PACIFIC WORLD

Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies

Third Series Number 12
Fall 2010

Special Issue:
Buddhisms in Japan

The Dangerous *Kami* Called Buddha: Ancient Conflicts between Buddhism and Local Cults and Medieval Attempts at Resolution

Fabio Rambelli
University of California, Santa Barbara

AN IMPORTANT ASSUMPTION underlying the study of processes of religious assimilation in Japan involving Buddhism and local cults (normally known as *shinbutsu shūgō,* 神仏習合, "amalgamation of *kami* and buddhas"), is that such processes were essentially peaceful and nonconfrontational. Indeed, religious struggles opposing Buddhist institutions to local cultic centers were notably absent for the most part of late ancient and medieval Japan. However, religious assimilation was never complete and systematic. For example, elements remained that were kept separate, as in the phenomenon known as *shinbutsu kakuri* 神仏隔離 (lit., "separation of Shintō and Buddhism"), which can be observed in court rituals and, notably, at the Ise shrines 伊勢神宮. In addition, medieval authors posited the existence of spiritual/demonic entities, known as "real *kami*" (*jisshin,* 実神, or *jissha,* 実社), which could not be assimilated within Buddhism.[1] Furthermore, it is also possible to identify a shift away from Buddhism in medieval and early modern discourses about the *kami* 神.[2] All this suggests the presence of tensions, if not open conflicts, in more or less latent forms, within the dominant discourse of assimilation.[3] One of the most evident points of tension can be found in the early accounts of the arrival of Buddhism to Japan and in their medieval interpretations.

In this article, I explore the tension between Buddhism and indigenous notions of divinities by focusing on two sets of related issues. First, I review the ways in which early eighth-century Japanese Buddhist authors described their understanding of the Buddha, in particular as it took shape from within the context of contemporaneous *kami* cults. This understanding was projected back in history to the time of Buddhism's transmission to Japan. Next, I discuss a number of medieval

interpretations of the events presented in these earlier sources about the conflicts preceding the establishment of Buddhism in Japan. I will show that, while early texts present the Buddha in a manner that is strikingly similar to the contemporaneous understanding of the *kami* (in fact, the statue of the Buddha that marked the official transmission of Buddhism to Japan was considered a *kami* from the foreign countries to the west of Japan, *nishi no tonari no kuni no kami,* 西蕃神), medieval authors attempted to reinterpret the ancient anti-Buddhist movement as part of a larger, cosmic process of struggle opposing Buddha to Māra on the one hand, and Japanese *kami* as violent agents of Buddha's soteriological intentions on the other. Amalgamation of *kami* and buddhas, thus, was a cultural process that started at the very beginning of the transmission of Buddhism to Japan; it involved confrontations and negotiations, and contributed to shaping for a long time the understanding of both entities involved.

THE ARRIVAL OF "BUDDHA-*KAMI*" TO JAPAN

What we know about the introduction of Buddhism to Japan and the ensuing incidents is based on two accounts, one in the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 and the other one in the *Gangōji garan engi narabini shizaichō* 元興寺伽藍縁起並資材帳 (hereafter, *Gangōji engi*).[4] It is important to note that both texts were composed approximately two hundred years after the events they described, and each had a rather explicit ideological agenda—in the case of *Nihon shoki* legitimizing the ruling dynasty and creating an official history and in the case of *Gangōji engi* legitimizing the role of Buddhism and the place of Gangōji temple in it. Thus, they cannot be read as factual, objective testimonies of the events. Here I will follow mainly the narrative of events in the *Nihon shoki*, and integrate it with elements from the *Gangōji engi* when they are significantly different.

In 538 (Senka 宣化 3), according to the *Gangōji engi*, or in 552 (Kinmei 欽明 13), if we follow the *Nihon shoki*, King Syŏng Myŏng 聖明王 of Paekche 百済 in the Korean Peninsula (known as King Syŏng, 聖王, in Korea) sent to the Yamato court as a gift a number of Buddhist sacred objects, in particular an image of Śākyamuni, tools for bathing it (*kanbutsu,* 灌仏, an early form of Buddhist worship), and a box of scriptures for the performance of ritual services. Obviously, the Buddha image became immediately the focus of attention by the notables of the Yamato clans, mainly because of its "noble aspect" (*hotoke no kao*

kiragirashi, 仏の相貌端厳し);[5] apparently, an anthropomorphic representation like that was previously unknown in that remote archipelago. The ruler, Kinmei 欽明, asked his ministers what should be done with it. Immediately, two positions emerged. The chief minister Soga no Iname 蘇我稲目 supported official worship in the name of international cooperation. In contrast, other important members of the court such as Mononobe no Okoshi 物部 尾輿 and Nakatomi no Kamako 中臣 鎌子 strongly objected for the reason that local deities may resent the "foreign god." As a compromise, the ruler allowed Iname to worship the image privately.

Soon a terrible epidemic broke out in the realm and many people died. As the *Gangōji engi* reports, "the wrath of the *kami* manifested itself."[6] Apparently there was a dispute between the two factions at court concerning the causes of the epidemic. While the Soga attributed it to a lack of official worship of the foreign god—therefore, the cause was Buddha's anger—the Mononobe and the Nakatomi argued that it was the result of the anger of the local *kami* against the Soga's worship of the foreign god. They asked the ruler that the new cult be eradicated, and Kinmei consented. The Buddha image was thrown into the Naniwa Harbor and the temple was burned to ashes; at that point, however, a disaster (presumably, a fire) hit the king's residence.[7] There are a few discrepancies in the succession of events as told by the two sources. In addition to the year of the official arrival of Buddhism to Japan, the *Gangōji engi* says that the first persecution occurred after Soga no Iname died in 569. It also states that the death of emperor Kinmei in 571 was caused by an epidemic that broke out after the first anti-Buddhist persecution.

The narrative, for the moment, stops here. However, Buddhism had not been completely eliminated. A few months later, a miraculous log of camphor tree emitting music and light was found afloat in the sea not far from the coast. It was brought to the emperor, who ordered two buddha images to be made from it.[8] This narrative segment may be a fragment from the origin story of the image of Amida enshrined at Hisosanji 比蘇山寺 in Yoshino or at Zenkōji 善光寺; as such, it is probably a later interpolation. In any case, we get a sense that Buddhist artifacts kept coming to Japan from beyond the sea. The attitude of the Yamato authorities was ambivalent, as some images were rejected and others accepted.

Returning to the main narrative of Buddhism at court, we find that in 572 Emperor Bidatsu 敏達, the successor of Kinmei, appointed as his chief ministers Soga no Umako 蘇我馬子 and Mononobe no Yuge no Moriya 物部弓削守屋. It is from this moment that the contrast within the Yamato state concerning Buddhism escalated. In 584 the minister Kōga 鹿深臣 (written 甲賀 in *Gangōji engi*) brought back from Paekche two buddha images, one of Miroku 弥勒 and another, perhaps, of Śākyamuni, and Soga no Umako began to reestablish the Buddhist presence in the country. He built a Buddha hall in the eastern part of his private residence to enshrine the statue of Miroku, and asked a defrocked monk from Koryŏ, known as Eben 恵便 in Japanese, to become his preceptor. In addition, he ordered a daughter of the immigrant officer Shime Datto 司馬達等, together with two other young women, to take the tonsure and become nuns. He held a ceremony, during which Datto miraculously obtained a relic of the Buddha.

As the *Nihon shoki* writes, "this is the beginning of Buddhism" in Japan—of course, the text is talking about the "official" and authorized beginning of Buddhism.[9] It was a peculiar beginning indeed: A chief minister acquires Buddhist images imported from abroad, places them in his private residence partly converted into a worship hall, and chooses from among the community of expatriates a few people to be appointed as clergy. The "monk" had been previously defrocked, and the "nuns" were daughters of notables. The fact that women were in charge of Buddhist ceremonies indicates perhaps an influence of contemporary shamanistic practices, but also a deep lack of understanding of Buddhist doctrines, institutions, and ceremonies: of the three jewels, only the Buddha and the sangha were somehow present; the dharma was still absent (a relic, though, was produced in order to strengthen the sacredness of the entire affair).

Let us return to the report of the *Nihon shoki*. In 585, Umako built a *stūpa* and held a large ceremony to enshrine the relics there. In this way, Umako expanded the pro-Buddhist policy of Iname, which had remained on a purely private level. However, the difficulties were not finished. Soon after the ceremony, Umako fell seriously ill. Divination attributed the disease to a "curse" (*tatari,* 祟り) from, literally, the "Buddha-*kami*" 仏神 (with the two characters read *hotoke*, "Budha") that had previously been worshipped by his father Iname. Umako recommended to his children that they worship the "*kami* of his father," i.e., the statue of the Buddha. He also ordered a stone image of a buddha

to be made, and prayed to it to have his life extended. At that point, once again, an epidemic broke out in the realm, and many people died. Mononobe no Moriya and Nakatomi no Katsumi 中臣勝海 denounced Umako for violating the ban on Buddhism imposed by the previous emperor, Kinmei. Emperor Bidatsu agreed with them and proclaimed: "Buddhism must be stopped!"[10] Also according to the *Gangōji engi*, it was Emperor Bidatsu in person who ordered the persecution of Buddhism. Interestingly, Bidatsu was the only son of Kinmei without Soga blood (the other sons, related to the Soga clan, were subsequent emperors Yōmei 用明, Sushun 崇峻, and Suiko 推古).[11]

According to the *Nihon shoki*, Moriya went to the temple in person, cut the pole of the pagoda, fell it to the ground, and set the entire place on fire; he then took the burned image to the Naniwa Harbor and threw it in the sea. That day, we are told, there was strong wind and it rained even though there were no clouds in the sky. Moriya insulted Umako and the monk he had appointed; he also had the nuns beaten. At that point, another epidemic broke out. As the *Gangōji engi* reports: "After the destruction of Buddhism, an epidemic spread all over the realm and many people died. The sick were screaming: 'I'm burning! Somebody is breaking my body! Someone is cutting me into pieces!'"[12] Even the emperor and Moriya themselves were affected. Finally, Bidatsu allowed Umako to worship again the Buddha privately. Two months later, in the eighth month of 585, the emperor died. The conflict between Umako and Moriya grew stronger.[13]

The new emperor, Yōmei, son of Soga no Iname's daughter, Kitashihime 堅監姬, appointed again Umako and Moriya as chief ministers. In 587 Yōmei fell ill; he gathered the court and proclaimed his faith in Buddhism. He was the first emperor to do so, but he was also the first emperor related to the Soga. He also asked the opinion of the ministers about his faith. At court, pro- and anti-Buddhists quarreled fiercely. Predictably, Mononobe no Moriya and Nakatomi no Katsumi opposed the emperor's decision to worship Buddhism, whereas Umako supported it.[14] During the debate, Moriya was secretly told that he was in danger, and fled to his residence in Ato (present day Osaka Prefecture). Shortly afterwards the emperor died. Umako quickly raised an army and defeated the pretendent to the throne, a son of Bidatsu without blood ties with the Soga. He then attacked Moriya. Moriya climbed a tree and fought bravely shooting countless arrows, but when the archer Tominoichii 迹見赤檮 in the Soga army killed and

decapitated him, Moriya's army disbanded and was defeated.[15] The site where the battle took place is traditionally considered to be the location of a Buddhist temple, the Taisei shōgunji 大聖勝軍寺 in Yao City 八尾市, Osaka Prefecture. A pond in the temple compound is believed to be the place where Moriya was decapitated, either by the warrior Tominoichii or, according to another version, by Hata no Kawakatsu 秦河勝.[16] Near the temple we still find Moriya's tomb.

The *Nihon shoki* reports, anachronistically, that Prince Umayado 厩戸 (the future Prince Shōtoku, 聖徳太子, 573?–622?) had also joined the battle; in the decisive moment of the fight, he made wooden sculptures of the Four Heavenly Kings (*shi tennō,* 四天王) and vowed to build a temple for them if they helped the Soga to win the battle; Umako also expressed an analogous vow. Eventually, Moriya was killed and his party defeated; the Soga clan had won. From this moment, Buddhism would no longer encounter any official resistance; the Buddhist transformation of Japan had begun. The following year, in 588 (the first year of emperor Sushun's reign), Paekche sent to Japan relics, priests, and professionals expert in the arts related to temple construction (carpenters, tile makers, painters, etc.), probably upon a request from the Yamato state; then, Umako began the construction of Asukadera 飛鳥寺 (present-day Hōkōji, 法興寺). In the same year, Umayado began the construction of Shitennōji 四天王寺 (in present Osaka), the temple he had vowed to dedicate to the Four Heavenly Deities. Umayado donated to the temple the land and half the slaves that had belonged to Moriya.[17] In 592 Umako's daughter became empress with the name Suiko; in the following year, her brother Umayado became regent: here began his career as a Buddhist ruler, best known as Prince Shōtoku (Shōtoku Taishi, 聖徳太子).

THE NATURE OF EARLY ANTI-BUDDHISM

Historians have traditionally raised the issue of whether the Mononobe and the Nakatomi were really anti-Buddhist or whether this accusation is a later fabrication. For decades, the received interpretation in modern times was that the Mononobe defended Japanese national culture, whereas the Soga were in favor of internationalization.[18] Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉 downplayed the rivalry between the two clans on textual bases; he was perhaps the first to argue that tales of anti-Buddhist persecution do not reflect historical events, but are forgeries of later Buddhists.[19] He indicated three factors in support of

his hypothesis. Firstly, all sources repeat the same events. Passages in *Nihon shoki* concerning the early stages of Buddhism in Japan are considered to be based largely on the *Gangōji engi*; the entries on the persecution of Buddhism during the reigns of Kinmei and Bidatsu are patterned on the *Liao Gaosengzhuan* 梁高僧伝 and therefore might have little historical value. Secondly, terms used to refer to the Buddha (such as "foreign *kami*" [*adashi no kuni no kami,* 蕃神] and "Buddha-*kami*") and the general anti-Buddhist rhetorics are the same as those that appear in Chinese texts written well before the Japanese events took place. Finally, Tsuda argued, it is difficult to define pro- and anti-Buddhist positions at a time when no one really understood the Buddhist doctrines. In particular, it is hard to believe that the Nakatomi were anti-Buddhist when their descendant Kamatari 鎌足 (the founder of the Fujiwara House, 藤原家) was such a strong supporter of Buddhism. In fact, the struggle between the Soga and the Mononobe does not appear in the earliest sources: the *Gangōji engi*, concerning the anti-Buddhist events of the Kinmei era, only reports the opposition of "other ministers" without mentioning their names; as for the Bidatsu era, it only mentions the emperor's anti-Buddhist attitude. According to Tsuda, these tales were used much later to give a religious meaning to the struggle between the Soga and the Mononobe in order to present the Soga especially as pro-Buddhist and the Mononobe as anti-Buddhist. Narrations of this kind may have played a role in temple and clan politics in the early Nara period, when both the *Nihon shoki* and the *Gangōji engi* were written. It may be useful to remember that the Gangōji claimed to have been founded by the Soga; the *Gangōji engi* had thus an interest in downplaying the role of other people in the diffusion of Buddhism.[20] However, Tsuda's interpretation was later criticized by Tamura Enchō 田村円澄. Tamura believed that the contrast between the two clan involved emphasis on Japanese versus international culture and religion; he even wrote that their contrast was the "first intellectual struggle" in Japan.[21]

There is an agreement among historians today concerning the existence of an anti-Buddhist movement as part of struggles between local clans. Hayami Tasuku 速水侑 suggests that the Mononobe clan might have had relations with Buddhism or with Buddhists. Members of the Mononobe clan were sent to Paekche during the reigns of Yūryaku 雄略 and Keitai 継体, and may have been exposed to Buddhism; the Mononobe had a family relationship with the Kuratsukuri no suguri

鞍作村主, a group closely connected with Buddhism, in Shibukawa, Kawachi Province, their home region.[22] Recently, Kumagai Kimio 熊谷公男 has reiterated that there is enough historical evidence to support the received vision based on the *Nihon shoki* and other texts.[23] The Mononobe and the Nakatomi were ancient clans traditionally in charge of ritual and religious matters in the Yamato court. In contrast, the Soga was a new clan that had flourished thanks to foreign trade with the mainland and the control of the flow of immigrants to Japan (in fact, it may have been formed by immigrants). The entourage of Soga no Umako was formed almost exclusively by immigrants or descendants of immigrants.[24] It is well possible that one of the reasons for Iname's prompt acceptance of Buddhism was his desire to strengthen his ties with the mainland and the foreigners living in Japan.[25] In addition, we should note that in Korea as well there had been debates and struggles concerning Buddhism when it first arrived, which resulted in death and material destruction.

However, the struggle in Japan between the two clans was not necessarily over Buddhism per se, but about power and control. Recently, Michael Como has argued that much of the narratives about the struggle opposing Soga and the Mononobe could have been an echo of the rivalry between different groups of immigrants to Japan from the Korean Peninsula, namely, those such as the Soga related to Paekche, centered in Hōryūji 法隆寺, and those such as the Hata 秦 clan related to Silla 新羅, centered in Shitennōji and Kōryūji 広隆寺.[26] Obviously, the difficult relations among rival clans were not only due to Buddhism, but involved international relations with the states in the Korean Peninsula, local power, and prestige at court. As the *Gangōji engi* writes, despite the fact that Buddhism had been authorized as a private worship of the Soga clan, "people from Paekche, Koryŏ 高麗, and China gradually began to worship" as well.[27]

The geopolitical situation in East Asia had a growing impact on the internal situation in the Yamato state, and a critical point was reached during Emperor Kinmei's rule. The Soga were the proponents of a new government system and a more open position toward Korea, whereas the Mononobe were probably in favor of an older politics of direct intervention in the Korean Peninsula (the territory of Mimana, 任那). The arrival of Buddhism added another point of contention to the already convoluted situation. We should also add that the arrival of Buddhism coincided with frequent outbursts of epidemics, virtually unheard of in

previous times; this must certainly have be a major source of concern to the Yamato leadership.[28] Since the very beginning, then, Buddhism involved serious problems for governance in Japan: struggles among powerful clans, geopolitical considerations, even public health issues. My main concern here is neither to discuss Japanese tribal politics nor to establish which source is more historically reliable, but rather to understand the early Japanese attitude toward Buddhism, in particular in relation to contemporary beliefs about the *kami*. In this respect, both *Nihon shoki* and *Gangōji engi* appear to share the same outlook toward deities (*kami*) in general and the Buddha in particular.[29]

UNDERSTANDING THE BUDDHA-*KAMI*

To sum up our discussion thus far, sources outline the following picture. Acceptance of the Buddha at court angered the local deities who provoked an epidemic; the Buddha was therefore thrown away in Naniwa Harbor, perhaps as a way to return it to the land where it came from.[30] At this point, it was the Buddha who became angry and provoked an even worse epidemic. A striking aspect of the early accounts of the arrival of Buddhism is their ambivalent reaction to the new deity. Calls for rejection were made in order not to anger local deities, but sources also report interest for and fascination toward the new god (as we will see, texts mention its beauty, even its power).

More fundamentally, the new statue of the Buddha from Paekche was understood as a divinity, not as a symbol or a representation in general, thus indicating a basic form of religious fetishism.[31] Furthermore, both parties involved, i.e., pro-Buddhist and anti-Buddhist, epitomized in the sources by, respectively, the Soga and the Mononobe clans, agreed in considering the Buddha statue a "visiting god." In fact, the Buddha was called *kami* like the local deities: "*kami* recently arrived" (*imaki no kami,* 今来神), "*kami* of the neighboring country" (*tonari no kuni no kami,* 蕃神 or 他神), "*kami* called Buddha (*butsujin*)," are among the designations in the sources for the new deity; these terms are contrasted with "the *kami* of our realm" (*kunitsukami,* 国神). The Soga and the Mononobe conflicted, however, on the actual treatment this new god should be given, whether to accept and worship it or to reject it.[32] Thus, at this early stage, what opposed pro- and anti-Buddhists was not, strictly speaking, a religious struggle, since both parties shared the same logic governing local *kami* cults.[33] In this sense, at least, the entire discussion about pro- and anti-Buddhist attitudes is misleading;

what the clan chieftains debated, at court, were not different religions, but the treatment to be given to different *kami*—one of which, the Buddha statue, was closely related to Paekche. A brief discussion of "visiting gods" is thus in order.

Origuchi Shinobu 折口信夫, in his discussion of *marebito* まれびと, people (and gods) coming from an elsewhere situated far away, reports ancient Japanese myths and stories about "visiting deities" (*marebito no kami*, *kyakushin,* 客神) who came to the Japanese archipelago, such as Sukunabikona 少彦名神, a god who arrived floating in the sea, and Amenohiboko 天日槍 (mentioned in the *Harima no kuni fudoki,* 播磨国風土記), who came from the Korean Peninsula and fought against local deities.[34] It is possible that these stories were records, in the mythical register, of movements of people, things, and ideas from the Asian continent to the Japanese archipelago. Hayami Tasuku has suggested that Buddhism was initially treated in the same way as these ancient gods, as a "visiting deity from a neighboring country" (*tonari kuni no marahitogami,* 隣国客神), according to the expression that appears in the *Nihon ryōiki*.[35] In the fact, the *Nihon ryōiki* seems to conflate two different episodes, namely, the official transmission of Buddhism from Paekche and the arrival of a miraculous tree trunk floating on the sea;[36] in any case, like Sukunabikona, a Buddha too, in the form of a magic tree, came floating in the sea. The relative mildness of initial anti-Buddhist persecutions in Japan, especially when compared with those that had occurred in China, could be explained, then, as a manifestation of this ambivalent attitude between acceptance and rejection of entities coming from the outside that were considered "sacred"—and not, as authors have argued, because of a supposedly tolerant, collective, and assimilative culture typical of Japan.[37]

Initial forms of anti-Buddhism, as they are described by the older texts, were not reactions against Buddhist ideology based on theoretical speculation or ethical arguments. They may have concerned power relations among the most influential clans of Yamato and visions of the state, but as we have seen the texts are rather elusive on these subjects. In contrast, something that immediately strikes the observer is the reported fear of the deities, both local and foreign. The early texts are unanimous in stating that the Buddha acted like the local deities as an unpredictable and violent force. As the *Gangōji engi* states, "the Buddha-*kami* was a dangerous being" (*hotoke [butsujin] wa kashikokimono [osoremono] ni arikeri,* 仏神は恐物にありけり).[38] The foreign god

is described as superior to local deities, which suggests an ambiguous attitude toward the Outside: did the ancient Japanese ultimately accept Buddhism because they "liked" this foreign religion, as it were, or just because the "Buddha-*kami*" was stronger than their own gods, thus suggesting a cultural form of inferiority complex? Be that as it may, it is interesting to note that it was the pro-Buddhists who emphasized the superior strength and devastating violence of the Buddha-*kami*; the anti-Buddhists do not seem to have been able to explicate the terrible consequences of anti-Buddhist persecutions as interventions of their local deities.

In particular, the arrival of Buddha images and their worship are directly associated in all extant sources to the outbreak of epidemics, natural calamities, and meteorological anomalies. In other words, the arrival of the "Buddha-*kami*" threatened not only the social and political equilibrium of the Yamato state, but the cosmic balance as well. In this sense, it is particularly interesting that buddhas were initially treated as visiting deities from elsewhere, similar to traditional deities of the Izumo 出雲 mythological cycle such as Ōkuninushi 大国主 and Sukunabikona; these deities were considered to be dangerous but also, when pacified, very benevolent to their worshipers. It is also interesting to notice that the arrival of Buddhism during a time of intense exchanges with the Asian mainland coincided with the diffusion in Japan of a series of epidemics on a large scale as yet unknown in the archipelago. It is natural that people at the time tried to explain these epidemics as supernatural interventions. It was also not by chance, then, that Buddhists stressed their religion's power both to cause illnesses and to heal.

The *Gangōji engi* says that the death of Emperor Kinmei in 571 was caused by an epidemic that broke out after the first anti-Buddhist persecution that followed Soga no Iname's death in 569. On his deathbed, Emperor Kinmei is reported to have said to his children: "The Buddha-*kami* is a dangerous entity. Do not forget your uncle's [Soga no Iname] last words: do not abandon the cult of the Buddha-*kami*."[39] Later, when Soga no Umako also fell seriously ill, divination attributed the disease to a "curse" (*tatari*) from the "Buddha-*kami*" who had been previously worshiped by his father Iname. Umako recommended to his children to worship the "*kami* of his father," i.e., the Buddha. It is not clear why the "Buddha-*kami*" cursed Umako, who had just built a temple and established the first Japanese clergy. Perhaps he wanted his worship to

be expanded further. In any case, unpredictability and violence, and the use of violent means (especially, disease) in order to manifest their presence and requests, are typical features of the early *kami* as they are recorded in the *Nihon shoki* and the *Fudoki*; and as Michael Como has shown, deities associated with immigrant clans were considered especially dangerous.[40] It is easy to see initial resistance if not open hostility toward the Buddha-*kami*, another immigrant deity, in this religious context.

Other instances of sacred violence in the narratives seem to point, rather than to local *kami* beliefs, to a rudimentary understanding of the law of karma. For example, the *Gangōji engi* states in a passage that appears almost identical also in the *Nihon shoki*: "After the destruction of Buddhism, an epidemic spread all over the land, and many people died. The sick were screaming: 'I'm burning! Someone is breaking me up! Someone is cutting me!'"[41] In this case, forms of violence employed against Buddhist objects (breaking things, cutting the pillar of the *stūpa*, etc.) were exerted upon people. Texts emphasize that the suffering of the common people was exactly the same as that which had been inflicted upon the nuns and the statues in Soga no Umako's temple destroyed by the Mononobe and the Nakatomi.[42] Thus, the text presents a supernatural "an eye for an eye," according to which innocent people were punished exactly in the way as the three treasures had been persecuted. Whereas this might be a primitive and very literal interpretation of the law of karma, still it clearly indicates the destructive potential of Buddha according to the ancient Japanese pro-Buddhists. We might think that this interpretation indicates a merely rudimentary understanding of Buddhism during the early stages of its propagation; however, we should notice an important difference between the early Chinese accounts of disasters striking anti-Buddhists and their Japanese versions we have discussed. For the Chinese, death of the persecutors was clearly due to the impersonal law of karma, whereas for the Japanese it was mostly the Buddha-*kami* himself who meted out punishment on his enemies—an idea that was later developed, in the middle ages, into the concept of *butsubachi* 仏罰 (punishment meted out by the buddhas).[43]

THE BUDDHA-*KAMI*'S ORIGINAL VIOLENCE

In fact, Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), the Tendai aristocratic monk, was aware of the ethical problems intrinsic in standard accounts of

Moriya's death, in which a pious Buddhist (Prince Shōtoku) prays to the Buddha that his enemy be defeated and killed. He tried to justify it in the following way: "It was not Buddhist Law that did such things as kill Moriya. Rather, Imperial Law did away with a bad minister who was bad because he was destroying the Three Treasures of Buddhist Law that were to guard Imperial Law."[44] Here Jien is deploying the idea of the mutual dependence of Buddhist law and Imperial law to justify Prince Shōtoku's lack of Buddhist compassion toward his enemy—and, at the same time, to exempt Buddhism from the taint of violence. Along these lines, an early biography of Prince Shōtoku, *Jōgū Shōtoku Taishi den hoketsuki* 上宮聖徳太子伝補闕記, presents a negative portrait of Moriya, writing that "internally he had forgotten the virtue of filiality, externally he despised the way of ruler and subjects."[45] *Genkō shakusho* (1322) 元亨釈書 by Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬 (1278–1346) also ignores the moral conundrums related to Shōtoku's victory; according to it, Moriya's defeat was due to Shōtoku's prayers to the Four Heavenly Generals.[46] However, it is striking to discover that later sources—well into the medieval period—chose to explicitly emphasize the original violence of the Buddha, even in more brutal and complex forms than those we find in the Nara sources.

For example, the *Sangoku denki* 三国伝記 (1407) by Gentō 玄棟 (n.d.) clearly presents the fight between Mononobe no Moriya and Prince Shōtoku as a religious struggle in which supernatural entities participate on each contender's side. Moriya's stance is represented by these words he supposedly pronounced: "Why should we turn our back to the gods of our country and worship a foreign god?" At the beginning, Moriya's army was stronger in battle. Then, Prince Shōtoku vowed to build a temple to the Four Heavenly Generals (*shitennō*) should they support him until the final victory. During a particularly violent battle, Moriya climbed a hackberry tree (*enoki,* 榎) and shot an arrow belonging to his clan's god Mononobe no Futsu no ōkami 物部符都大神. The arrow hit Prince Shōtoku's armor, but did not harm him. The prince shot back an arrow of the Heavenly Generals that hit Moriya in the chest; after uttering the words, "My wish is realized; all my desires are fulfilled," he died. Moriya was decapitated by Hata no Kawakatsu and his head was brought to Prince Shōtoku, who said: "My wish is now fulfilled."[47] Moriya's army, having lost its leader, was defeated. Prince Shōtoku afterwards built the Shitennōji to fulfill his vow as a sign of gratitude to the Four Heavenly Generals. We should

notice here that, as far as only human beings were involved, Moriya's army was superior to that of Prince Shōtoku; the latter's victory was determined by the supernatural intervention of Buddhism in the guise of the Four Heavenly Generals. In other words, the superiority of the Buddhist fighters (the Four Heavenly Generals) is shown as superior to that of the Japanese *kami*. Setting aside the crude battle images in this source, we should emphasize that the Buddhist monk Gentō, the author of this account, did not see anything strange in the fact that a Buddhist temple was built after the realization of a vow to defeat and kill one's enemy, and that Moriya was killed by Prince Shōtoku thanks to the help of the protectors of Buddhism (the Four Heavenly Generals). It is uncanny, though, that both Moriya and Prince Shōtoku claimed that their respective wishes had been realized, one with his demise, the other with his triumph. How can we explain this?

A number of medieval sources offer us several important clues. The Tōdaiji 東大寺 scholar monk Gyōnen 凝然 (1240–1321) explains Moriya's failure and murder in a very interesting way. Gyōnen argues that Moriya's attempt to destroy Buddhism was a skillful means (*hōben,* 方便) to increase the number of temples and strengthen belief. Gyōnen writes: "Thanks to Prince Shōtoku's victory, everybody in Japan now takes refuge in the *buddhadharma* and there are temples and pagodas everywhere."[48] In fact, Moriya's land and wealth were confiscated and donated to a temple—as an indication of the meritorious power of such donations. For Gyōnen, Moriya was a sacrificial victim, as it were: he was killed to display the superiority of Buddhism and Buddhism's function as the protector of the state and the legitimate emperor against usurpers. Prince Shōtoku's military triumph was a good way to advertise the power of Buddhism and to secure consensus among the populace. Jūshin 住信 (b. 1210), in his collection of Buddhist stories *Shiju hyaku innen shū* 私聚百因縁集 (1257), also wrote that Prince Shōtoku's fight against Moriya was done also in order to rescue Japan from its wretched condition as a "country of wrong dharma and pure evil (*jahō jun'aku,* 邪法純悪)," referring to the situation before the arrival of Buddhism.[49]

The medieval standard biography of Prince Shōtoku, however, the *Shōtoku Taishi den ryaku* 聖徳太子伝略, develops the story of the struggle between the prince and Moriya by rejecting the logic of skillful means and introduces instead a vertiginous cosmic dimension. It quotes a certain *Hongan engi* 本願縁起, according to which Moriya had

been a criminal and a destroyer of Buddhism for several lives and in different countries. He had lived many times in China both as a man and as a woman; he had joined the Buddhists always with the goal to lure them to revolt against their country's rulers, to confound their minds, to inspire evil feelings, to grab temples' lands, and to destroy temples and *stūpas*. In particular, people who attempt to carry out this kind of actions in Japan are all manifestations (*hengen,* 変現) of Moriya.[50] Elsewhere, Moriya is presented as a cosmic felon, a true demonic entity (*jissha akunin,* 実者悪人),[51] the opposite of Prince Shōtoku himself, who was also reborn in China seven times but was instead a manifestation of Kannon 観音.[52] It is easy to recognize here a Japanese version of the cosmic opposition between Buddha and Māra—and, on a smaller, more localized scale, between Śākyamuni and Devadatta in India. In fact, the *Shōtoku Taishi den ryaku* reports the following words attributed to the prince: "I and Moriya are like reflections, we are like echoes [of each other]."[53] This obscure statement can be found in a clearer form in the *Shōtoku Taishi den shiki* 聖徳太子伝私記, one of the prophecies attributed to Prince Shōtoku, which states: "I and Moriya will be forever enemies and forever indebted to each other, like a shadow follows a shape. [We have been like that] already for five hundred lives." However, this text gives an unexpected twist to these two heroes' relation: "Both the Prince and Moriya are manifestations of great bodhisattvas. They appear like that [i.e., as Prince Shōtoku and Moriya] in order to spread Buddhism."[54] Aiming to strengthen the entire Buddhist system, they collaborate, each in his own capacity, one by causing troubles and the other by solving them. In the same vein, another text quotes an unnamed source defining Moriya a manifestation of Bodhisattva Jizō 地蔵, who appears in our world after the extinction of the Buddha to save sentient beings[55]—with the implication that Moriya sacrifices himself by acting as an enemy of Buddhism in order to help the diffusion of the dharma, in a supreme form of *migawari* 身代り (self-sacrifice in favor of someone else), as it were.[56] It is possible that the different treatment reserved to Mononobe no Moriya, envisioned either as an evil felon or a self-sacrificial saint, depends on the place of composition of the sources, whether at Hōryūji 法隆寺 (often expressing the former attitude) or Tennōji (indicating the latter vision). In fact, the heads of families claiming to be the descendants of Moriya until recently lived nearby the Tennōji and presided over the major ceremonies of the

temple; in the middle ages they served as the lay administrators (*zoku bettō,* 俗別当) of the compound.

CONCLUSION

According to these narrations, Buddhism was accepted in Japan because of Buddha's power—not the power to save beings, but to punish them. Important consequences followed from this initial reaction to Buddhism. First of all, Buddhist violence, once domesticated, was put at the service of the state and its representatives. This was the beginning of the Buddhist discourse on the protection of the state (*chingo kokka,* 鎮護国家); this discourse involved a political ideology, a rhetoric, and a ritual apparatus that flourished for centuries and, in some form, still exists today. The subtext of such ideology and rhetoric, however, is precisely the violent power of Buddhism, according to which Buddhism defeats the enemies of the state (variously configured as natural disasters, famines, droughts, epidemics, bandits, traitors, foreign invaders, heretics, etc.) by employing a supernatural violence that takes place in the invisible realm of buddhas and *kami*. A second consequence is that a peculiarly Buddhist ideology of violence develops and materializes itself in violent actions carried out by members of Buddhist institutions precisely as Buddhists, similar to Shōtoku Taishi's military campaign. The Japanese Buddhist ideology of violence manifested itself in the actions of the medieval soldier-monks (*akusō,* 悪僧, lit. "evil monks"), but also in all the rationalizations of war and of violent political conduct produced throughout Japanese history until World War II.[57]

From our discussion thus far, it appears that Buddhism has fully absorbed the ambivalent, dangerous nature of the ancient *kami* with whom it came into contact since its transmission to Japan. Later, Buddhism tried to distance itself from its acquired *kami*-nature by re-inscribing its transmission to Japan (and its struggles with local *kami*) into a grander narrative about the cosmic fight opposing Buddha to Māra. In this way, enemies of Buddhism (and exclusive worshipers of *kami*) were re-envisioned as local embodiments of Māra and Devadatta. Subsequently, the *kami* were included in this new Buddhist meta-narrative as violent agents at the orders of the Buddha. From the middle age, Buddhist institutions tried to justify particularly serious and devastating occurrences as forms of voluntary self-sacrifice performed in accordance with the will of buddhas and *kami*. One of the first instances

of this logic is an explanation of the Mongol invasions reported in the *Nomori kagami* 野守鏡: "Since we are in the final age of the dharma, the power of Buddhism is declining . . . perhaps was it the gods, who, in order to revive the power of Buddhism . . . provoked the foreigners' attack as a skillful means and brandished their sacred swords?"[58] In other words, it was the *kami* protecting Japan who actually unleashed the Mongols' attacks, which were nothing else than skillful means (*upāya*) to "revive the power of Buddhism." This was by no means an isolated position. Violent means were deemed necessary to save the Japanese. The *Shasekishū* 沙石集, a collection of Buddhist tales written in the early fourteenth century by Mujū Ichien 無住一円 (1226–1312), is even more explicit: "Our country is a marginal land far away [from India]. Its unruly people do not know the Law of Karma and don't believe in the Buddha-Dharma. Out of compassion . . . the Dharmakāya [the Buddha in its absolute and unconditioned form] manifests its body of equal outflow and appears to the Japanese in the form of demons and dangerous animals, to subjugate such evil people and bring them to Buddhism."[59] Deities protecting Japan are actually "demons and dangerous animals" or, more literally, "evil demons, malignant *kami*, poisonous snakes and violent beasts"; several Shintō texts belonging to the Buddhist tradition make clear that the true shape of the *kami* is that of snakes. Thus, Japan was protected by dangerous entities against the evil influences of demons. According to this reasoning, violent attacks against Buddhism were in fact the *compassionate* deeds of buddhas and *kami* together, and this togetherness again blurs the distinctions between them.

The protagonists of the early struggles preceding the adoption of Buddhism in Japan, Prince Shōtoku and Mononobe no Moriya, came to be interpreted in medieval Japan as actors in a larger world-historical and cosmic drama. Prince Shōtoku became the local, Japanese manifestation of the Buddha, while Moriya came to play the role of Devadatta. Furthermore, the contrast between Buddha and Devadatta was also reconfigured as the paradigm of a cosmic struggle opposing Buddha to Māra as his opposite cosmic principle; this cosmic drama is explored in many facets of medieval Japanese mythology.[60] Thus, the roles of the initial enemies of Buddhism in Japan, Moriya and, by extension, the *kami* whose interests he defended, were also included in the Buddhist system, as local manifestations of historical and cosmic enemies of the Buddha. I would like to suggest that in this way the initial opposition

between Buddhism and local cults was not solved but contained, as it were, by transposing it onto this cosmic plane. Concrete historical events became parts of an abstract meta-historical narrative. But there was a price to pay for that: the medieval Japanese Buddha was no longer a *kami*, but had preserved some of the features of the ancient *kami*, in particular, the power to punish his enemies.

This fact seems to suggest an interesting movement in the process of assimilation that was parallel but inverse to the dominant one. In other words, whereas Buddhism claimed to be pacifying and saving local *kami* by including them in the Buddhist system in various forms, it also ended up by absorbing some very un-Buddhist features of the *kami* cults, such as the recourse to violence as a legitimate form of action and expression.[61] We can see in this process one of the interpretations of the term *shūgō* 習合 (as in *shinbutsu shūgō*), which means, literally, "to learn from each other," "to be influenced by another's customs and ways." Interestingly, there is also a homophone of *narau* 習う ("to learn"), written with a different character 倣う, meaning "to copy" and "to model something after something else"; if we replace this character to the original one, we can acquire a good picture of the assimilation process, namely, Buddhism and the *kami* were copying each other to the extent that they were able to reciprocally model one after the other.

NOTES

1. On *shinbutsu kakuri*, see Takatori Masao 高取正男, *Minkan shinkōshi no kenkyū* 民間信仰史の研究 (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1962), esp. the chapter "Haibutsu ishiki no genten"; Takatori Masao 高取正男, *Shintō no seiristu* 神道の成立 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979); and Sato Masato 佐藤真人, "Shinbutsu kakuri no yōin wo meguru kōsatsu 神仏隔離の要因をめぐる考察," *Shūkyō kenkyū* 宗教研究 81, no. 2 (353) (September 2007): 149–173; on "real *kami*," see Fabio Rambelli, "Re-positioning the Gods: 'Medieval Shintō' and the Origins of Non-Buddhist Discourses on the *Kami*," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 16 (2006–2007): 305–325.

2. See Fabio Rambelli, "Before the First Buddha: Medieval Japanese Cosmogony and the Quest for the Primeval Kami," *Monumenta Nipponica* 64, no. 2 (Autumn 2009): 235–271; and Rambelli, "Re-positioning the Gods."

3. I already suggested that narratives about *kami*'s anger at Buddhists' appropriation of *kami* lands and natural resources could be clues of struggles opposing Buddhist institutions and local cults, which could be related, in turn, to forms of resistance by local clans against the growing power of

the state. See Fabio Rambelli, *Vegetal Buddhas* (Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 2001), 51–57; and Fabio Rambelli, *Buddhist Materiality: A Cultural History of Objects in Japanese Buddhism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 147–153.

4. *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀, ed. Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎 et al., 2 vols., *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文學大系 67–68 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1968); English translation in W. G. Aston, *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697* (orig. pub., 1897; repr., London: Allen & Unwin., 1956). *Gangōji garan engi narabini ruki shizai chō* 元興寺伽藍縁起並流記資材帳, in *Jisha engi* 寺社縁起, ed. Sakurai Tokutarō 桜井徳太郎 et al., *Nihon shisō taikei* 20 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1975), 7–22; *kanbun* text 328–335. English translation in Miwa Stevenson, "The Founding of the Monastery Gangōji and a List of Its Treasures," in *Religions of Japan in Practice*, ed. George J. Tanabe (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 299–315.

5. *Nihon shoki*, 2:100–101.

6. *Gangōji engi*, 9.

7. *Nihon shoki,* 2:100–102.

8. *Nihon shoki*, 2:104.

9. *Nihon shoki,* 2:148.

10. *Nihon shoki,* 2:150.

11. Kumagai Kimio 熊谷公男, *Ōkimi kara tennō e* 大王から天皇へ, Series Nihon no rekishi 日本の歴史 3 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2001), 201.

12. *Gangōji engi*, 17.

13. *Nihon shoki*, 2:148–152.

14. This episode is also mentioned in the *Sendai kuji hongi* 先代旧事本紀, in *Shintō taikei* 神道大系, ed. Shintō taikei hensakai 神道大系編纂会, 120 vols. (Tokyo: Shintō taikei hensankai, 1977–1994), Kotenhen 古典篇, 8:189, in a rare reference to Buddhism in that text.

15. *Nihon shoki*, 2:158–160.

16. *Jōgū Shōtoku Taishi den hoketsuku ki* 上宮聖徳太子伝補闕記, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:123b.

17. However, it appears that the Shitennōji was actually built later; if this is true, it may not be directly connected with Shōtoku Taishi, and Umayado's vow may not be true. In fact, at the time of the decisive battle, Umayado was only fourteen years old.

18. See for instance Harada Toshiaki 原田敏明, "Kodai shūkyōron 古代宗教論," in *Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi* 岩波講座日本歴史, ed. Ienaga Saburō 家永三

郎 et al., vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1962), 279–313.

19. Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉, *Nihon koten no kenkyū* 日本古典の研究, 2 vols; reprinted in *Tsuda Sōkichi zenshū* 津田左右吉全集, vols. 1–2 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1963–1966), 2:86–104.

20. Ienaga Saburō et al., eds., *Nihon bukkyōshi* 日本仏教史, 3 vols. (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1968), 1:50–54.

21. Tamura Enchō 田村円澄, *Kodai Chōsen bukkyō to Nihon bukkyō* 古代朝鮮仏教と日本仏教 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980), 30.

22. Hayami Tasuku 速水侑, *Nihon bukkyōshi: Kodai* 日本仏教史—古代 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1986), 28–37.

23. Kumagai, *Ōkimi kara tennō e*, 201.

24. A clan closely related to the Soga, the Shime, originated with Shime Tatto who immigrated to Japan from the Korean Peninsula around the middle of the sixth century. The clan was mainly in charge of building horse stables. One of its member was the famous Buddhist sculptor Kuratsukuri no Tori 鞍造止利; they built their clan's temple, the Sakatadera 坂田寺, in Asuka.

25. Kumagai, *Ōkimi kara tennō e*, 204.

26. Michael I. Como, *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), esp. 22–27.

27. *Gangōji engi*, 9.

28. Since its beginnings in Japan, Buddhism was closely related to epidemics; the Buddhist discourse on healing, its spiritual and mental overtones notwithstanding, was always understood also in very concrete, bodily terms. In fact, scholars have pointed out that the arrival of Buddhism coincided with increasing contacts between the Japanese archipelago and the Asian mainland, which involved also the diffusion to a relatively isolated area of dangerous diseases, such as smallpox, bubonic plague, mumps, and measles, against which people had not yet developed an immune response. On this subject, see William H. McNeill, *Plagues and Peoples* (orig. pub., 1976; repr., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1985), esp. 133–134.

29. It is interesting to note that some exponent of the Shintō establishment still continue to uphold the belief in the initial struggle between Buddhism and Shintō. A Shintō memorial service is still performed in front of Moriya's tomb to celebrate Moriya as the "hero" (*eirei,* 英霊) who gave his life to protect "our country's divine national essence" (*wagakuni jingi kokutai,* 我が国神祇国体); see http://www.jinjacho-osaka.net/oosakanomatsuri/mononobenomoriya_bozennsai.htm.

30. Returning an unwanted god to the sea already had an important precedent

in ancient mythology, namely, the episode in which the gods Izanagi and Izanami abandoned at sea their malformed "leach child" (*hiruko*, written 水蛭子 in *Kojiki* and 蛭児 in *Nihon shoki*); see *Kojiki* 古事記, ed. Ō no Yasumaru 太安萬侶, in *Kojiki, Norito* 古事記・祝詞, ed. Kurano Kenji 倉野憲司 and Takeda Yūkichi 武田祐吉, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文學大系 1 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1958), 23; *Nihon shoki*, 1:86.

31. Tsuda already indicated the cultic importance of Buddha's statue as a *kami*: Tsuda, *Nihon koten no kenkyū*, 94–95. The concept of religious fetishism was first introduced by Charles de Brosses in 1760 (Charles De Brosses, *Du culte des dieux fétiches* [orig. pub., 1760; repr., Paris: Fayard, 1988]). On religious fetishism in Japan, see Ishizuka Masahide 石塚正英, *Fetishizumu no shinkōken: shinbutsu gyakutai no fōkurōa* フェティシズムの信仰圏ー神仏虐待のフォークローア (Tokyo: Sekai shoin, 1993).

32. Hayami, *Nihon bukkyōshi*, 36–37.

33. Ibid., 37.

34. The locus classicus of Orikuchi Shinobu's treatment of *marebito* is the third draft (*daisankō* 第３稿) of his seminal article "Kokubungaku no hassei 国文学の発生," included in his *Kodai kenkyū*古代研究 (reprinted in *Origuchi Shinobu zenshū* 折口信夫全集, vol. 1 [Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1965], 3–62). The episode is in *Fudoki* 風土記, ed. Uegaki Setsuya 植垣節也, *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* 新編日本古典文学全集 5 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1997), 201–217 (*passim*); see also Michiko Y. Aoki, *Records of Wind and Earth: A Translation of Fudoki, with Introduction and Commentaries* (Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Asian Studies, 1997), 71 and *passim*.

35. Hayami, *Nihon bukkyōshi*, 28–37.

36. *Nihon ryōiki* 日本霊異記, by Keikai 景戒, ed. Izumoji Osamu 出雲路修, *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 30 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1996), 14.

37. See Hayami, *Nihon bukkyōshi*, 28–37.

38. *Gangōji engi*, 10.

39. Ibid.

40. See Michael I. Como, *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009).

41. *Gangōji engi*, 17.

42. See for example *Gangōji engi*, 17; *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書, by Kokan Shiren, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 62:143; *Jōgū Shōtoku hōōtei setsu* 上宮聖徳法王帝説, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:119–121.

43. See Fabio Rambelli, "Buddha's Wrath: Esoteric Buddhism and the Discourse of Divine Punishment," *Japanese Religions* 27, no. 1 (2002): 41–68.

44. *Gukanshō* 愚管抄, by Jien 慈円, ed. Okami Masao 岡見正雄 and Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文學大系 86 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1967), 138. English translation from Delmer M. Brown and Ichirō Ishida, *The Future and the Past: A Translation and Study of the* Gukanshō*, an Interpretative History of Japan Written in 1219* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1979), 27. On the same line of argumentation, Jien wrote that also Emperor Sushun was killed by Soga no Umako because of his attempts to eliminate Buddhism.

45. *Jōgū Shōtoku Taishi den hoketsuku ki*, 71:123a.

46. *Genkō shakusho*: the description of Prince Shōtoku's fights against Moriya is on p. 143.

47. *Sangoku denki* 三国伝記, by Gentō 玄棟, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 92:216c.

48. *Sangoku buppō denzū engi* 三国仏法伝通縁起, by Gyōnen 凝然, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 62:12c.

49. *Shiju hyaku innen shū* 私聚百因縁集, by Jūshin 住信, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 92:185c.

50. *Shōtoku Taishi den ryaku* 聖徳太子伝略, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:128c.

51. *Taishi den kokon mokuroku shō* 太子伝古今目録抄, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:277. The term *jissha* is written 実者, a variant form of 実社. On the concept of true demonic entity (*jissha*) as opposed to supernatural entities as manifestations of buddhas and bodhisattvas, see Rambelli, "Re-positioning the Gods."

52. On this, see *Taishi den kokon mokuroku shō*, 71:271. The *Gukanshō* defines Prince Shōtoku a "magnificent incarnation of Avalokiteśvara": Brown and Ishida, *The Future and the Past*, 27.

53. *Shōtoku Taishi den ryaku*, 71:128c.

54. *Shōtoku Taishi den shiki* 聖徳太子伝私記, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:299c.

55. *Kenshin Tokugo kuketsu shō* 顕真得業口決抄, in *Dai Nihon bukkyō zensho* 大

日本仏教全書, ed. Bussho kankōkai 仏書刊行会, 100 vols. (orig. pub., 1912–1922; repr., Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 71:304a–b.

56. I owe this information to Abe Yasurō (personal communication, London, June 10, 2005).

57. On *akusō* see Mikael Adolphson, *The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha: Monastic Warriors and Sōhei in Japanese History* (Honolulu: Hawai'i University Press, 2007); on Buddhist rationalizations of war in modern Japan, see Brian Victoria, *Zen at War* (New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1997); and Brian Victoria, *Zen War Stories* (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

58. *Nomori kagami* 野守鏡, in *Gunsho ruijū*, ed. Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 and Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai 続群書類従完成会, 30 vols. (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho ruijū kanseikai, 1959–1960), 278:508.

59. *Shasekishū*, p. 64. English translation in Robert E. Morrell, *Sand and Pebbles (Shasekishū): The Tales of Mujū Ichien, a Voice for Pluralism in Kamakura Buddhism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985), 75.

60. See Iyanaga Nobumi, "Le Roi Mâra du Sixième Ciel et le mythe médiéval de la création du Japon," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 9, Mémorial Anna Seidel: Religions traditionnelles d'Asie orientale, Tome II (1996–1997): 323–396. Ikoma Tetsurō 生駒哲郎 has suggested that the struggle that opposed Prince Shōtoku to Mononobe no Moriya re-emerged in a new fashion after the destruction of Tōdaiji in 1181; Shōtoku was envisioned as the living Buddha of Japan, whereas Moriya became the embodiment of anti-Buddhist evil, who later manifested himself as Taira no Kiyomori 平清盛 (Ikoma Testurō 生駒哲郎, "Chūsei shōjin shinkō to Mononobe no Moriya denshō: Seija to butteki no saisei 中世生身信仰と物部守屋伝承：聖者と仏敵の再生," *Shigaku zasshi* 史学雑誌 113, no. 12 [December 2004]: 100).

61. See Satō Hiroo, *Amaterasu no henbō* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2000); Satō Hiroo, "Wrathful Deities and Saving Deities," in *Buddhas and Kami in Japan*, ed. Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 95–114.