in the Konponchūdō, the first building constructed on Mt. Hiei by Saichō. Also, according to Murayama (1981, p. 329), relations were identified early on between Gozu Tennō and a “divinity” (*myōjin*) called Sekizan which was enshrined at the Sekizan Zen’in 赤山禪院, a small shrine in Nishisakamoto at the western foot of Mount Hiei. Sekizan was the Chinese

³⁰ Genshin’s devotion to Jizō is discussed by Hori in Ōsumi 1983, pp. 288–92.

³¹ Rituals directed to “crossroads divinities” are discussed in various works on early Japanese religion. See, for example, a note on one such ritual that was performed in Kyoto in 938 in Hayami 1975, p. 159.

Taoist divinity Ch'ih-shan who was enshrined on a high peak of that name in the Ch'ih-shan Fa-hua yüan (Japanese: Sekizan Hokke-in 赤山法華院) in Shantung province. At some point in the early T'ang period (618-907) if not earlier, Ch'ih-shan, who was invoked by Taoist practitioners for immortality and various other blessings, came under Buddhist influences as is evidenced by the name of the shrine (Fa-hua; Japanese, Hokke; i.e., Lotus) in which Ch'ih-shan resided. In 838 the Japanese monk Ennin (Jikaku Daishi, 794-864), who eventually became the third Tendai *zasu*, visited Ch'ih-shan and prayed to the divinity there for the successful fulfillment of his desire to acquire the Buddhist Law in China, and he pledged that were he to realize that goal he would worship that divinity upon his return to Japan in gratitude for its aid. In 888, two decades after Ennin died, his disciples fulfilled their master's pledge by building the Sekizan Zen'in (see Shibuya 1939, p. 21 and p. 24). The relation, if there was one, between Ch'ih-shan and Gozu Tennō in China is not clear, but such a relation was established in Japan by the Enryaku-ji people as a way of constructing another bridge between the Enryaku-ji and the Gion complex.

At some point the divinities enshrined at Gion came to be worshipped as protectors of Mount Hiei—the *Jie Daishi den* says that “the Gion divinities are our protectors” (*Gion Shōja no kami wa waga go nari*)—and the Hachiō-ji, which were enshrined in Tenjindō, also came to be enshrined in one of the seven sub-shrines at the Hie Shrine (see Hanawa 1927, 8, pp. 739-40; Takahara 1972, pp. 101-3).

Although, in conclusion, we cannot answer with certainty the questions how and why the Enryaku-ji took control of the Gion cultic complex, without doubt that development involved matters of a political, economic, and doctrinal/ritual character. The political and economic issues are perhaps quite obvious, but the doctrinal/ritual one less so. Nonetheless, in the late tenth century the similarity of the concerns of the *goryō* cult and those of Genshin's Amidist and Jizō cults was such that although the very fact of that similarity was not the cause or the reason for the Enryaku-ji's takeover of the Gion shrine, it did provide a link between the Enryaku-ji and the Gion complex and a rationale whereby the two cultic centers could be seen as having much in common. The awareness that that was the case pervaded Japan from the tenth century down to the end of the nineteenth when it was obfuscated and denied for new reasons of a politicoreligious nature.³²

³² This issue is discussed in Grapard 1984, pp. 240-65.

REFERENCES

- EIZAN GAKUIN 叡山学院, ed.
 1927 *Eshin Sōzu zensho* 恵心僧都全集 [Collected works of Genshin]. Sakamoto, Shiga Prefecture: Hicizan Tosho Kankōkai.
- GORAI Shigeru 五来 重 et al., eds.
 1979 *Kamikannen to minzoku* 神觀念と民俗 [The populace and the concept of divinity]. *Kōza Nihon no minzoku shūkyō* 講座日本の民俗宗教 [Symposium on Japanese popular religion], vol. 3. Tokyo: Kōbundō.
- GRAPARD, Allan
 1984 Japan's ignored cultural revolution. The separation of Shinto and Buddhist divinities in Meiji (*shinbutsu bunri*) and a case study: Tōnomine. *History of Religions* 23/3:240-65.
 1986 Institution, ritual, and ideology: The twenty-two shrine-temple multiplexes of Heian Japan. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion, Atlanta.
- GRONER, Paul
 1984 *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Buddhist Studies Series 7.
- HANAWA Hokiichi 塙保己一, ed.
 1927-30 *Gunsho ruijū* 群書類従 [Classified collections of Japanese classics]. Tokyo: Naigai Shoseki Kaisha. *Jie Daisōjō den* 慈慧大僧正伝 [Biography of the Buddhist Master Jie], vol 5, Folio 69, pp. 553-63.
 1975 *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従 [Classified collections of Japanese classics, continued], 72 vols (reprint). Tokyo: Zoku Gunshoruijū Kanseikai. *Jie Daishi den* 慈慧大師伝 [Biography of the Great Master Jie], vol 8, Folio 213, pp. 734-42.
- HAYAMI Tasuku 速水 侑
 1975 *Heian kizoku shakai to bukkyō* 平安貴族社会と仏教 [Buddhism and aristocratic society in the Heian period]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- HIOKI Shōichi 日置昌一
 1972 *Nihon sōhei kenkyū* 日本僧兵研究 [A study of the Japanese warrior monks]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.
- HIRABAYASHI Moritoku 平林盛得
 1976 *Ryōgen* 良源. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- HORI Daiji 堀 大慈
 1964 *Ryōgen to Yokawa fukkō (jō)* 良源と横川復興 (上) [Ryōgen and

- the revival of Yokawa, I]. *Jinbun ronsō* 人文論叢 10:24–55.
- 1966a Ryōgen to Yokawa fukkō (ge) [Ryōgen and the revival of Yokawa, II]. *Jinbun ronsō* 12:1–34.
- 1966b Jinzen to Myōkōin 尋禪と妙香院 . *Nihon bukkyō* 日本仏教 23:1–11, 24:52–65.
- 1976 Yokawa bukkyō no kenkyū 横川仏教の研究 [A study of Yokawa Buddhism]. *Shisō* 史窓 34:26–42.
- IENAGA Saburō 家永三郎
- 1980 *Nihon bukkyō shi* 日本仏教史[A history of Japanese Buddhism], vol 1: *Kodai-hen* 古代篇 [The ancient period]. Tokyo: Hōzōkan.
- KUBOTA Osamu 久保田収
- 1974 *Yasaka jinja no kenkyū* 八坂神社の研究 [A study of the Yasaka Shrine]. Kyoto: Shintō-shi Gakkai.
- KURODA Toshio 黒田俊雄
- 1980 *Jisha seiryoku* 寺社勢力 [The power of temples and shrines]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- 1981 Shinto in the history of Japanese religion. *The Journal of Japanese Studies* 7/1:1–21.
- KYŌTO-SHI 京都市, ed.
- 1970 *Heian no shinkyō* 平安の新京 [The new Heian capital]. *Kyōto no rekishi* 京都の歴史 [The history of Kyoto], vol 1. Tokyo: Gakugei Shorin.
- 1971 *Chūsei no meian* 中世の明暗 [The splendor and gloom of the medieval period]. *Kyōto no rekishi*, vol 2. Tokyo: Gakugei Shorin.
- MCMULLIN, Neil
- 1984 The Sanmon-Jimon schism in the Tendai school of Buddhism: A preliminary analysis. *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 7/1:83–105.
- forthcoming *The Lotus Sūtra* and politics in the mid-Heian period.
- forthcoming On placating the gods and pacifying the populace: The case of the Gion *goryō* cult.
- MURAYAMA Shūichi 村山修一
- 1981 *Nihon onyōdō-shi sōsetsu* 日本陰陽道史総説 [Introduction to the history of Japanese Taoism]. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō.
- ŌSUMI Kazuo 大隅和雄 and HAYAMI Tasuku, eds.
- 1983 *Genshin* 源信 . Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan. Includes articles by Hori Daiji on “Nijūgo sanmai’e to Reizan’in Shakakō 二十五三昧会と霊山院釈迦講 [The Śākyamuni *kō* of Reizan’in and the Nijūgo Sanmai’e group],” pp. 263–301, and “Yokawa bukkyō no kenkyū,” pp. 205–232.

SANSOM, George

1958 *A History of Japan to 1334*. London: The Cresset Press.

SHIBUYA Jigai 渋谷慈鑑, ed.

1939 *Tendai zasuki* 天台座主記 [A chronicle of the Tendai abbots]. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō.

SHIGA Takeshi 志賀 剛

1981 *Nihon ni okeru ekijin shinkō no seisei* 日本に於ける疫神信仰の生成 [The formation of the belief in disease-causing divinities in Japan]. *Shintō-shi kenkyū* 神道史研究 29/3:148-75.

TAKAHARA Yoshitada 高原義忠

1972 *Yasaka jinja* 八坂神社 [The Yasaka Shrine]. Tokyo: Gakuseisha.

TAKEUCHI Rizō 竹内理三, ed.

1967 *Heian ibun* 平安遺文 [Documents of the Heian period], *Komonjohen* 古文書編 [Ancient documents], vol 2. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō.

TOYODA Takeshi 豊田 武

1973 *Nihon shūkyō seidoshi no kenkyū* 日本宗教制度史の研究 [Studies in the history of Japanese religious institutions]. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō.

WADA Kenju 和田謙寿

1973 *Nihon jūin seiritsu-shi no konpon mondai ni tsuite* 日本寺院成立史の根本問題について [Regarding basic problems in the history of the establishment of Japanese temples]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 22/1:84-89.

WADA Teiichi 和田悌一

1972 *Genshin ni okeru mikkyō juyō ni tsuite* 源信における密教受容について [Regarding Genshin's acceptance of esoteric Buddhism]. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 20/2:683-85.

WHEATLEY, Paul and Thomas SEE

1978 *From Court to Capital: A Tentative Interpretation of the Japanese Urban Tradition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

YAMADA Yoshio 山田孝雄 et al., eds.

1963 *Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集 [Tales old and new]. *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* vols 22-26, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

YASAKA JINJA SHAMUSHO 八坂神社社務所, ed.

1942 *Yasaka jinja kiroku* 八坂神社記録 [Yasaka Shrine documents]. *Yasaka jinja sōsho* 八坂神社叢書 [The Yasaka Shrine library], vol 1. Kyoto: Yasaka Jinja Shamusho.