Historiographical Issues in the Studies of Japanese Religion: Buddhism and Shintō in Premodern Japan

Ikuo Higashibaba
Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley

The area in which our investigation will take place makes nonsense of that conventional distinction hitherto observed by most western writers on Japanese religion, the separation of Shintō from Buddhism. Shintō, with its liturgies, rituals and myths, has been usually treated in isolated purity, unadulterated by Buddhist elements. The Buddhist sects have likewise been described according to doctrines respectably based on scriptures with their proper place in the Buddhist canon. The large area of religious practice common to the two, in which the worshipper is scarcely aware whether the deity he is addressing is a Shintō *kami* or a bodhisattva, has been either ignored or relegated to various snail patches with pejorative labels such as superstition, syncretism or magic.

Carmen Blacker, *The Catalpa Bow* (1975)

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the so-called "new history" has gained remarkable popularity among historians worldwide. The new history, which has grown out of the French *Annales* school, aims at doing history of the whole range of human activity. As a perspective proposing a variety of new fields of exploration and approaches, the new history challenges on several fronts the traditional paradigm of historical writing.[1]

Peter Burke, an influential proponent of the new history, compares the new history to the traditional paradigm in the following six aspects:

1. The new history is concerned with virtually every human activity, while traditional history is essentially concerned with politics.

2. The new history is more concerned with the analysis of structures, while traditional historians think of history (historical writing) as essentially a narrative of event.

3. Many of the new historians are concerned with "history from below" while traditional history offers a view from above.

4. The new history is concerned with great variety of types of evidence such as visual, oral, and statistical evidence other than official records, while traditional history focuses on "the documents."

5. The new history is concerned with collective movements as well as individual actions, with trends as well as events, while the traditional model of history is primarily concerned with individuals and events.

6. The new history considers the traditional claim of the objectivity of history to be unrealistic. Standing on cultural relativism, the new history values "varied and opposing voices" rather than the ideal of the "Voice of History."[2]

The new historians' interests in the whole range of human activity have inspired the incorporation of other disciplinary approaches into historical writing. Social and economic interpretations of history have been promoted from early stages in the development of the new history. Today historians are encouraged to learn also from a variety of other disciplines, including anthropology, psychology, and literary theory. In particular, anthropology has begun to exert a remarkable influence on the newly arising cultural history.[3]

It must be noted that the new history attempts to understand society as a total and integrated organism, and it emphasizes serial, functional, and structural approaches.[4] Results of different approaches are not left unconnected to each other, merely being juxtaposed side by side. Rather, new historians see history as interaction between different categories within a certain social structure, according to a principle of cohesion. The new history thus aims at constructing a general history of a society in a certain space-temporal area.

The new history has fostered a number of fields of exploration, including history from below, women's history, micro-history, oral history, history of reading, and history of images. In reaction to the traditional paradigm, which focuses on an historical account of great figures, the new history has promoted much exploration into the ordinary experience of popular social life and culture. Although the "history from below" still involves many problems,[5] it has succeeded in exploring the historical experience of people whose existence has been so often ignored in the traditional model of historical writing.

Challenges to the conventional paradigm in historical writing have also emerged in recent works on premodern (ancient and medieval) Japanese religions. Many historians today find it very insufficient to write a Japanese religious history in the conventional manner by focusing on the thought and actions of great religious masters. Instead, those historians propose perspectives with which to explore Japanese religious history in terms of not only doctrine but also of society and culture. Their perspectives would lead to a general religious history dealing with the whole range of historical experience, including ordinary life experience.

One significant example of such challenges to the conventional paradigm is some new historians' opposition to the idea that Shintō and Buddhism can be studied separately — a long-standing assumption which most modern scholars have taken for granted.[6] Scholars opposing this idea argue that such an idea is due not to a study of history but to a twofold historiographical problem: the overemphasis on doctrine to define a religion and the motives on the part of scholars for the strict separation of Shintō and Buddhism under the influence of Meiji ideology.[7] The new historians' challenge to the idea that Shintō and Buddhism can be studied separately reveals their dissatisfaction with the conventional approach to Japanese religious history, which is responsible for that problematic idea about the relationship between Shintō and Buddhism.

Constructed from new perspectives, as new historians claim, a history would demonstrate the opposite of the conventional assumption about the relation between Shintō and Buddhism: Shintō and Buddhism did not exist as discrete religions in premodern times. What existed instead was a highly combinative religious world integrating various elements, which we recognize only today under the separate categories of Shintō and Buddhism.

Despite the growing popularity of the new perspective in premodern Japanese religious history, only a few historians have seriously attempted to review their approaches in any structured manner. In the following pages, I wish to clarify some of the important issues of the new perspectives which have been rapidly emerging in many historical writings on premodern Shintō and Buddhism.

The task of any new historical perspective is twofold. One is to propose a new paradigm, which is always associated with critique of the conventional perspective, while the other is to justify the new perspective with historical evidence. Therefore, my discussion below deals not only with perspectives, but also with evidence which supports the perspectives, highlighting important aspects of premodern Shintō-Buddhism relations.

I will discuss the new paradigms focusing on those regarding thought and institutions in premodern Shintō and Buddhism. Accordingly, historical evidence will be classified into these categories. I will also discuss the issue of the "history from below" approach in the study of premodern Shintō and Buddhism. Study of ordinary religious experience in premodern Japan has been attempted by a few Japanese historians, but it has remained mostly ignored in western scholarship.

I. NEW PERSPECTIVE: ON THOUGHT

In my discussion of a new perspective pertaining to the theological aspect of premodern Shintō-Buddhism relations, I will focus on the thesis proposed by Kuroda Toshio, perhaps the most influential proponent of the recent new perspective movements in the study of premodern Japanese religion. My discussion on Kuroda is followed by an examination of the *honji suijaku* "the original nature, trace manifestation" theory, which developed in the medieval period. The *honji suijaku* theory was the fundamental rationale which combined Buddhist and Shintō divinities.

HISTORIOGRAPHICAL THESIS OF KURODA TOSHIO

In addition to the fact that his thesis offers a new theological perspective to the premodern Shintō-Buddhist relations, there is a good reason to begin this historiographical study with Kuroda Toshio. Kuroda, perhaps for the first time in the western scholarship, highlighted a historiographical issue in the study of Shintō and Buddhism, and he opposed the conventional perspective by presenting his thesis as well as by addressing the problems involved in the conventional perspective.

Since his article "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion"[7] first appeared in English in 1981,[8] Kuroda's insight has encouraged many western scholars to approach premodern Shintō and Buddhism from new viewpoints. Those historians took Kuroda's position by opposing in one way or another the conventional assumption.

In his article, Kuroda specifically argues against the scholars' manner of discussing Shintō as if Shintō has been a single body of ideas, practices, and institutions throughout Japanese history. He challenges the conventional view of Shintō by re-examining the meaning of the word "Shintō" in the premodern period.

Kuroda explains that scholars have understood Shintō in one of the following two ways. First, they believed that, despite the dissemination of Buddhism and Confucianism, the religion called Shintō has existed without interruption throughout Japanese history. According

to Kuroda, this interpretation is particularly strong among Shintō scholars and priests. Second, aside from whether it existed under the name Shintō, there have always been Shintō-like beliefs and customs throughout history. This interpretation is popular in studies of Japanese culture or intellectual history.[9]

The above two ways of understanding of Shintō commonly presuppose that Shintō is a unique religion which has independently existed throughout history. Kuroda contends, however, that this view is not only an incorrect perception of the facts but also a one-sided interpretation of Japanese history and culture.[10]

Kuroda's thesis is based on his analysis of the historical development of the meaning of the word "Shintō" in ancient and medieval times. He examines the original meaning of Shintō as appearing in *Nihonshoki*, the Chronicles of Japan, complied in 720 C.E.[11] Kuroda claims that there are three possible interpretations of Shintō: (1) popular beliefs in general (not necessarily Japanese but could also be Chinese and Korean); (2) the conduct or action of *kami*; (3) and Taoism.[12] Consequently, he argues, in no example is Shintō used to refer to an independent religion, nor does it indicate something that is uniquely Japanese.[13]

Kuroda, then, observes that during eighth to eleventh centuries, veneration of *kami* was absorbed into Buddhism through a variety of doctrinal innovations and new religious forms (*shinbutsu shūgō*). In this period, people became more cognizant of *kami* in relation to the Buddhas. According to Kuroda, however, this heightened awareness of *kami* never implied that Shintō was an independent entity. "On the contrary," he writes, "there was more of a sense that Shintō occupied a subordinate position and role within the broader scheme of Buddhism."[14]

As to the meaning of the word Shintō in medieval times (twelfth through sixteenth centuries), Kuroda believes that it meant the state of being a *kami* or attributes of a *kami*. As such, for Kuroda, Shintō in the medieval period was a segment of a Buddhist system called the esoteric-exoteric *(kenmitsu)* system," which constituted the fundamental religious system of medieval Japan. He writes:

> This entire order constituted the fundamental religious system of medieval Japan. Shintō was drawn into this Buddhist system as one segment of it, and its religious content was replaced with Buddhist doctrine, particularly *mikkyō* and Tendai philosophy.[15]

Far from being an independent religious entity, Shintō existed only within the Buddhist system and was interpreted through Buddhist doctrine, in particular, through the *honji suijaku* theory:

In *kenmitsu* Buddhism, the most widespread interpretation of the religious content of Shintō was the *honji suijaku* theory, based on Tendai doctrine. According to this theory, the *kami* are simply another form of the Buddha, and their form, condition, authority, and activity are nothing but the form and the acts by which the Buddha teaches, guides, and saves human beings. Shintō, therefore, was independent neither in existence nor in system of thought. It was merely one means among many by which the Buddha guides and converts sentient beings.[16]

Kuroda's thesis is most immediately concerned with the issue of the perspective which has been imposed on historical studies of premodern Shintō and Buddhism—the perspective which eventually limited our understanding of their historical reality. Although historians commonly discuss the syncretism of medieval Shintō and Buddhism, this very concept is, according to Kuroda, based on a perspective which arbitrarily divides Shintō and Buddhism into pure categories in all periods of Japanese history.[17] From such a viewpoint, the medieval Shintō-Buddhism amalgamation has been treated as an exceptional, which is, as Allan Grapard describes it, a "phenomenon as odd and fleeting."[18]

Kuroda's argument is essentially historiographical in that his critique is not of the historical reality of the phenomena which today we call Shintō but of the historian's assumption that Shintō was an independent religion throughout history. To be sure, the whole matter has to do with the manner of explaining the Shintō tradition, not the history of the tradition itself.

His insight—which equates Shintō with *kami* in premodern times—negates the understanding of Shintō as an autonomous doctrinal, ritual, and institutional system, but conversely it affirms that there were at least beliefs and practices pertaining to *kami*. In other words, although Kuroda denies Shintō as what modern scholars classify based on the notion of "religion," he affirms Shintō as a form of belief system directed to *kami*, which was different from any form of Buddhist faith, no matter how deeply integrated in the Buddhist *kenmitsu system*. What concerns us here is not a historical problem but conceptual one, the problem of how to look at Shintō, in what terms to define Shintō.

Kuroda also addressed the possible "causes" for the conventional assumption. In the same article and elsewhere,[19] he argues that the modern approach to Shintō and Buddhism is due to the development of the notion that Shintō was Japan's indigenous religion. Promoted by the movements of the National Learning *(kokugaku)* and the Restoration Shintō *(fukko shintō)* in the Tokugawa period, this notion was finally completed during the Meiji period when the separation between

Shintō and Buddhism was nationally executed *(shinbutsu bunri)*.[20] This being the case, Kuroda even thinks that historians who presuppose the separation between Shintō and Buddhism in premodern and during the Tokugawa period are still under the influence of Meiji ideology.

THE HONJI SUIJAKU THEORY

If, as Kuroda claims, premodern Shintō was a part of the Buddhist *kenmitsu* system, and if the separation between Shintō and Buddhism was due to a historiographical distortion, we must observe the *honji suijaku* theory with much greater attention. The theory should no longer be understood as a part of the premodern "phenomenon as odd and fleeting" on the border of the history of two separate religions.[21] On the contrary, the *honji suijaku* theory must be understood to represent a general tendency of religious thought in premodern times, and it fully defines the theological relation between the premodern Shintō and Buddhism.

The *honji suijaku* (original nature, trace manifestation) theory developed from the Tendai school's interpretation of the *Lotus Sūtra* in which the first half of the sūtra is understood as *"jakumon,"* things pertaining to the manifested (historical) Buddha, and the second half as *"honmon,"* things pertaining to the Original (Eternal) Buddha.[22] The origin of this interpretation has become associated with the Chinese T'ien T'ai school Master Chih-i (538-94). In his commentaries on the sūtra, Chih-i applied the division of the manifested Buddha and the Original Buddha to the sūtra's structure, first and second halves, and he termed them *chi-men* and *pen-men*, respectively.[23]

When exactly did the "original nature, trace manifestation" schema begin to be applied to the relationship between Buddha/bodhisattva and *kami?* The answer depends upon how strictly we define the meaning of the *honji suijaku* theory. If we define the theory broadly, as referring to any assimilative thought *(shūgō shisō)* to explain *kami* in terms of Buddhist concepts, then the *honji suijaku* theory must have begun by the mid-eighth century.

The theory then developed through four stages until it finally became formulated as the theory which particularly defines *kami* as phenomenal manifestations of the Buddhas or bodhisattvas.[24] Probably by the twelfth century, the *honji suijaku* theory was applied to almost all *kami* enshrined at major shrines, such as Ise, Kasuga, Usa, and Hie, by way of identifying the *kami* 's *honji*.[25]

The *honji suijaku* theory permeated into all levels of Japanese religious life with shrine priests and monks as agents of propaganda.[26] In accordance with the theory, it also became customary to enshrine stat-

ues of Buddhist divinities in Shintō shrines.[27] *Kami* statues were made in the guise of Buddhist statues, and figures of *kami* and amalgamative mandaras were painted.[28] The *honji suijaku* theory provided intellectual justification for the general Shintō-Buddhist associations (*shinbutsu shūgō*) which were seen ritually and institutionally as well.

The *honji suijaku* theory became an integrated part of much of medieval Buddhist thought.[29] In particular, Tendai and Shingon schools developed the theories which formed the Buddhist Shintō thought systems called "Sanno Shintō" and "Ryobu Shintō," respectively.

To focus on the Tendai case, Tendai's Sanno Shintō was born out of the *honji suijaku* theory combined with the Tendai doctrine of *hongaku* (original enlightenment). Hirai Naofusa explains, "In Tendai's philosophy of ultimate reality, primordial Buddha nature as represented by Śākyamuni Buddha was held to be the reality behind all phenomena, including the *kami*. The main deity of the Hie Shrine [Sanno], the tutelary deity of Enryakuji, was considered an incarnation of Śākyamuni."[30] Thus, within the *honji suijaku* theory's general framework of correspondences between *kami* and Buddhist divinities, Sanno Shintō developed a particular theory of correspondence based on Tendai teaching.[31]

Learned Shintō priest families who opposed kami's subordinate position against Buddhist divinities fostered their Shintō thought (*shintō ron*) outside Buddhist schools. Although they attempted to reassert Shintō's distinctiveness and superiority,[32] their theories were more or less syncretic, integrating Buddhist, Confucian, and Taoist elements. Most of all, Shintō thought was under the influence of the *honji suijaku* theory, because it was generally structured by the logic of the "true nature, trace manifestation."

To take one example, the Yoshida family's Shintō thought, called "Yui'itsu Shintō," developed a theory in which Shintō is the "root-foundation," while Buddhism is the "flower-fruit," and Confucianism the "branch-leaf."[33] By making the Shintō *kami* Taigen Sonjin the fundamental deity from whom all things originate,[34] Yui'itsu Shintō reversed the former interpretation of the *honji suijaku* theory.

The *honji suijaku* theory represented the combinative character of both medieval Shintō and Buddhist thought. In Shintō, although the positions of Buddhist deities and *kami* were reversed, the theory remained as the primary theoretical framework (origin-manifestation), and it provided Shintō with two basic elements of thought, *kami* and Buddhist divinities. On the other hand, the theory existed as an integrated part in the Buddhist philosophical system. As long as the *honji suijaku* theory originated from Buddhist philosophy, the Shintō thought based on the same theory must be understood as a part of the Buddhist doctrinal system. In this sense, as Kuroda argues, there was no independent Shintō thought.[35]

II. NEW PERSPECTIVES: ON INSTITUTIONS

Kuroda's opposition to the conventional assumption which deals with Shintō and Buddhism separately has been echoed by many Western students of the history of Japanese religions. They began to direct their attention to the premodern Shintō and Buddhist relationship. In so doing, historians started to apply new approaches to the study of Japan's premodern religions in contrast to the conventional view which overemphasizes theoretical issues and great figures. Thus, fields which the history of Japanese religions had long overlooked began to be explored.

It is perhaps in the field of studying religious institutions that the history from new perspectives has most advanced, in terms of its theoretical formulation and exploration of historical evidence. Sociological studies show that in premodern times, most major Shintō shrines and Buddhist temples did not exist independently. Rather, they were closely connected with each other to form integrated wholes.

In this section, I will discuss a sociological perspective in the study of premodern Japanese religions and its consequence for the historical relation between Shintō and Buddhism. First, I will briefly examine a tendency of new sociological perspectives and the primacy of institutional consideration, through the works of Neil McMullin.

My discussion will be, then, focused on the Shintō-Buddhist institutional relationship. I will also examine the "combinative" principle, a paradigm proposed by Allan Grapard for the historical study of Japanese religious institutions and, in extension, of Japanese religions in general. I will concentrate my historical discussion on the development of shrine-temple complex, the core institutional system in premodern Shintō and Buddhism.

SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES

The commonest critique of the conventional paradigm of doing history of Japanese religions is the paradigm's lack of sociological perspective. Neil McMullin lists some vital aspects that have been missed in the study of premodern Japanese religions: (1) the relation between the development of religious institutions, rituals and doctrines, and developments in the society-at-large of the time, (2) the comparative importance of religious institutions, rituals, and doctrines, and (3) the relation between religion and politics.[36]

First, McMullin argues that religious structures (institution, ritual, and doctrine) developed almost invariably in response to other sectors of the society of the time.[37] Therefore, religion must be understood not

in isolation but in the broad context of the societies in which those institutions and rituals arose and functioned.[38] McMullin argues that this perspective is important if the reasons for a religion's "development, the nuances of its meaning, and its full significance are to be understood and appreciated."[39]

Second, McMullin contends that it is improper to overlook institution and ritual in favor of doctrine. The importance of religions in Japanese history was due primarily to the religious institutions. In this respect, Allan Grapard also reminds us that the emergence, formation, and development of cultic centers are a fundamental aspect of Japanese religions and culture.[40] McMullin's arguments for the institutional study are indeed the heart of his historiographical argument. Within the framework of a sociologically-based interpretation of religion, he believes that religious institutions deserve primary attention, because they made great impact on a number of aspects of society, such as art, economy, education, literature, politics, and others.[41]

McMullin also argues that we must emphasize the study of ritual in order to understand premodern Japanese religions. According to McMullin, the primary activity of most Buddhist clerics, for example, was not so much the study of doctrine as it was learning, practicing, and performing rites.[42] He further maintains that the development of Buddhist traditions are best understood as the appearance of new kinds of rituals.[43]

Third, McMullin's concern for the institutional study of religion leads him to a further specific topic, that is, the relation between religious institutions and politics.[44] He argues that it is incorrect to assume that religion and politics had different spheres of operation. In ideological terms they were mutually dependent, and religious institutions had strong political power.[45] He writes:

If religion is understood in a broader sense, whereby it refers to a body of institutionalized expressions of beliefs, rituals, observances, and social practices found in a given cultural context, then religion and politics greatly overlap insofar as the latter has to do with the regulation and control of people living in society.[46]

If McMullin's view represents a tendency toward sociological perspectives, the social study of premodern Japanese religions does two new things. First, as noted already, it socially *contextualizes* the deeds and thoughts of famous figures. Modern studies of the history of Japanese religions have tended to focus on doctrines and on the thought and biographies of the major figures. In so doing, scholars have treated them as if they had been ahistorical independent phenomena isolated from

surrounding conditions.[47] A sociological perspective interprets major religious figures by putting them into a larger social structure. By relating their development to that of other parts of society, it offers new explanations of those figures. The sociological approach explains *why* a religious event took place by finding its determining mechanism in the surrounding society.

Parenthetically, such a social contextualization requires historians to maintain a subtle balance so as to avoid the possible pitfall of "sociological reduction." In the practice of social contextualization, there is a tendency to focus more on the search for social causes than on the understanding of religious developments themselves. McMullin's own work on the relation between Buddhism and the state in the sixteenth century Japan ironically demonstrates this pitfall. His overemphasis on the state policy leaves many aspects of the internal developments of Buddhism ignored, developments which must have occurred as a result of the interaction of Buddhism with the state.[48]

The second contribution of the sociological perspective is that it shifts analytical focus from doctrines to institutions so a religious history can include communal forms and ritual practices as well. Institutional study therefore makes it possible to create, as it were, a "three-dimensional" historical vision of a religious tradition.

If an institutional study is socially contextualized, let alone explored within each dimension, the religion's history may become more enhanced and structured within itself, and it appears as a significant segment of the larger Japanese premodern history. Thus, sociological exploration has the potential to construct a broader history by using institution as the basic context of analysis.

It is Allan Grapard, an historian of Japanese religions, who brought this potential to the level of a theoretical framework. Grapard's insight is significant to this study, because his claim for institutional study is based on his opposition to the scholars' manner of explaining Shintō and Buddhism separately.[49] Grapard's historiographical claim for institutional study and his historical claim of the combination of the two traditions on an institutional level are two sides of the coin. Institutional study reveals the combinative nature of Shintō and Buddhism. Conversely, historical evidence of that combination supports the institutional study as a proper perspective.

The following set of proposals by Grapard shows the nature and the scope of his study:

1. Japanese religiosity is grounded in specific sites at which beliefs and practices were combined.
2. Japanese religiosity is neither Shintō nor Buddhist nor sectarian but is essentially combinative.

3. Those combinative systems which evolved in specific sites are
related to institutions of power and, therefore, to political, social,
and economic order, all of which are interrelated and embodied in
rituals and institutions marking those sites.[50]

Grapard asserts that Japanese religious systems (belief and ritual
systems) were grounded in specific sites. He observes that until the
Meiji period, types of Japanese religious systems were differentiated
according not to the division based on the doctrines or founders but to
specific places, such as Nanto (Nara Buddhist school), Tō-Eizan (Ten-
dai school), Nangaku (Shingon school), Ise (the Shintō of Ise), and Miwa
(the Shintō of Miwa).[51] He maintains that religion or religiosity in Ja-
pan is primarily attached to some kind of space referent.[52] For Grapard,
the emergence, formation, and development of cultic centers are the
fundamental aspect of Japanese religions.

He observes that religious systems at these locale-specific units
demonstrate the association between particular *kami* and particular
Buddhas/bodhisattvas as the common characteristic. At each site,
temples were associated with shrines. Grapard believes that the asso-
ciation between Shintō and Buddhist divinities that occurred in cultic
centers is a vital part of their being.[53]

Grapard argues that the combinative character found in cultic cen-
ters proves to be the rule of Japanese religiosity. He further proposes to
call the combinative structure (its complex elements as well as the ways
in which they interacted) the Japanese "cultural system," because, re-
lated to institutions as well as to political, economic, and social orders,
the belief system embodies Japanese cultural patterns.[54] He writes,

These combinations form the real structure of the mindscapes
through which the cultural systems of Japan found expression. The
Japanese tradition before Meiji was always combinatory. In that
tradition, reality was neither Shintō nor Buddhist but exhibited an
interrelational structure....[55]

His intention is to use the consequence of the institutional under-
standing as the model of explanation for the history of Japanese cul-
ture in general. The model is to disclose the "principle of cohesion" of
the units in a social structure at a given time. Grapard's fundamental
hypothesis in his study of premodern institutions is, therefore, "that
sites of cult are the best symbolic representatives of the cultural sys-
tems that determined in great part the evolution of Japanese history:
they are nexus in which the forces responsible for that history are clear."[56]

Grapard's ambitious proposal concerning the centrality of cultic
centers has yet to be validated though various data from both religious

and non religious contexts. His perspective clearly demonstrates, however, that the conventional paradigm in historical writing of premodern Japanese religion must be re-examined. It follows that serious discussion on the scholar's assumption that the historical study of Shintō and Buddhism can be carried out separately is in order.

SHRINE-TEMPLE MULTIPLEX

In contrast to the usual assumption among scholars, Shintō and Buddhist institutions were closely associated with each other during premodern periods. In short, "all so-called Buddhist institutions were at least partly Shintō, and all so-called Shintō institutions were at least partly Buddhist."[57] The realm of premodern shrines cannot be explained apart from the realm of temples, and vice-versa. A few examples explain how these institutional associations between the two traditions began and developed.

During the Nara period (710-794), Buddhist temples began to be built on the grounds of major Shintō shrines. These temples, generally referred to as *jinguji* (shrine-temples),[58] housed the Buddhas and bodhisattvas that were believed to protect and guide the enshrined *kami* to liberation.[59] Most of the early *jinguji* were built by the efforts of Buddhist mountain ascetics, called *shami*, *ubasoku* or *zenshi*, for tutelary shrines belonging to powerful local clans.[60]

It is, therefore, understandable that in early periods a *jinguji* was constructed to enhance the power of local *kami* so that the *kami* would bring more well-being to the local society, especially in the form of good crops. Perhaps this empowerment of the *kami* was believed to be possible in part by the supernatural power of the ascetics as well as the grace of the Buddhist divinities in the temples.

Later, as the *honji suijaku* theory developed, the association between shrines and temples came to be given more universal meanings according to Buddhist assimilative cosmology. Even then, however, it is more likely that the appearance of temples in shrine precincts was not just a matter of Buddhist cosmology, but it was also more secular a matter faced by Buddhists who did not have territorial grounding at the time and needed to establish communication with the communities they wanted to convert.[61]

By the Heian period (794-1185), it was almost a universal phenomenon for a major Shintō shrine to have some affiliated Buddhist temples, and the *jinguji* represented this trend. For instance, all the twenty-two imperially-sponsored Shintō shrines in Kinai area had their affiliated Buddhist temples, with the eleven of them being *jinguji*.[62] Even Ise Shrine was no exception.[63]

Conversely, many of major Buddhist temples had affiliated Shintō shrines, and this tendency was represented by temple-shrines called *chinju* built on the grounds of the temples. *Kami* were enshrined in *chinju* to protect the Buddhist deities in the temples. The most famous example of the *chinju* was Hachimangu, which enshrined the *kami* Hachiman. In 752, the first Hachimangu was built in the compound of the Todaiji Temple to protect the Lochana Buddha. Thereafter Hachimangu were built to protect other major Buddhist temples, including Daianji (807) and Yakushiji (896).[64] The temple-shrine complexes combined Buddhist and Shintō elements into integrated wholes.

Powerful complexes consisting of major shrines and major temples, such as the Hie-Enryakuji and Kasuga-Kofukuji complexes, created what Grapard calls "Shintō-Temple multiplexes" which incorporated all of their branch shrines and temples into one organic whole. To take the example of the Kasuga-Kofukuji multiplex, it had at least forty-five branch shrines and 142 branch temples integrated in its system by 1441.[65] The Kasuga-Kofukuji multiplex was one huge institution of religious, political, and economic control.[66]

Religiously, for instance, the ritual performed at the Kasuga shrine included nine annual Buddhist ceremonies which Kofukuji monks organized and dedicated to the Kasuga *kami*.[67] Also, as the *honji suijaku* theory was completed, the *honji* Buddhist divinities of Kasuga's five *kami* were placed both in the shrine and in the Kofukuji temple. Kasuga's *honji* statues were also seen in branch temples of the Kofukuji.[68]

III. NEW PERSPECTIVES: HISTORY FROM BELOW

So far in their historical writings, scholars have focused too much on famous and powerful elites and scriptural traditions to the detriment of the history of popular traditions. The history of Japanese Buddhism, for example, has been largely the history of thought and acts of great Buddhist masters, including such founders of Buddhist schools in Japan as Saicho, Kukai, Shinran, Honen, Dogen, Eisai, Nichiren, and Ippen. Likewise, premodern Shintō history has been, except for accounts of ancient local worship in tutelary *kami*, focused on intellectual history of Shintō schools of thought, such as Ise, Sanno, Ryobu, Miwa, and Yui'itsu, which were mostly developed by the learned priest families.

The emphasis on great masters and intellectual elites has been greatly responsible for creating the historical image of sectarian divisions within premodern Shintō and Buddhist traditions and, ultimately, of the separation between Shintō and Buddhism. Critiques of this "history from above" approach have begun to be issued by a growing number of scholars, often from the standpoints of social and cultural approaches to history.[69]

In this final historiographical discussion, I will first examine James Foard's critique of the emphasis on sectarian founders in the conventional religious history. Though Foard's discussion pertains to the specific topic of Kamakura Buddhism, his insight represents a general critique from a "history from below" perspective against the conventional historiography. Subsequently, I will discuss the issue of Shintō and Buddhist relations in premodern Japanese folk tradition. Examined on the lower level of Japanese society, Shintō and Buddhism did not appear as discrete traditions in premodern times. In this section, I will not have an independent discussion of specific cases to demonstrate the close association between Shintō and Buddhism in Japanese folk tradition. Several examples will be incorporated into my historiographical examination of the "history from below" perspective.

JAMES FOARD'S MODEL

James Foard questions the traditional paradigm in history of Kamakura Buddhism which has taken the sectarian divisions for granted. This paradigm is "belief in what constituted Kamakura Buddhism—a set of five discrete sects initiated by five extraordinary figures, within whose remaining writings we will find Kamakura Buddhism."[70]

Foard's specific concern is the problems in which the traditional model is inevitably involved when explaining the reformative significance and power of Kamakura Buddhism. He insists that the traditional insight fails in two ways. First, it is self-contradictory because it chooses extraordinary figures as exemplary for an age. Second, it cannot explain the institutional failure of "breakthrough" of reformation.[71]

Foard finds the traditional reformative model to be "an historiographic fallacy that can never serve historical explanation."[72] Besides, it is an enduring sectarian historiography which exclusively concentrates on the sectarian founders.[73] Consequently, the traditional model results in separating the similar as well as leaving kindred movements unattended. He proposes a new model with which he can explain the significance of the change Kamakura Buddhism realized. This new model is more inclusive.

Only when the reformation model is abandoned can we approach an accurate understanding that includes far more than the famous sects. In particular, we must see such sectarian founders as Shinran only in the context of a more inclusive complex of interrelated changes in Buddhist doctrine, practice, leadership, social organization, and proselytizing techniques.[74]

According to Foard, the major change in Kamakura Buddhism was the emergence of new affirmation that any individual, regardless of his or her social or ecclesiastic status, could gain access to the transcendent power and receive Buddhist salvation through some form of devotion to a particular Buddha, bodhisattva or sūtra. Prior to the Kamakura period, Buddhist salvation had been open only to the clergy. With this new affirmation, however, the barrier was broken through, and Buddhism had its first universal appeal to Japanese regardless of their class, learning, or particular local cults. In this sense, Foard argues that Kamakura Buddhism was popular Buddhism open to anyone, contrasting sharply with the closed monastic Buddhism as well as local folk religion.[75]

His concept of popular Buddhism has two advantages for overcoming the historiographical limitation of the conventional interpretation of Kamakura Buddhism. One is the vertical expansion of the field of exploration. By defining Kamakura Buddhism as the rise of popular Buddhist devotionalism, Foard expands the focus of attention from the upper elites to include the lower populace.

Another advantage of Foard's model is a horizontal expansion. Popular devotionalism was not just a movement of the five new schools. It occurred in Buddhism on the whole, including such older Buddhist institutions as the Shingon and Tendai schools. Methodologically, Foard's new insight is supported by his sociological morphology, a study of a variety of types of new cults, orders, and sects. Foard maintains that the rise of popular Buddhist devotionalism was manifested in a great variety of new movements, which are categorically grouped into these three forms.[76]

"HISTORY FROM BELOW" AND
SHINTŌ-BUDDHIST ASSOCIATION

As for the relation between premodern Shintō and Buddhism, the new perspectives which I discussed in preceding sections have already suggested that the scholar's conventional categorization of Shintō and Buddhism does not help to fully explain the traditions' historical reality. In all, the "history from below" perspective agrees with this suggestion.

Folklorists agree that when Buddhism was introduced to Japan in mid-sixth century, the majority of premodern populace did not differentiate indigenous *kami* and imported Buddhist divinities.[77] They received Buddhism into the Japanese cultural and religious contexts. Buddhist divinities were regarded as one among many *kami*, called *daitōshin* (great *kami* of China) or a *dashikuni no kami* (*kami* from other lands).[78]

People in those days received Buddhism not internally (doctrines and thoughts) but externally (ritual and temple constructions). Worshipping *kami* and worshipping the Buddhas therefore were not essentially different things.[79]

It was probably in the context of mountain beliefs (*sangaku shinkō*) that the earliest form of the association between *kami* and Buddhist divinities took place and influenced Japanese folk religiosity. Mountains had been the object of worship in early Japan. Ancient Japanese felt the power of mountains either as the place of descent or dwelling place of *kami* (*yama no kami)* or as *kami* itself.[80] Not only worshipping mountains, however, people were involved in mountain beliefs more broadly:

> All the roles of the mountain as an integral factor in the religious life of the people are involved. In other words, it is related with all the aspects of the relations between one phase of natural environment and man's religious activities.[81]

Shugendō, which began to appear in the eighth century, is the best known religious tradition which blended elements from mountain beliefs and from Buddhist (and Taoist) traditions. "Buddhist notions and techniques of religious realization interacted with the indigenous Japanese phenomena of sacred mountains to create the peculiar blend of traditions."[82] Shugendō was a "popular religion" in Foard's sense, and its influence on the religiosity on the folk level is most remarkable. Shugendō practitioners (referred to as *shugenja* or other names) performed various magico-religious rituals in response to "the mundane needs of the common people."[83] Shugendō was also one of the main channels for disseminating religious teachings to the common people.[84]

Historiographically speaking, a "history from below" perspective may participate in the discussion of premodern Shintō-Buddhism association by providing an insight into popular modes of association. This insight may be different from that attained though conventional analyses focusing on patterns realized on the upper level. At present, however, for all the efforts by several folklorists and historians of religions to describe historical development of Japanese folk religion, their works are usually unsatisfactory. Although they apparently recognize the syncretic nature of folk religion, scholars still tend to approach the study according to the rigid categories of Shintō and Buddhism.

Consequently, they emphasize either Shintō or Buddhist elements found therein and attempt to explain the complex structure of folk religion under such themes as "folk Shintō" or "popularization of Buddhism."[85] It should not be denied that the various Shintō and Buddhist

elements within folk religion still preserve their "formal meaning" within the respective traditions. It is important to see, however, how these elements were interrelated and functioned together within the new context of folk beliefs and practices.

CONCLUSION

I have discussed issues of perspectives in historical study of premodern Japanese religions in the context of the relationship between Shintō and Buddhism. Conventional study of the history of Japanese religions has focused on doctrines and great figures. As a result, it has created an assumption that Shintō and Buddhism have existed separately and therefore, they can be studied separately. Exploration from different perspectives, however, demonstrates that such an assumption is seriously misleading, because in many ways, Shintō and Buddhism were closely associated.

The relation between a perspective in writing history and historical evidence is circular. Each depends on the other to prove itself. Yet, as Kuroda and others point out, it is also the case that certain external factors like the ideology of a time or influence of other scholarship seriously affect the historian's perspective. Once a perspective is settled, historical areas for exploration are determined accordingly. In the case of the history of premodern Japanese religions, the idea of the discrete existence of Shintō and Buddhism was due to two mixed reasons, the Meiji state policy of separating the two traditions and the influence of the western scholarship of the study of religions, including the notion of religion itself. The fields they have explored the most were those concerned with the deeds and writings of the upper elite of religious society.

What sort of ideology and scholarly influence is, then, behind today's new perspectives in the study of premodern Japanese religions? At the outset of this paper, I suggested the influence of the "new history." Yet, it alone does not seem to fully explain the situation. This crucial issue of historiography is, however, beyond the scope of this study.

REFERENCES

Burke, Peter ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing.* University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Earhart, Byron. *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity.* 3rd. ed. Belmont: Wadsworth. 1982.

Earhart, Byron. *A Religious Study of The Mount Haguro Sect of Shugendo: An Example of Japanese Mountain Religion.* Tokyo: Sophia University, 1970.

Foard, James. "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies.* 7 (1980): 261-291.

Eliade, Mircea et al. *Encyclopedia of Religion.* Vol. 13. New York: McMillan, 1987.

Gilday, Edmund T. "Dancing with Spirit(s): Another View of the Other World in Japan." *History of Religions,* 32 (1993): 273-300.

Grapard, Allan G. "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shintō and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji *(shimbutsu bunri)* and a case study: Tonomine." *History of Religions,* 23 (1984): 240-265.

Grapard, Allan G. "Institution, Ritual, and Ideology: The Twenty-Two Shrine-Temple Multiplexes of Heian Japan." *History of Religions,* 27 (1988): 246-269.

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

Hardacre, Helen. *Shintō and the State: 1868—1988.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Hunt, Lynn. "Introduction: History, Culture, and Text." Lynn Hunt ed. *The New Cultural History.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Kuroda Toshio. "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion." trans. James C. Dobbins and Suzanne Gay, *Journal of Japanese Studies,* 7 (1981): 1-21.

Kuroda Toshio. *Nihon chusei no shakai to shukyo.* Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990.

Matsunaga, Alicia. *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation.* Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1969.

McMullin, Neil. *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth Century Japan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

McMullin, Neil. "Historical and Historiographical Issues in the Study of Pre-Modern Japanese Religions." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* 16 (1989): 3-40.

McMullin, Neil. "The Encyclopedia of Religion: A Critique from the Perspective of the History of the Japanese Religious Traditions." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion,* 1 (1989): 80-96.

Miyake Hitoshi. "Religious Rituals in Shugendo—A Summary." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* 16 (1989): 101-116.

Miyata Noboru et al. *Kami to hotoke: Minzoku shukyo no shoso.* Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1983.

Murayama Shuichi. *Honji suijaku.* Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1974.

Tylar, Susan. "Honji Suikaku Faith." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16 (1989): 227-250.

Tsuji Hidenori. *Shinbutsu shūgō.* Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1986.

NOTES

[1] The "traditional paradigm," when used as the counterpart of the new history, refers to the "common-sense view of history" which has been assumed to be *the* way of doing history. In the West, it is specifically "Rankean history" which follows the perspective of the great German historian Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886). (Peter Burke, "Overture: the New History," Peter Burke ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*[University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991], 3.) Though convenient in discussing Western history, the label "the traditional paradigm" is confusing when used in the context of Japanese religious history. The western sense of traditional historiography is referred to as "modern," or western, perspective of doing history, as opposed to the traditional Japanese way prior to the Meiji period. To avoid confusion, I will use "conventional" instead of "traditional" whenever I mean the "common sense view of history" in the context of Japanese religious history.

[2] Peter Burke, "Overture: the New History," Peter Burke ed. *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 3-6.

[3] Lynn Hunt, "Introduction: History, Culture, and Text," Lynn Hunt ed. *The New Cultural History*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 6-11.

[4] Hunt, "Introduction: History, Culture, and Text," 2.

[5] For example: how exactly is "below" defined: socially, economically. or educationally?; what sources can we use: diaries, memoirs, or inquisitorial records (as Ginzburg did to reconstruct the spiritual world of Menocchio in *Cheese and Warms*)?

[6] See for example, Allan G. Grapard, "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shintō and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (*shimbutsu bunri*) and a Case Study: Tōnomine" *History of Religions*, 23 (1984): 240-265; "Institution, Ritual, and Ideology: The Twenty-Two Shrine-Temple Multiplexes of Heian Japan," *History of Religions*, 27 (1988): 246-269; *The Protocol of the Gods. A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992). Helen Hardacre, *Shintō and the State: 1868—1988*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989). Kuroda Toshio "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion" trans. James C. Dobbins and Suzanne Gay, *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 7 (1981): 1-21. Neil McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues in the Study of Pre-Modern Japanese Religions," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 16 (1989): 3-40; "The Encyclopedia of Religion: A Critique from the Perspective of the History of the Japanese Religious Traditions," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 1 (1989): 80-96.

7 Susan Tyler, "Honji Suijaku Faith," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* 16 (1989). 227.

8 Kuroda Toshio, "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion" trans. James C. Dobbins and Suzanne Gay, *Journal of Japanese Studies,* 7 (1981): 1-21.

9 Ibid., 1-2.

10 Ibid., 3.

11 The word "Shintō" appears in the following three parts in the *Nihonshoki:*

   1) The emperor believed in the teachings of the Buddha *(Buppo or hotoke no minori)* and revered Shintō (or *kami no michi).* [Prologue on Emperor Yomei]

   2) The emperor revered the teachings of the Buddha but scorned Shintō. He cut down the trees at Ikukunitama Shrine. [Prologue on Emperor Kotoku]

   3) The expression "as a *kami* would" *(kamunagara)* means to conform to Shintō. It also means in essence to possess one's self of Shintō. [Entry for Taika 3/4/26] (Kuroda, "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion," 4. For a full translation of *Nihonshoki,* see W.G. Aston, *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697* [London, 1896].)

12 Kuroda, "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion," 5.

13 Ibid., 7.

14 Ibid., 9.

15 Ibid., 10-12.

16 Ibid.

17 Kuroda, *Nihon chusei no shakai to shukyo,* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1990), 4-5.

18 Allan G Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods. A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 3.

19 See for instance his *Nihon chusei no shakai to shukyo,* 1-14.

20 Kuroda, "Shintō in the History of Japanese Religion," 19; *Nihon chusei no shakai to shukyo,* 3-5. The National Learning and the Restoration Shintō claimed "renewal" and "purification" of Shintō tradition by returning to the thought and consciousness of the ancient original Japanese. It became the foundation of the religious ideology of Meiji government, which attempted to execute the idea by establishing the "department of kami of Heaven and Earth *(jingi kan),"* and by issuing orders to separate Shintō and Buddhism *(shinbutsu bunri rei)* (both in 1868). For Meiji's state policy of religion, see, for example, Helen Hardacre, *Shintō and the State: 1868–1988,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), especially 16-18 and 21-36.

[21] So scarce attention has been given to the *honji suijaku* theory, especially in western scholarship. The only book-length study in English is Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation*, (Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1969).

[22] This way of interpretation of the Lotus Sūtra is referred to as "*honjaku nimon*" or, as Alicia Matsunaga puts it, the "*honjaku* interpretation" (Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation*, [Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1969], 212.)

[23] Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation*, 115-116. Matsunaga explains that the relation between the historical Buddha and the Original Buddha is analogous to some other dichotomies in Buddhist philosophy, including: (1) the relation between the absolute truth *(paramārtha satya)* and the relative truth *(saµ vŗti satya)*; and (2) the relation between wisdom *(prajñā)* and skilful means *(upāya)* (Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation*, 113-116).

[24] The four stages in the development of the *honji suijaku* theory are: 1) *kami* accepting and protecting the Dharma; 2) *kami* as suffering sentient beings; 3) *kami* as enlightened beings; and 4) *kami* as manifestations (Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation*, 218-227). Matsunaga presents these four developmental stages, according to an image of the elevation of kami's status vis-a-vis Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.

[25] Murayama Shuichi, *Honji suijaku*, (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1974), 170. For some examples of identification between original Buddhist deities *(honji)* and *kami (suijaku)* see Matsunaga, 231-233; Murayama, 171-173; Tsuji Hidenori, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1986), 99-102.

[26] Their chief method of propagation was telling mystical narratives about the origin of *kami (engi-mono* or *honji-mono)* in which Buddhist divinities are illustrated as historical origin of *kami*.

[27] Byron Earhart, *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity* 3rd. ed. (Belmont: Wadsworth, 1982), 108. For example, Kasuga Shrine enshrined statues of Shaka, Yakushi, Jizo, Kannon, and Monju as *honji* of the five *kami* of the shrine. (Tsuji, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, 103-104.)

[28] Murayama, *Honji suijaku*,. 251-302.

[29] Murayama recognizes the *honji suijaku* theory's incorporation into the following schools' teachings: Jōdo, Jōdo Shin, Jishū, Nichiren, and Sōtō. See Murayama, *Honji suijaku*, 169-211.

[30] "Shintō," M. Eliade et al. *Encyclopedia of Religion* Vol. 13 (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 284. See also Murayama, *Honji suijaku*, 303-321.

[31] Earhart, *Japanese Religion: Unity and Diversity*, 110.

[32] Ibid., 111.

[33] *Kon-yō-kajitsu ron* (root-leaf-fruit theory). This is the central thesis in *Yui'itsu Shintō myohoyoshu*, the school's theoretical formulation

written by Yoshida Kanetomo. (Murayama Shuichi, *Honji suijaku*, 354.)

34 "Shintō," *Encyclopedia of Religion* Vol. 13, 284.

35 This conclusion may make the theological aspect of premodern Shintō-Buddhist relations too simple, ignoring many of their differences. Indeed, we should still be warned against an overemphasis of the combinative characters in both Shintō and Buddhist thoughts. They were amalgamated, but not completely. Among Kamakura schools, in Zen schools particularly, their doctrines had little affinity to the *honji suijaku* theory. Nonetheless, a study of the *honji suijaku* theory demonstrates that premodern *kami* faith and Buddhism were not separate in thought. Rather, they shared much in common known under the term of the *honji suijaku*.

36 Neil McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues in the Study of Pre-Modern Japanese Religions," 3-40.

37 Ibid., 8.

38 Ibid., 27.

39 Ibid.

40 Allan Grapard, "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shintō and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji *(shimbutsu bunri)* and a Case Study: Tonomine," *History of Religions*, 23 (1984): 244.

41 McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues," 10-11.

42 Ibid., 11.

43 For instance, the Kamakura reform schools might be interpreted as "movements that propagated new forms of ritual rather than as new doctrinal traditions." (McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues," 12.)

44 He wrote a book-length work on this subject: Neil McMullin, *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth Century Japan*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984). In this work, McMullin discusses political, economic, and military powers of Buddhist institutions. He illustrates how Buddhist institutions developed in relation to the state politics and highlights the changes that took place to the institutions during the late sixteenth-century Japan under the rule of Oda Nobunaga. The book examines the Buddhist institutions from an "external" perspective, in particular, through the lens of Oda Nobunaga.

45 By "politics" McMullin means "simply, the way people organize their social life together, and the power relation which this involves." By "ideology" he means, by quoting Terry Eagleton, "the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power-structure and power relations of the society we live in, and, more particularly, those modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power, to the

assumptions by which certain social groups exercise and maintain power over others." (Neil McMullin, "The Encyclopedia of Religion: A Critique from the Perspective of the History of the Japanese Religious Traditions," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion*, 1 (1989): 80-96.

[46] McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues," 32.

[47] Undoubtedly, the Western model of interpretation of religion, which began to be introduced to the country in the Meiji period, has a great influence on the historical study of Japanese religions. As Helen Hardacre points out, Christian heritage in western scholarship has entailed a predisposition to give the most emphasis to doctrine to the extent that "doctrine is commonly assumed to constitute the universal essence of religion. By comparison, rites and communal observances seem to be gratuitous appendages to the core of religious life." (Helen Hardacre, *Shintō and the State: 1868—1988* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989], 10.)

[48] His work is essentially a study of Oda Nobunaga's policy toward the Buddhist temples. In his study, Buddhist-state relationship is located within a large agenda of Nobunaga's unification policy. Nobunaga's policy toward temples was among those toward many other groups, and it is sometimes difficult to identify which policy refers to the relationship between Buddhism and the state. It is important, as McMullin himself argues, to see how religious traditions reflected and generated social conditions, but when discussion is made with an excessive emphasis on social conditions, it obscures the essential point of discussion.

Except some ideological debates on *obo-buppo* relation, he almost exclusively deals with the "institutional aspect" of Buddhism in premodern Japan. McMullin's study gives us impression that despite the radical socio-political change outside, religions in Nobunaga's age were static inside. He left many important issues undiscussed, including what changes did Nobunaga's policy bring to Buddhist temples in terms of doctrine and ritual; and how was Nobunaga's attack on temples religiously understood by Buddhists, both on the levels of leaders and lower class members.

[49] Grapard, "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution," 243.

[50] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*, 4, 13.

[51] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 4-5.

[52] Grapard, "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution," 243.

[53] Ibid., 245.

[54] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 13.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid., 257.

[57] McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues," 8.

[58] Those temples usually had the name of the shrine to which the word *"jinguji"* was attached, such as "Usahachiman jinguji (725)," "Ise Dai-jinguji (766)," "Isonokami jinguji (866)." The first part of these names were shrine names.

[59] Historically speaking, the appearance of the *jinouji* marks the earliest form of the association between Buddhist tradition and Shintō traditions. It corresponds to the first phase of the development of the *honji suijaku* theory (see note 24 above).

[60] Tsuji Hidenori, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, 51-53.

[61] Grapard, "Institution, Ritual, and Ideology: The Twenty-two Shrine-temple Multiplexes of Heian Japan," *History of Religions*, 27 (1984): 253-254.

[62] Grapard, "Institution, Ritual, and Ideology," 246-269.

[63] Ise Dai-jinguji, constructed 766, was later removed (772) from the precinct of the Ise Shrine, as a part of the shrine's efforts for recovering its autonomy. (Miyata Noboru et al. *Kami to hotoke: Minzoku shukyo no shoso* [Tokyo: Shogakukan], 1983), 267-268.

[64] Tsuji, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, 89-91.

[65] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 131.

[66] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 148.

[67] Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 109-110.

[68] Tsuji, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, 103-106. For example, in Murooji temple in Yamato province all of the five *honji* of Kasuga were placed.

[69] For a discussion which combines "history from below" and "social history," see especially James Foard, "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 7 (1980): 261-291. which I discuss below; and Edmund T. Gilday, "Dancing with Spirit(s): Another View of the Other World in Japan" *History of Religions* 32 (1993): 273-300.

[70] James Foard, "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," 264. These five sects (schools) and founders are: the Jōdo Shū by Honen (1133-1212): the Rizai Shū by Eisai (1141-1215); the Jōdo Shin Shū by Shinran (1173-1263); the Sōtō Shū by Dōgen (1200-1253); the Nichiren or Hokke Shū by Nichiren (1222-1282).

[71] Ibid., 265.

[72] Ibid., 285.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid., 265.

[75] Ibid., 266-269.

[76] Ibid., 274.

[77] Wakamori Taro, *Kami to hotoke no aida*, 77.

[78] Miyata Noboru et al. *Kami to hotoke: Minzoku shukyo no shoso*, 10.

[79] Tsuji, *Shinbutsu shūgō*, 30-31.

[80] See Byron Earhart, *A Religious Study of The Mount Haguro Sect of Shugendo: An Example of Japanese Mountain Religion*, (Tokyo: Sophia University, 1970), 7-16.

[81] Kishimoto Hideo, "The Role of Mountains in the Religious Life of the Japanese People," *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress for the History of Religions*, 1958, 545-549 (Cited by Byron Earhart, *A Religious Study of The Mount Haguro Sect of Shugendo*, 7).

[82] "Shugendo," M. Eliade, et al. *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 13, 303. For a concise description of Shugendo in English, see the above article (vol. 13, 302-305); for discussions on several aspects on the tradition see *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 16/2-3 (1989), the whole issue. A comprehensive study of Shugendo in English is Byron Earhart, *A Religious Study of The Mount Haguro Sect of Shugendo: An Example of Japanese Mountain Religion*.

[83] Miyake Hitoshi, "Religious Rituals in Shugendo—A Summary" *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 16 (1989), 101.

[84] "Shugendo," 302.

[85] See for example Miyata, *Kami to hotoke*.