

DIGITAL ACCESS TO SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD
DASH.HARVARD.EDU

HARVARD LIBRARY


The Restoration of Peace Through the Pacification of Vengeful Spirits: Jien (1155-1225) and the Construction of Buddhist Orthodoxy

Citation

Swanson, Eric Haruki. 2019. The Restoration of Peace Through the Pacification of Vengeful Spirits: Jien (1155-1225) and the Construction of Buddhist Orthodoxy. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

Link

http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:42029681

Terms of use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material (LAA), as set forth at

https://harvardwiki.atlassian.net/wiki/external/NGY5NDE4ZjgzNTc5NDQzMGIzZWZhMGFlOWI2M2EwYTg

Accessibility

https://accessibility.huit.harvard.edu/digital-accessibility-policy

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. Submit a story

The Restoration of Peace Through the Pacification of Vengeful Spirits: Jien (1155-1225) and the Construction of Buddhist Orthodoxy

A dissertation presented

by

Eric Haruki Swanson

to

The Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In the subject of

East Asian Religion

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

April 2019

© 2019 Eric Haruki Swanson

All rights reserved.

Dissertation Advisor: Ryuichi Abé Eric Haruki Swanson

The Restoration of Peace Through the Pacification of Vengeful Spirits: Jien (1155-1225) and the Construction of Buddhist Orthodoxy

Abstract

Previous research on Tendai monk Jien 慈円 (1155-1225) has often presented him as an exemplary literary figure of pre-modern Japan, and he is known most for authoring *A Fool's Exegesis on Historical Events* (*Gukanshō* 愚管抄) and hence a prolific composer of Japanese poetry (*waka* 和歌). As such, he has been depicted as an intellectual figure who was also torn between his worldly obligations and his desire to pursue the aesthetic pleasures of composing poetry. However, these images of Jien have been constructed through modern academic disciplines and frameworks that have dictated the way his writings have been studied. By illustrating the extent to which he was intricately involved in the establishment and restoration of Buddhist institutions, reviving Buddhist learning, and performing exoteric and esoteric Buddhist rites, this dissertation seeks to show how his active participation in these various religious projects resists the commonly perceived persona of Jien as an internally troubled Buddhist poet, torn between the realms of "religious asceticism" and "politics."

A critical assessment of Jien's constructed identity can also help us re-evaluate his motivations for composing his most well known work, the *Gukanshō*. Although known primarily as a work of historical writing, a close analysis of the way Jien crafts his

historical narrative suggests that it should rather be read as a religious discourse, and that the other qualities of his writings, such as the political issues it addresses, the poetic and rhetorical refinements as an exemplary literary work, or the understanding that it can be read as a pedagogical device, derive from a fundamental concern that can be seen as religious in nature, and that which addresses the issue of social disorder. I will focus specifically on Jien's discussion of vengeful spirits (怨霊 *onryō*) that is weaved throughout the *Gukanshō* and argue that it is precisely in his discussion of vengeful spirits, which have often been relegated as "odd factors" in his historical writing, that reveal the extent to which Jien's historical project intersected with his larger ritual projects, specifically in his establishment of the ritual program at Daisangehōin 大懺悔法院 located in the proximity of the Heian capital.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Re-assessing Jien's Constructed Identity
1. Introduction....2
2. Jien's Early Years....4
3. Idealized Interpretations of Jien in Modern Scholarship....9
4. The Rise and Fall of Kanezane and Questioning Jien's "Period of Reclusion"..21
5. Jien Memorialized in Hagiography: *The Biography of the Priest of Compassionate Pacification*....28
6. Kujō Kanezane and Jien's Collaboration to Realize the "Flourishing of the Buddhist Teachings" 36
7. Jien as Emperor Go-Toba's Personal "Protector Monk"....42
8. Conclusion 44

Chapter 2: Re-assessing Jien's Motivations for Writing the *Gukanshō*
1. Introduction....47
2. Basic Structure and Summary of the *Gukanshō*....50
3. Analyzing the Title: the *Gukanshō* as "Modest Views of an Ignorant Priest".....53
4. A History of the Study of the *Gukanshō*....56
5. English Scholarship on the *Gukanshō*....67
6. Gukanshō as a "Philosophy of History"....75
7. Studying the *Gukanshō* as Literature....76
8. Conclusion. 84

Chapter 3: Re-assessment of *Gukanshō* as a Treatise about Vengeful Spirits
1. Introduction....87
2. Questioning Vengeful Spirits as "Odd Factors" in the *Gukanshō*....88
3. Jien's Vision of Disorder as Both Political and Religious....93
4. Deterioration of Relationship between Emperor and Regent....99
5. Jien's Advice on How to Restore Order....105
6. Appearance of Vengeful Spirits in Jien's Narrative History....111
7. Two Great Vengeful Spirits as Outcome of the Hōgen Rebellion....119
8. The Principle of Vengeful Spirits....122
9. Conclusion....130

Chapter 4: Jien's Self-Image and the Intersections Between Historical Writing and Ritual
1. Introduction....133
2. Jien's Self-Image as the "Capable Priest"....134
3. Jien's Grand Ritual Project: Pacifying Vengeful Spirits to Protect the Heian Capital 146
4. Legitimizing Lineages through Relic Worship and Poems for the Dead....156
5. Reorienting the Center in the *Record of the Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness*....160
6. Conclusion....165

Bibliography....169

Acknowledgements

I am forever indebted to my advisor Ryuichi Abé for his insightful direction and compassion throughout the PhD program at Harvard. It was thanks to his openness that I was able to explore freely into various avenues of interest, and ultimately for his patience and moral support that I was able to complete this disseration. James Robson was a wonderful mentor and it was always exciting to bounce off ideas with him in his office. His love and passion for the study of East Asian Religions was always inspiring and I deeply appreciated his close reading and comments on my thesis. Helen Hardacre taught me the joy and challenges of doing research and mentoring students. Her stance as a scholar is one that I will always aspire to reach. In addition to my interactions with my committee members, the courses I took as a graduate student with Edwin Cranston, Melissa McCormick, Yukio Lippit, David Howell, and Alexander Zahlten, were all instrumental in expanding my perspective and I am deeply grateful for the knowledge I gained in these seminars, as well as the experiences of working with these wonderful scholars.

I would also like to thank the visiting scholars with whom I had the opportunity to engage with through countless study sessions over the years, including Daitō Takaaki, Tamura Kanji, Kaminishi Wataru, Takeda Sachiya, Okimoto Yukiko, Chikamoto Kensuke, among others who were a constant source of academic insight and inspiration. During my trips to Japan, Michimoto Tesshin at Ryūkoku University was always selfless with his time and helped me read through some crucial texts for the thesis. Thomas Eijō Dreitlein and Doi Natsuki always greeted me with a warm welcome back every time I

went to visit Kōyasan University to utilize the library and their archives. At various academic events both at Harvard and in Japan, Abe Yasurō and Abe Mika were also always very supportive of my research and I deeply appreciate their feedback and encouragement through the years.

I am also indebted to my fellow graduate students who I had the pleasure of meeting through the course of the program. My wonderful *senpai*, Ethan Bushelle and Shea Ingram, laid down a great foundation for my experience at Harvard. Working alongside with great colleages like Jesse Drian, Alexis Sanborn, Shi-Lin Loh, Kit Brooks, Xingyi Wang, Ying Lei, Billy Brewster, Adam Lyons, Andrew Campana, Ryan Glasnovich, Julia Cross, Dana Mirsalis, Naohito Miura, Yuxin Qin, Sara Klingenstein, Jesse LeFebvre, Daniel Borengasser, Jonathan Thumas, and many others vastly enriched my graduate experience and, perhaps more importantly, forced me to develop as a person. The friendship I was able to cultivate with Koto Sadamura, Joaquín Atria, Yurika Wakamatsu, Phillip Bloom, Peter Bernard (and his lovely family) and Daniel Joseph helped me get through rough times. I will cherish the connections I was able to make with these fine folks for a lifetime.

I am greatly indebted to the Reischauer Institute for providing me with grants to attend academic conferences and workshops, travel to Japan over the summers to conduct research, and for supporting the Dissertation Writing Fellowship for the final year of the graduate program. The Reischauer Institute also generously provided me with an office as a graduate student assistant for the last five years, from which I

benefited greatly for both my own research and for teaching preparations. I send a special thanks to all the Reischauer staff for their support and generosity.

I would also like to thank my parents, Paul and Yuko, for providing me with a strong foundation that has allowed me to pursue my goals, and to my siblings, Joy, Sophia, and Jimmy, for their healthy dose of indifference toward what I do. My deepest graditude, however, goes to my life partner, Yukari, who through her relentless strength and ceaseless care, supported me through this long and arduous journey, and to our daughter, Ami, who never failed to bring joy and a sense of purpose into our lives. I would not be here today without their love and support.

Chapter 1:

Re-assessing Jien's Constructed Identity

Introduction

The *Poems of One Hundred Poets* (Jp. *Hyakunin Isshu* 百人一首), a classical anthology of one hundred *waka* poems compiled by Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241) in the early 13th century, includes one of Jien's most well-known poems:

> Though I may not be fit,
> I shall shroud the people in this world of suffering
> In the wooded lands of Mt. Hiei,
> [With the] black-dyed sleeves of my Buddhist robes.[1]
>
> おほけなく　うき世の民に　おほふかな　わがたつ杣に　墨染の袖[2]

In this poem, Jien presents himself as an extremely humble figure, yet driven with a strong sense of responsibility and compassion to bring solace to all beings who live in a world marked with suffering. This poem has also been the focus of scholarly studies of Jien's life. Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, for example, points to this specific poem to paint an internal struggle that Jien experienced early in his life, in which he felt torn between his desire, on the one hand, to lead a quiet life in the mountains away from the worldly affairs of the court where he could focus on his more aesthetic and religious endeavors, and on the other, having to accept his responsibilities in engaging with court politics that were intricately connected to the ambitions of his elder brother, Kujō Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207).[3] Although the depiction of Jien as a torn individual presents a compelling story of the struggles Jien may have experienced as a young novice, I argue that this particular depiction of Jien was not only largely constructed through early

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all the quotes from Japanese texts are my own translation.
[2] Yoshida Kōichi 吉田幸一. Ed. *Hyakunin isshu kochū* 百人一首古注. Koten Bunko Vol. 291. Tokyo: Koten Bunko, 1971. p. 57.
[3] Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Jien no kenkyū* 慈円の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980, pp. 41-52.

scholarship on Jien, but that this identity of Jien as an aesthetically torn poet has also dictated the way in which his writings have been studied. In this chapter, I will argue that this tendency to see Jien as torn between his "religious" and "literary" endeavors on the one hand, and his "worldly affairs" on the other as indicated in Taga's scholarship simplifies the complexities of Jien's contribution to medieval society, that ranged from the earliest years of his appointment as *zasu* 座主 in 1192 to the final days of his life, which ended in 1225. For Jien, these two categories were seen as completely integrated and inseparable, especially as he comes to address issues regarding "disorder" and "world maintenance."[4]

When we consider the larger implications of why it is important to re-evaluate the way Jien has been depicted in modern scholarship, I argue that removing the lens of Jien as an internally conflicted poet-monk will reveal some of the political and social implications of Jien's ritual projects, particularly as it pertains to the political motivations that benefit Jien's familial connections to the Kujō family. Specifically, to assume that Jien was reluctant in engaging with Kanezane's political endeavors is a problematic projection, which seems to stem from an attempt to portray Jien as the "conflicted poet-monk," particularly in depicting the early stages of his life. In fact, a critical assessment of the secondary literature on Jien's life paired with a close reading of primary sources show that Jien reveals little reluctance to engage in the projects spearheaded by

[4] I have found Peter Berger's notion of "world maintenance" as discussed in *Sacred Canopy* as a helpful framework to re-asses Jien's contribution to medieval society. As such, many of the questions that have driven my research do not begin with the attempt to confine Jien as "a poet" or "a historian" but rather ask how Jien, as a multilayered individual whose worldview was informed by a religious outlook, and specifically how Jien relied on a religious discourse to respond to the anxieties that arise in times of social distress.

Kanezane. On the contrary, it was the close collaboration between the two that helped to create new ritual practices and spaces that attempted to elevate the Kujō family's position in the Heian court.

Jien's Early Years

Jien was the son of Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164), the eldest son of the Japanese regent Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162). His mother was the daughter of Fujiwara no Nakamitsu 藤原仲光, Kaga 加賀, the mother of Kujō Kanezane, who later would become a prominent and highly influential politician later in life.[5] His birth into this prestigious, aristocratic family largely dictated the course of his life: his actions having a significant impact in both the political affairs of the aristocracy and the religious culture of his time as he responded to specific challenges faced by the Fujiwara family to which he belonged. In fact, it was Kujō Kanezane who initially arranged Jien to take tonsure and go down the path of a Buddhist monk.[6]

Jien was only eleven years old when he entered the Shōren-in monzeki 青蓮院門跡 under the auspice of his master, Kakukai Hosshinō 覚快法親王 (1134-1181), and

[5] For schorship on Kujō Kanezane, see: 1) Kanō Shigefumi 加納重文. *Kujyō Kanezane—shashoku no kokorozashi, ten'i shinryo ni kotaeru mono ka* 九条兼実—社稷の志、天意神慮に答える者か—. Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō, 2016. 2) Ōno Jyunko 大野順子. "Kenkyū ki kujō ke kadan ni okeru waka hyōgen ni tsuite—jyusshu zōtōka gun wo chūshin ni" 建久期九条家歌壇における和歌表現について—十首贈答歌群を中心に. In *Kodai chūsei bungaku ronkō dai 28 shū*, 221-246. Tokyo: Shintensha, 2013. 3) Matsuzono Hitoshi 松薗斉. *Nikki no ie—chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki* 日記の家—中世国家の記録組織. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997. 4) Higuchi Kentarō 樋口健太郎. *Chūsei sekkanke no ie to kenryoku* 中世摂関家の家と権力. Tokyo: Azekura shobō, 2011. 4) Obara Hitoshi 小原仁. *Chūsei kizoku shakai to bukkyō* 中世貴族社会と仏教. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007. For works specifically on Kanezane's diary, the *Gyokuyō*, see 1) Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Gyokuyō sakuin: Fujiwara Kanezane no kenkyū* 玉葉索引：藤原兼実の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974. 2) Ōae Akira 大饗亮. *Gyokuyō jikō sakuin* 玉葉事項索引. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō 風間書房, 1991.

[6] Taga (1980), pp. 28-40.

was thirteen when he took tonsure there as his disciple, taking the name of Dōkai 道快. Kakukai Hosshinō was the seventh son of Emperor Toba 鳥羽天皇 (1107-1123). He was the disciple of Gyōgen 行玄 (1097-1155) ,who was himself the son of Regent Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実（1042-1101), and established the Shōrenbō 青蓮房 on Mt. Hiei. In 1153, Retired Emperor Toba moved the Shōrenbō from Mt. Hiei to the Sanjō area of the Heian capital (to the north of present-day Chionin temple) as the living quarters for his son Kakukai Hosshinō, effectively making it into the Shōren-in, a temple institution that served as living quarters for Buddhist monks who came from aristocratic or imperial families.[7] After Kakukai Hosshinō became the Tendai *zasu* 天台座主 in 1117, the Shōrenin monzeki came to function as a living quarters for those in the rank of *zazu* and held high prestige as an institution that trained and transmitted Buddhist teachings among those associated with the imperial family.[8]

Considering the prestige and connection to the imperial family that the Shōrenin monzeki had at the time Jien entered the institution, it is not difficult to imagine that there were strong political and economic reasons for Kujō Kanezane to arrange his half-brother to enter into the Buddhist order at Shōrenin monzeki. In fact, as recorded in his

[7] For a general introduction to Shōrenin monzeki, see Watanabe Shujun 渡辺守順 [Ed.]. *Hieizan* 比叡山. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1987, pp. 257-266. For a discussion on the role that Shōrenin monzeki had in negotiating conflicts with Mt. Hiei, see 1) Murayama Shūichi 村山修一. *Hieizan shi: tatakai to inori no seiiki* 比叡山史：闘いと祈りの聖域. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994.235-250. 2) Taira Masayuki 平雅行. “Shōrenin no monzeki sōron to kamakura bakufu” 青蓮院の門跡相論と鎌倉幕府. In *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会, edited by Kawane Yoshiyasu and Fukuda Eijirō 河音能平・福田栄次郎, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2004.

[8] Watanabe Shujun 渡辺守順 [Ed.]. *Hieizan* 比叡山. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1987, p. 257.

diary, the *Gyokuyō* 玉葉,[9] Kanezane explicitly states his hope that this move would help the prosperity of his Kujō clan.[10] It was not unusual at the time for high-ranking aristocrats to have their sons enter into prominent Buddhist temples, as it not only alleviated the economic pressure within the family, but it also helped them generate closer ties with powerful temple institutions. This was crucial in navigating rival relationships with other family lineages, as temple institutions and their connections with a vast network of institutions were often a source of information that could potentially give the family an upper hand. In fact, by the late Heian period, most of the highest ranking positions within the Buddhist hierarchy, including *chōja* 長者 and *zasu* in Buddhist institutions in and around the Heian capital were held by many of the young acolytes from aristocratic families. Jien, who would eventually become a four-time *zasu* of Enryakuji, is one prime example of how aristocratic families were able to expand their political influence through sending their kin to train at Buddhist institutions.

It was at the young age of thirteen and fourteen that Jien began his training under Kakukai Hosshinō. According to Jien's own accounts as expressed in the *Ichigo shiyui* 一期思惟,[11] it was between the ages of fifteen and sixteen when we was instructed in the "mantra teachings" (入真言教) and received the "Great Teachings of the Three

[9] For scholarship on *Gyokuyō*, see 1) Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Gyokuyō sakuin: Fujiwara Kanezane no kenkyū* 玉葉索引：藤原兼実の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974. 2) Ōae Akira 大饗亮. *Gyokuyō jikō sakuin* 玉葉事項索引. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō 風間書房, 1991.

[10] For scholarship on the establishment of the Kujō family, see Higuchi Kentarō 樋口健太郎. *Chūsei ōken no keisei to sekkanke* 中世王権の形成と摂関家. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan, 2018, pp. 187-268. For a discussion of the development of the Kujō family and Kanezane's political ambitions, see Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Jien no kenkyū* 慈円の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980. pp. 6-118.

[11] For a discussion of the *Ichigo Shiyui* and a reproduction of the text, see Murata Masashi 村田正志. "Shōrenin yoshimizu zō ni okeru jien shiryō" 青蓮院吉水蔵における慈円史料. *Rekishi Chiri* 歴史地理. Vol. 84, pp. 35-57.

Divisions" (受三部大法), referring to the teachings of the three major esoteric Buddhist texts of the Tendai Esoteric tradition on Mt. Hiei: the *Dainichi kyō* 大日経 (Ch. *Da piluzhena chengfo shenbian jiachi jing* 大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經, Skt. Mahāvairocana-sūtra), *Kongochōkyō* 金剛頂経 (Ch. *Jingangding yiqie rulai zhenshi shedasheng xianzheng dajiaowang jing* 金剛頂一切如來眞實攝大乘現證大教王經, Skt. Vajraśekhara-sūtra), and the *Soshitsuji kyō* 蘇悉地経 (Ch. *Suxidi jieluo jing* 蘇悉地羯羅經, Skt. *Susiddhi-kara-mahā-tantra-sādhanôpāyika-paṭala*). In the second month of the second year of the Kao era (1170), Dōkei (Jien) received the status of *ajari* 阿闍梨 (Skt. *ācārya*) from his master Kakukai and was officially recognized as a master of esoteric teachings. In addition to his early training in the esoteric teachings, Jien also spent his youth studying the *Lotus Sutra*. Also according to his *Ichigo shiyui*, when Jien was at the age of 20, he requested permission from his master to travel to Ebumiji Temple 江文寺 in Ōhara, where he stayed for a year to study the teachings of the *Lotus Sutra*. The following year, when he was 21, he continued his training at Mudōji Temple 無動寺 on Mt. Hiei, a location that was already known at this time as temple established by the Fudō Myōō practitioner and Tendai monk Sōō 相応 (831-918).[12] According to several biographical accounts and a number of legends, Jien is said to have practiced the *sennichi shugyō* 千日修行, or the 1000-day training, associated with Fudō Myōō. For example, the *Genpei Seisuiki* 源平盛衰記 includes an account that illustrates Jien's determination for practice. It explains that Jien's practice coincided with the midst of

[12] For scholarship on Mudōji and the legends of Sōō, see Murayama Shūichi 村山修一. *Hieizan shi: tatakai to inori no seiiki* 比叡山史：闘いと祈りの聖域. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994, pp. 209-234.

disruption and violence on Mt. Hiei that caused many to flee and return to the capital, but that Jien diligently continued the practice until the end.

While these legendary accounts are unreliable, there is a documented account of Jien's desire to remain on Mt. Hiei in Kujō Kanezane's diary, *Gyokuyō*.[13] On the second day of the fourth month in the third year of the Jishō era (1180), Kanezane recorded a meeting with Jien, his first visit to Kanezane after he had finished his 1000 day training at Mudōji. This meeting between Jien and Kanezane has been the focus of a number of studies that point to this event as indication that Jien was so immersed in his religious training that he had become disinterested in worldly affairs. The account itself, is extremely short:

> April 2nd. Sunny day. At around noon (the hour of the ox), Hōshōji *zasu* Dōkei (Jien) came to visit. It is his first visit since completing his 1000 day practice and returning to the capital on the 24th. He talked about a number of matters. To be brief, he expressed that there is no benefit to "worldly affairs" (*seken no koto* 世間ノ事) and that he thinks of life in seclusion （*inkyo* 隠居）. I talked him out of it.
>
> 二日、庚寅［天］晴、午刻、法性寺座主道快被来、千日入堂了、去廿四日下京、今日始被来也、條々有被示合事等、大略世間無益、有隠居之思由也、余加制止了[14]

In Taga's explication of this account, it is described as a "disagreement" between Kanezane and Jien.[15] However, we can see that the actual account in Kanezane's journal is extremely vague and much is left to the interpretation of the reader as to what Jien meant here by "worldly affairs" and what is implied in his statement of "thinking of life in seclusion." It was perhaps the vagueness of this passage that allowed modern

[13] Ichishima Kenichi 市島謙吉. Ed. *Gyokyuyō*. Kokusho kankōkai sōsho Vol. 48-50. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1907-1907.
[14] *Gyokuyō Vol. 2*, p. 275.
[15] Taga, p. 41.

scholars to use this passage to project their views of what the personal interactions between Kanezane and Jien may have been like. The open-endedness of this passage in Kanezane's journal, in other words, acted as a void in which modern scholars were able to construct an image of Jien as a "torn poet" uninterested in the political ambitions of his older brother.

Idealized Interpretations of Jien in Modern Scholarship

One of the earliest attempts to construct an overarching narrative of Jien's life as both a poet, Buddhist monk, and intellectual can be seen in *Jien-kokka to rekishi oyobi bungaku* 慈円ー国家と歴史及び文學 by scholar of classical Japanese literature, Tsukudo Reikan 筑土鈴寛, first published in 1940. Following the first part of the work that consists of a basic overview of historical events in Jien's life, Tsukudo starts his analysis of Jien by providing a look into what he calls the "essence" of Jien in a chapter titled, "A History of Jien's Essence/Psyche" (*Jien no seishin shi* 慈円の精神史).[16] In these pages, Tsukudo paints Jien as one who was endowed with a religious ideal of perfect oneness based on the teachings of the One Vehicle of the *Lotus Sutra*, which he suggests was at odds with what he called "a growing sense of individuality" (*kojin ishiki no fukamari* 個人意識の深まり) among the court elite who were involved in the politics of the Heian court. Regarding Jien's "essence," Tsukudo suggests that Jien had already cultivated a deep understanding of the Buddhist teachings in his twenties after his initial training at Mudōji temple on Mt. Hiei, where he experienced the *sennichi shugyō*. In

[16] Tsukudo Reikan 筑土鈴寛. *Jien: kokka to rekishi oyobi bungaku* 慈円：国家と歴史及び文学. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1942, pp. 129-177.

discussing Jien's worldview at the young age of 24 at the time he completed this training, Tsukudo describes his "essence" in the following way:

> Through a contemplation of the true form of all dharmas as taught in the *Lotus Sutra*, Jien was able to see the entire world as one-reality, to awaken to the truth that the appearance of reality in its various forms as a skillful means, was ultimately One-Truth and of the One Buddha Vehicle. Furthermore, seeing the infinite nature of the Buddha, he was able to understand the mysterious sameness of the real and the conventional, embodied the non-duality of the origins and the traces, the immediate equality of the absolute and differentiation, and finally understood that in faith 信仰 and history 歴史 , the realms of the dead and living, of mind and body were non-dual...through faith of single-minded reverence, he was able to obtain believe in an eternal life and a self-understanding that all beings were already on the path to Buddhahood and endowed with Buddha nature that transcended the ordinary man.[17]

Although there is no reason to question the fact that Jien undertook these religious practices, based on the prescriptions of the Lotus practice on Mt. Hiei, in his youth we should be suspicious of Tsukudo's claims here that assumes that the Tendai ideals became the foundation of Jien's "essence," which Tsukudo suggests lay also at the foundation of Jien's understanding of "history" and "faith." This is particularly problematic, as these claims regarding the interiority of Jien's thought and identity also become the basis on which the narrative of Jien's life is also constructed. Perhaps one of the most well-known events of Jien's life, at least a moment that has garnered much attention as his story came to be told and re-told by various scholars, such as Taga Munehaya and another prominent literature scholar Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄 is the moment often depicted as a large turning point in Jien's life, where he decides to "descend the mountain" (*gezan* 下山), to leave his life of training on Mt. Hiei to enter into the world of

[17] Tsukudo, pp. 132-133.

court politics in the Heian capital. As already discussed above, this moment in Jien's life is usually described as one of a negotiation between Jien's desire to stay in a life of seclusion and his brother Kanezane's persistence and final persuasion of Jien's acceptance of his familial obligations to become involved in the more "worldly" affairs to assist Kanezane's political endeavors. Tsukudo not only depicts Jien's decision as a dramatized moment of "conversion" and determination, he also suggests that it was a special period in Japanese history in which three exemplary members of court society emerged in different ways to actualize their different ideals in the world:

> The poetic world of Fujiwara no Teika, the place of quietude that Jien desired, and the ideal world of a unified governance that Kanezane sought, although differing in the worlds that they strove for, each dreamed to transcend the perceived reality to realize a world that was unified and harmonious. At this time, Jien stood up from his seat of the contemplation of principles, left his hut for Buddhist practice, and threw himself into the tumulus world of transmigration. This was, without a doubt, because he was encouraged from Kanezane. However, it also was because Jien also had a deep soteriological desire to save people of the world. It was, in fact, around this time that he sung in one of his poems: "How I think of the many people in the floating world." From this moment onward, Jien took the "sincerity of poetry," the "diligence of prayer" and his "thoughts of political salvation" as three-parts of a single body (*sanshin ittai* 三身一体), and attempted to realize an adorned Pure Land in this realm through the work he did as a poet and religionist, as a religionist and a skilled politician to bring order to the world, and by harmonizing his poetry, reality, and faith.[18]

Here too, Tsukudo provides a rather compelling interpretation of the ideals that drove Jien's actions by suggesting that he came to the decision to enter into the political realm based on his fundamental desire to save all sentient beings, even suggesting that he should be seen as acting in accordance to that of a bodhisattva.[19] To support his view of

[18] Tsukudo p. 139.
[19] Tsukudo, p. 162.

Jien's internal essence and desire to save all sentient beings, Tsukudo incorporates the teachings of the Tendai tradition, claiming that they are at the foundation of Jien's worldview. While Jien was clearly well read in the major sūtras and treatises of the Tendai tradition, as indicated in the various doctrinal treatises and ritual programs he composed later in his life, Tsukudo also relies heavily on Jien's *waka* poetry as a basis to understand Jien's internal thoughts and motivations. There has been an abundant amount of Japanese scholarship on Jien's poetry, ranging from topics that deal with its social functions, as well as attempts to clarify the more "philosophical."[20]

Although I will refrain from going into the complexities of his poetry here, it is worth pointing out that there is a methodological problem in the way Tsukudo uses these religious concepts and poetic expressions as a basis to illustrate Jien's motivations and narrate his life choices. The fact of the matter is, we will never be able to fully understand Jien's internal thoughts and Tsukudo's interpretations of Jien's "essence" based on the expressions seen in his poetry are speculations at best. Perhaps, we should be more conscious of the social contexts under which these poems were constructed and read. Who would have been the audience for these poems that Jien composed? Another problem is that most of these poems are undated and it is difficult to ascertain when in Jien's life he wrote some of these poems. Even if we were able to pin down a date of a poem, can we really read these poetic expressions as

[20] For scholarship on Jien's waka poetry, see: 1) Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien hōraku waka ronkō* 慈円法楽和歌論考. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2015. 2) Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien waka ronkō* 慈円和歌論考. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin 笠間書院, 1998. 3) Yamamoto Hajime 山本一. *Jien no waka to shisō* 慈円の和歌と思想. Tokyo: Taiyōsha, 1999. 4) Yamamoto Akihiro 山本章博. *Chūsei shakyōka no kenkyū—jyakunen saigyō jien* 中世釈教歌の研究—寂然・西行・慈円. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2016. 5) Yamazaki Toshio 山崎敏夫. *Chūsei waka to sono shūhen* 中世和歌とその周辺. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1980.

reflecting Jien's intentions and motivations, or should we consider the performative aspects of *waka* poetry composition? What about the social and political aspects of *waka* poetry as methods to build and strengthen personal networks within members of the Heian court? In other words, rather than using *waka* poetry as devices to construct a narrative of Jien's life, should we not consider the broader historical and social factors that are involved in the production of *waka* poetry? Although I do not have the space to address all of these questions here, I simply want to suggest that it is important to realize that scholars such as Tsukudo and Taga have used both the vagueness of Kanezane's journal entries and the unreliable content in Jien's *waka* poetry as a way to present Jien as an ideal Buddhist poet who was driven primarily by a religious concern for the salvation of all beings, and only reluctantly became involved in "worldly" matters concerning the political endeavors of Kujō Kanezane as a way to realize his religious ideals. It is not my intention to suggest that Jien held none of these values and aspirations of a Buddhist practitioner. I do want to suggest, however, that it is important to critically assess Tsukudo's effort to construct this vision of Jien in this manner as a form of memorializing in itself, and to recognize that Tsukudo's attempt to project him as an ideal Buddhist monk prevented him (whether consciously or not) to recognize the political nature of Jien's actions and motivations, a point to which I will return to later. This depiction of Jien by Tsukudo also had a significant impact on the way Jien continues to be memorialized in scholarship to this day, seen for example, in the

scholarship of Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄 on the notion of "reclusion" (*tonsei shisō* 遁世思想) in medieval Japan.[21]

In many ways, Taga Munehaya, who devoted his entire academic career to the study of Jien, picked up the torch left by Tsukudo. Although it is undisputable that scholarship of Jien would not be where it is today if not for Taga's extensive study of Jien's writings, it is also important to note that Taga also falls into some of the same problematic interpretations that were seen in Tsukudo's work, particularly in Taga's assessment of Jien's dramatic decision to leave the mountain to commit himself to the political endeavors of his brother Kanezane. It is important to note, however, that Taga does a much more extensive job attempting to provide historical evidence that illuminates Jien's final decision to get involved in "worldly affairs." He does this by pointing to more concrete examples of Jien's interaction with Kanezane as indicated in the latter's court diary, the *Gyokuyō*, as well as by providing additional evidence based on newly discovered texts that express Jien's own thoughts on his decision to "descend from the mountain" at this juncture of his life. The narrative Taga presents, however, is still that of Jien's internal conflict, as one who is torn between a desire to stay secluded in the mountains to pursue religious and poetic arts on the one hand, and his responsibility to engage in the worldly responsibilities to his family, which came from the great expectations that Kanezane had for Jien to take on his role in supporting the

[21] For a recent example of this, see Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄. *Saigyō / Jien to nihon no bukkyō: tonse shisō to chūsei bunka* 西行・慈円と日本の仏教—遁世思想と中世文化. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2016, pp. 2-31.

prosperity of his lineage's future.[22] Taga also relies on Jien's poetry to delineate Jien's internal struggles, after which he explains:

> To stay in seclusion in the mountains or to mingle with the masses, to stay in the mountains or to go out to urban spaces of capital. By going through this emotional disarray, Jien cultivated his mind. Behind many of Jien's poems, one can see hidden a vision of Jien's figure as one who cultivated his mind through experiencing this emotional disarray of having to make a decision between these two choices.[23]

This depiction of Jien's torn identity, emphasized by Taga Munehaya, is based on a record of a conversation between Jien and Kujō Kanezane regarding Jien's desire to remain on Mt. Hiei found in Kujō Kanezane's *Gyokuyō*. In that diary, Kanezane records a brief conversation he had with Jien in which, according to Kanezan's account, Jien expresses his desire to live in seclusion, explaining that "the affairs of the world have no benefit."[24] In Taga's reading of this passage, he suggests that there is a clear dichotomy between Jien's aversion to the "matters of the world" and the ideals of the ascetic, or the *hijiri* 聖. In another journal entry, on the fourteenth day of the eighth month on the fourth year of the Jishō era (1180), Jien is recorded as saying that "his life was worthless" (*shōgai mueki* 生涯無益). These entries become the basis for Taga to suggest that Jien wanted to live as a recluse, and to show that he had a great turning point in his life in which he illustrates a drastic shift from Jien's identity as a recluse monk who rejected the world to one who eventually comes to terms with how the realization of Buddhist thought and the salvation of others needed to be practiced "within the world."

[22] Taga, pp. 41-52.
[23] Taga, p. 49.
[24] *Gyokuyō Vol. 2*, p. 275.

Regarding the moment of Jien's "descent from the mountain," Taga also suggests that there was a "drastic change" in the way Jien understood the world when describing the contrast between Jien's time as a Buddhist practitioner around the time of his *abhiseka* in his late twenties to his sudden involvement with the political endeavors of Kanezane when he was in his mid-thirties.[25] According to Taga, Jien valued Buddhist teachings over all during his years of practice on Mt. Hiei, and expressed distaste for the worldly matters of the capital. When the time came for Jien to finally accept his responsibilities as a member of the Kujō family and to become more directly involved in "worldly affairs," Taga suggests that there was a drastic shift in Jien's worldview that was more accepting of his "worldly" role in the capital.[26] In his efforts to paint a dramatic narrative of Jien's decision to leave the mountains to join his brother Kanezane and enter into the world of court politics, Taga points to one of Jien's poems to illustrate Jien's internal struggle: "To ascend to the peak through the dark mountain path, Perhaps this is not the true way." (くらい山さかゆくみねにのほるとて　まことのみちをよそに見る哉、#689) Taga explains that this poem indicates Jien's maturity in his understanding of the fundamental concepts of Mahayana Buddhism, which teaches that self-cultivation bears real fruit only when one practices in the midst of other sentient beings, i.e., in the "worldly realm." Furthermore, Taga's assumptions that Jien's worldview based on his ascetic training "in the mountains" earlier in his life and his "more mature" understanding of practicing Buddhist ideals "within the world" were

[25] Taga, p. 53-62.
[26] Taga, p. 93.

somehow fundamentally different and required a transformation of Jien's values leads him to make certain assumptions about Jien's moments of "reclusion."

It is worth questioning whether there is a clear-cut division between the "worldly affairs" and the ideal of the "*hijiri.*" In the conversation between Kanezane and Jien, the term *hijiri* is not even mentioned and although it is often described as Jien's internal struggle between the ideal of the "hijiri" who practices in seclusion within the mountain and his acceptance of his role as a Buddhist priest "in the world," the conversation in the *Gyokuyō* is so vague that it could be something as banal as Jien complaining about his administrative duties. According to another short account found in Kanezane's diary,[27] dated the fourth month, second day of the third year of the Chishō era (1179), Jien was already appointed as the administrator of Hōshōji 法性寺, a major family temple (*uji dera* 氏寺) for the Fujiwara family established by Fujiwara no Tadahira in 924, located in current day Higashiyama. Then where does Taga get this idea that Jien had this "internal struggle" in which he was drawn to the ideal of the mountain recluse? When analyzing the conversation as it appears in the *Gyokuyō*, Taga suggests that the term "worldly affairs" referred to the role of Buddhist institutions as protectors of the state, which include not only the practice of rituals but also building projects of Buddhist architectural structures. In juxtaposition to this position, Taga also suggests that Jien, as he completed his training on Mt. Hiei, came to hold the *hijiri* as the ideal form of the Buddhist practitioner, rejecting the way of life of the Buddhist priests who were engaged in "worldly" affairs of supporting the state.[28] To support his interpretation of Jien's views

[27] *Gyokuyō Vol. 2*, p. 275.
[28] Taga, p. 42.

of these two positions, Taga relies on another text, the *Ichigo shiyui* 一期思惟, a text that is undated but most likely composed by Jien late in his life. The *Ichigo shiyui* includes the following passage:

> Those who are suited as vessels for the flourishing of the Buddha dharma, are those who perform Buddhist rites on a daily basis. If they do not [perform rites on a daily basis], they should keep themselves retained in the mountain forests and withdraw from the world to the fringes of the mountains."[29]

Taga uses this passage to support his claim that Jien viewed the recluse monks (*hijiri*) who leave the world to perform austerities in the mountains as figures that are, in Jien's mind, clearly differentiated by those who stay "in the world" to work for the "flourishing of the Buddha dharma" (興隆仏法), which includes the involvement of Buddhist priests in the "worldly concerns" of the construction and administration of Buddhist temples. Furthermore, based on the *Gyokuyō* passages introduced above, Taga suggests that in his youth, Jien was drawn towards the ideal of the *hijiri* who remain secluded in the mountains, more so than the "worldly" priests who administer temples and this is what Jien meant when he told Kanezane, "the matters of the world have no benefit and I wish to live in seclusion." This juxtaposition between the ideal of the *hijiri* and the priests involved in temple administration, however, is not clearly indicated in this passage. In other words, it is clear that Taga's interpretation of this passage is colored by his assumption that, as suggested earlier by Tsukudo, Jien is a Buddhist poet who idealized the secluded life of a recluse as more authentic than a priest who was active "in the world." Not only is it problematic that the *Ichigo shiyui*, most likely written toward the end

[29] 「可為興隆仏法之器者可存尋常行儀、若不然者容身於山林、遁世於片山」 See Murata Masashi 村田正志. "Shōrenin yoshimizu zō ni okeru jien shiryō" 青蓮院吉水蔵における慈円史料. *Rekishi Chiri* 歴史地理. Vol. 84, p. 36.

of Jien's life, is used as evidence to describe what Jien is thinking when he was in his 20s, there is also the issue of how "recluse monks" are actually described in the *Ichigo shiyui.*

According to this text, one sees that Jien was, in fact, quite critical of "recluse monks" and even goes on to suggest that they are "evil." Although this is a topic that I will elaborate more on in a later chapter, it is worth noting here that later in his life, at least by the time he composed the *Gukanshō* and the *Ichigo shiyui,* Jien seems to have viewed "recluse monks" as heretics who threatened social order. It appears that Taga's interpretation of this passage is driven by his own preconceptions that the *hijiri* ideal should be separated from the more "worldly" activities of Buddhist priests at this time, and his insistence that Jien was a Buddhist poet who was torn between these two types of Buddhist practitioners. However, when we consider the fact that the *Ichigo shiyui* was meant to be a personal reflection of Jien's own achievements and the various Buddhist activities and projects he was involved in during his lifetime, a more direct reading of this passage could be interpreted as simply referring to the manner in which Jien was involved with ritual practice at different moments in his career. In other words, Jien is describing here that while he was "a vessel suited for the flourishing of the Buddha dharma," he performed Buddhist rites on a daily basis, and perhaps another way of saying "as one who is suited as a vessel for the flourishing of the Buddha dharma, I performed Buddhist rites on a daily basis [when I could]." The second part, could be read as "If it is not possible to [perform rites on a daily basis], [the vessels] should keep themselves retained in the mountain forests and withdraw from the world to the fringes

of the mountains," could be referring to the time he spent on Nishiyama 西山, a period in which he was forced to step down from his position of *zasu* as the result of the ousting of Kanezane from his position of power.[30] When we think about Jien writing this short treatise as a "recollection" of his own past, it seems to make more sense to analyze the second half of this passage as an explanation, or perhaps a justification, of why there was a period of time in his long career that he spent away from the court in the mountains of Nishiyama.

As mentioned, the reality was that Jien was forced to step down from his position of *zasu,* at the time when Kanezane was also forced to step down from his role as regent. In this sense, both Jien's rise to prominence as the highest ranking Buddhist priest in the Tendai order as well as his resignation was dependent on Kanezane's position within court politics and it shows the extent to which these two worked together. As for Jien's time of "reclusion" in Nishiyama, this was not necessarily out of Jien's wish to leave the capital to pursue his love of poetry and mountain asceticism, but out of a necessity to keep a safe distance from court politics at a time when the members of the Kujō lineage were ousted from their positions of power and replaced by members of the Konoe lineage. Although this was the most likely scenario for Jien's retreat to Nishiyama, it makes sense that Jien would not be so forth coming about this fact, as it would be an acceptance of the Kujō family's embarrassing defeat by the Konoe family. In this sense, it is interesting that Jien's memoire, the *Ichigo shiyui,* tells us a different narrative that seems to obfuscate the political embarrassment of Kanezane and his own downfall, but suggests that his time of retreat in the mountains was merely the proper thing to do as a

[30] Taga, p. 170-197.

Buddhist practitioner. When read in this way, Jien is in no way rejecting the role of Buddhist priests "in the world" nor making a value judgment that is meant to be juxtaposed with the ideal of a *hijiri* (as Taga suggests), but rather he seems to be simply saying that "in the circumstance that a priest is not given the space to perform rites, they should retreat to the mountains." One may argue that I may be placing too much emphasis on Taga's interpretation on this single passage, however, the manner in which he reads Jien's thoughts regarding the ideal of the recluse in this particular passage points to a larger interpretive issue. It is Taga's pre-conception of Jien as an idealized poet-monk, or perhaps due to his attempt to paint him as such, that shapes his interpretation of these passages and we should be aware that as much as Taga's scholarship is foundational for our understanding of Jien's contributions, we should also be aware of the bias in the interpretive lens that he uses in constructing Jien's persona as he puts together a compelling narrative of his life.

The Rise and Fall of Kanezane and Questioning Jien's "Period of Reclusion"

There is another period in Jien's life where he spent time away from the capital and in the mountains of Nishiyama 西山 on the western side of the Heian capital. This period spend on Nishiyama is often described as a "period of reclusion" and viewed as a period in which Jien distanced himself from the "worldly affairs" of court politics to pursue his acetic and poetic endeavors and another indication of Jien's internal struggle to find a balance between his poetic and ascetic desires on the one hand, and his more "worldly" responsibilities on the other. However, rather than interpret this time of his life

as a fluctuation or conflict between these two ways of life, it is perhaps better to situate Jien's decision to move away from the court and into the mountains as an inevitable consequence of political circumstances that surrounded his brother Kanezane's position within the court. In other words, while Kanezane's rise to power in the Heian court led to Jien's appointment as the *zasu* of Enryakuji, his "fall" from that position was also a direct result of Kanezane's political failures and it shows the extent to which Jien's place in Heian society was dependent on Kanezane's support.

On the thirteenth of the third month in the third year of the Kenyū era (1192), Kanezane rose to the rank of regent when Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa passed away and the young Emperor Go-Toba ascended the throne. Once in power, Kanezane was quick to take measures to solidify his influence both through his attempts to establish closer ties with Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147-1199) and appointing his family members to high administrative positions at Buddhist temples. In the eleventh month of the same year, Kanezane appointed Jien as the Tendai zasu to give him administrative power over Enryakuji. He also was active in reconstruction efforts of temples in the Nanto region, succeeding in restoring Kōfukuji in the fifth year of the Kenyū era (1194) and rebuilding Tōdaiji the following year. Within the first three years of his appointment as regent, it looked as if things were going well for Kanezane. However, Kanezane's quick success into the highest ranks of the Heian court and his insistence on strictly abiding to past precedents in his appointment decisions was not looked upon well, especially by the lower ranked aristocrats and he quickly made enemies within the court. Kanezane made his appointment decisions based on the traditional understanding of

the members of the court, which made a hierarchical distinction between the members of regent family 摂関家, the court nobilities 公家, and the lower ranked members of the court 諸大夫. However, as traditional administrative structures shifted during the Insei period, so did the traditional ranking system. By this time, families that were originally considered of a class of stewards (*iedukasa* 家司) that supported the regent families, such as the Zenshjōiryū 善勝寺流 and Kajūjiryū 勧修寺流 families, had risen to significant positions of influence. In his insistence on the traditional ranking system, Kanezane only appointed those of the high-ranking aristocratic families to the highest positions in the court, which upset aristocrats from the middle to lower ranking families, who had hoped for a better promotion based on their contribution to the court.[31] As frustration boiled among the middle to lower ranking aristocratic families, what was decisive in the fall of Kanezane was Yoritomo's decision to side with Takashina no Eishi 高階栄子 (1151? – 1216), commonly known as Tango no Tsubone 丹後局, who along with Minamoto no Michichika 源通親 (1149-1202), conspired to overthrow Kanezane. Without the support of Yoritomo, the only chance Kanezane would have had to maintain his position of influence was to have his daughter, Kujō Taeko 九条任子 (1173-1239), who was also the consort of Emperor Go-Toba, give birth to an imperial son.

[31] For schorship on Kujō Kanezane, see: 1) Kanō Shigefumi 加納重文. *Kujyō Kanezane—shashoku no kokorozashi, ten'i shinryo ni kotaeru mono ka* 九条兼実—社稷の志、天意神慮に答える者か—. Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō, 2016. 2) Ōno Jyunko 大野順子. "Kenkyū ki kujō ke kadan ni okeru waka hyōgen ni tsuite—jyusshu zōtōka gun wo chūshin ni" 建久期九条家歌壇における和歌表現について—十首贈答歌群を中心に. In *Kodai chūsei bungaku ronkō dai 28 shū*, 221-246. Tokyo: Shintensha, 2013. 3) Matsuzono Hitoshi 松薗斉. *Nikki no ie—chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki* 日記の家—中世国家の記録組織. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997. 4) Higuchi Kentarō 樋口健太郎. *Chūsei sekkanke no ie to kenryoku* 中世摂関家の家と権力. Tokyo: Azekura shobō, 2011. 4) Obara Hitoshi 小原仁. *Chūsei kizoku shakai to bukkyō* 中世貴族社会と仏教. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007.

However, when on the thirteenth day of the eighth month, she gave birth to an imperial daughter, later named Princess Shōshi 昇子内親王, and his rival Michichika's adopted daughter Minamoto no Ariko 源在子 who was also an imperial consort of Emperor Go-Toba, gave birth to an imperial son, who would later become Emperor Tsuchimikado 土御門天皇, on the tenth day of the eleventh month, the tables suddenly turned and many already aristocratic families already frustrated with Kanezane began supporting Michichika instead. When Kanezane's long time partner Sanjō Sanefusa 三条実房 (1147-1225) who was appointed as the Sadaijin 左大臣 fell ill in the third month of the seventh year of the Kenkyū era and resigned from his position, Kanezane did not replace the position with another appointment. By the 23rd day of the eleventh month of the same year, his daughter Kujō Taeko was kicked out of the Imperial Palace and Kanezane's position as the regent was revoked just two days later, seemingly with no attempt from Kanezane's side to reject the call for his resignation. At this time, other prominent members of the Kujō family, including Kanezane's brothers Fujiwara no Kanefusa 藤原兼房 (1153-1217) and Jien who were serving as the Chancellor of the Realm (*daijō-daijin* 太政大臣) and Tendai zasu of Enryakuji, respectively, were both pressured to resign from their positions. In other words, in only four years since Kanezane's rise as regent to the emperor, all the members who had close ties to Kanezane were stripped of their positions, making this a complete defeat for the Kujō family. Soon after Kanezane resigned from his position, Konoe Motomichi 近衛基通 (1160-1233), a member of the Konoe family, was appointed to replace Kanezane as the next regent for Emperor Go-Toba. This sudden replacement of the Kujō lineage's

position as the regent family to the emperor to that of the Konoe lineage was a devastating blow to the status of the Kujō family in the court, and a point that appears quite prominently in Jien's *Gukanshō*, which I will return to later.

This turn of events in the politics of the Heian court and its impact on the Kujō family is crucial in resituating our understanding of Jien's motivations and his identity. For example, the period following the devastating events of the political upheavals of the 7th year of the Kenkyū era is described as Jien's "period as a recluse " by Taga, with the suggestion that Jien was again drawn to the ideal lifestyle away from court politics. However, it is important to remember that Jien's decision to move to Nishiyama during this time was a result of the drastic downfall of the Kujō family and not necessarily a personal choice driven by his desire to pursue a quiet life in the mountains. A consideration of the ritual activities Jien was involved in during this time also suggests that although he was temporarily removed from the high administrative positions he had at Enryakuji, he continued to work actively during these years both in terms of his ritual activities and the composition of treatises. Two important rituals that he performed during his so-called "time of reclusion" was the *mandala ku* 曼荼羅供 for Gyōgen (行玄) and the *nyohōkyō* 如法経 for Kanshō 観性. Far from living the life as a "recluse," Jien can be seen as continuing the work of realizing the goals he shared with Kanezane to help restore the Kujō family. It was also during this time that Jien wrote many of the doctrinal and ritual treatises that would be become foundational to the Buddhist ritual center he established at Shorenin monzeki.

In other words, viewing this period of Jien's life as that of a "recluse" seems to come from an attempt to paint Jien's life story as one of the "tormented Buddhist poet," in which he was torn between religious and aesthetic ideals on the one hand and his "worldly" responsibly on the other, with the suggestion that these two are incompatible. Based on the records seen in the *Gyokuyō*, although there does seem to be some indication of Jien's reluctance to take on institutional responsibility, this does not necessarily mean that he viewed "worldly affairs" as incompatible with "religious ideals." This should be seen as more of a projection made onto Jien's identity by modern scholars, and depicting Jien as a troubled Buddhist poet does more to hinder our understanding of Jien's motivations. Although recent scholarship on Jien has taken a more careful approach in assessing the political implications of Jien's poetry, as seen in the work of Yamamoto Hajime and Ishikawa Hajime, this image of Jien as a divided individual who struggled between "worldly" responsibilities and aesthetic desires is still the dominant narrative used to describe his life story. For example, in Delmer M. Brown's "Jien and His Troubled Times" in *Jien: The Future and the Past*, Brown also follows this narrative and paints a picture of Jien's life as one that was torn between his role as a family member of the Kujō lineage and his identity as a "devout Buddhist" who tried to isolated himself completely from worldly affairs:

> Jien could never completely divorce his position as a son and brother of Regents from his position as a priest who studied and practiced Buddhism within the great Tendai sect. For a time he tried to isolate himself completely from worldly affairs but was drawn deeply into current political rivalries by the appointment of his favorite brother as Regent after Minamoto Yoritomo's victories in 1185. And when the Kujō began to fall from power, especially after the death of Yoritomo in 1199 and while Go-Toba was pressing for greater control of the *in no chō*, Jien seems to have

> made a serious and conscious effort to relate his religious beliefs—both Shinto and Buddhist—to the changing fortunes of the Kujō house.[32]

Although Brown's main point here about Jien's active and conscious effort to relate his beliefs in Shinto *kami* and engagement with Buddhist rites as a means to elevate the Kujō lineage is undisputable, the notion that there was a conflict between Jien's desire to live a life of a devout Buddhist and his involvement in the politics of the capital is questionable.

In other words, we should be more cognizant of the fact that modern scholars, particularly of Jien's literary work, have constructed an idealized vision of Jien's figure as a poet-monk, and used poetry in an uncritical way to provide a narrative of Jien's life as one who was torn between "religious ideal" and "worldly affairs." In our interpretation of Jien's motivations, we should also be more cognizant of what he actually accomplished and not let ourselves be too drawn by Jien's own poetic rhetoric of seclusion. To critically assess the narrative of Jien's life as presented in the works by scholars like Tsukudo and Taga, it is helpful to take a look at the way in which Jien was memorialized by his own disciples in *The Biography of the Priest of Compassionate Pacification* (*Jichin kashō den* 慈鎮和尚伝).[33] As a work of hagiographical literature, the contents of this biography need to be read critically. It is not my intension to suggest that this can be seen as a more historically accurate depiction of Jien. While fully understanding that this work was also written with its own biases and institutional motivations, we can still obverse significant differences in the way in which Jien's

[32] Brown, Delmer M. and Ichirō Ishida. *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, p. 419.
[33] Tendai Shūten Hensanjo. Ed. *Zoku Tendai shū zensho shiden 2—Nihon Tendai sō denrui I* 続天台全書 史伝２　日本天台僧伝類 I, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 403-409.

identity is presented to the reader and it provides an interesting point of comparison to re-evaluate the ways in which modern scholarship has constructed their own the narrative of Jien's life as an exemplary literary figure of pre-modern Japan.

Jien Memorialized in Hagiography: *The Biography of the Priest of Compassionate Pacification*

Through modern scholarship, as seen in the work of Taga and Ōsumi, Jien has been portrayed as a "troubled poet" torn between his desire for seclusion and his "worldly" responsibilities. However, when we look back to one of the earliest biographies written about Jien, we see that the vision of Jien's identity as composed by his own disciples gives us a very different picture than what we see in modern scholarship. Although no author is listed, the *Biography of the Priest of Compassionate Quelling* (*Jichin kashō den* 慈鎮和尚伝), hereafter *Biography*, was most likely composed by one or a group of Jien's disciples after his death in 1225, sometime between 1237-1289.[34] While this short text is usually viewed as a reliable primary source to study the events of Jien's life, there has been little attempt to critically analyze the significance of this text and what this tells us about the "memory" of Jien. Unlike the common image of Jien today as a literary figure, this biography reveals that his own disciples memorialized Jien first and foremost as a practitioner of exoteric-esoteric Buddhist rites. The biography itself is short, but it gives us a good idea of what parts of Jien's achievements were the most important for his immediate disciples and as we will see, equally important are the elements of his biography that have been left out.

[34] *Zoku Tendai shū zensho shiden 2,* pp. 403-409.

The *Biography* opens with a list of credentials and positions that Jien held during his lifetime. Considering the laudatory nature of hagiographical literature, this in itself is not unusual, but the order in which this information is given is interesting. It indicates that he was 1) the 58th *zasu* of Enryakuji, 2) served as the highest ranking of the *daisōjō* 大僧正, 3) the 18th generation descendent of the Minister Fujiwara Kamatari 藤原鎌足 (614-669), and 4) descendent of Previous Regent and Chancellor Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164). In other words, it is clear in the opening lines of the biography that most emphasis is placed on his high rank within the Tendai Sanmon lineage and of the Buddhist institution, but also makes claims of his legitimacy as a member of the highest echelons of the political order as the descendent of the Fujiwara clan. It is notable that Jien is listed here as the descendent of previous leading figures of the Fujiwara family, such as Kamatari and Tadamichi, and no mention is made of the fact that he is the younger brother of Kanezane. This is perhaps partially due to Kanezane's downfall mentioned above, as members of the Heian society would have still had a fresh memory of those devastating events and an association with Kanezane may have proved to be more harmful.

These opening lines listing Jien's credentials is followed by a brief history of his achievements as a priest, beginning with his tonsure under Kakukai Hosshinnō at the young age of 11. There is almost nothing said of his training as a novice and the document jumps to events that occur from his mid-20s, focusing on his administrative positions at Buddhist institutions, including his appointment as *zasu* at Hōshōji 法性寺 (age 24), and his appointment as *kengyō* 檢校 of Ryōgonzanmai in 楞巖三昧院 and

Jyōjyuin 常壽院 (age 27) and Mudōji 無動寺 on Mt. Hiei. Special emphasis is placed on Mudōji, as it is the location not only of his training but also where Jien eventually establishes his *kangakukō* 勧学講, or "Lectures to Promote Learning," in 1195 for the purpose of educating the monks of Mt. Hiei.[35] The establishment of the *kangaku kō* was the first major project Jien was involved in with the purpose of "reviving the Buddhist teachings." Importantly, this was a project that was sponsored by his brother Kanezane and had important implications for Kanezane's efforts to revive the Kujō family.[36] However, in this text there is no mention of Kanezane and the focus is on Jien's role in successfully reviving the Buddhist learning on Mt. Hiei. In the *Biography*, the *kangaku kō* is described as a seven-day event involving one hundred monastic students in which the first six days were spent deepening the profound meaning of the exoteric teachings, and the attainment of wisdom on the final seventh day through an esoteric rite.[37] What is striking is the manner in which the success of the *kangaku kō* is expressed in the *Biography*. It is described as a dharma assembly in the likes that has never been seen before that produced immeasurable good merit.[38] The *Biography* also elevates the importance of this assembly by suggesting that it was able to establish a karmic connection to one hundred people, equivalent to the number of members in the White Lotus Society 白蓮社, formed by Huiyuan 慧遠 (334-416). The emphasis of the

[35] For research on Jien's establishment of the *kangakukō,* see 1) Murata Masashi 村田正志. "Gakusō to jiin" 学僧と寺院. In *Murata Masashi chosaku shū dai go kan: Kokushi gaku ronsetsu* 村田正志著作集　第五巻 国史学論説. pp. 90-198. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan 思文閣出版, 1985. 2) Ogami Kanchu 尾上寛仲. "Jichin kashō no kagakukō" 慈鎮和尚の勧学講. *Tendai gakuhō* Vol. 14, 1972, pp. 67-79. 3) Ogami Kanchu 尾上寛仲. "Jichin kashō no kangakukō to kuritakō oyobi yusugikō" 慈鎮和尚の勧学講と栗田講及び湯次講. *Tendai gakuhō* Vol. 15, 1973, pp. 43-51.
[36] Taga, p. 103-106.
[37] *Zoku Tendai shū zensho shiden 2,* p. 404.
[38] *Zoku Tendai shū zensho shiden 2*, p. 404.

passages here are clear. Jien is a great Buddhist leader comparable to the legendary Huiyuan and that his contribution to the flourishing of the Tendai School involved a combination of a comprehension of the exoteric teachings complemented with the attainment of wisdom through esoteric ritual.

The rest of the *Biography* emphasized Jien as the performer of various exoteric and esoteric rites. In addition to indicating important information regarding his rank, the remainder of the *Biography* emphasizes the success he had in the performance of various rites such as the *Nyohō hokke goshu gyō* 如法法花五種行, *Amida senbō* 阿弥陀懺法, *Anchin hō* 安鎮法, *Mandala ku* 曼陀羅供, and *Daishijōkō hō* 大熾盛光法. After listing some details regarding when and where these rituals were successfully performed, the *Biography* provides a long section that takes up a significant portion of this short biography that expresses great praise for Jien's successful performance of these rituals.[39] The emphasis here is not only on the scale and variety of Buddhist rituals that Jien performed throughout his lifetime, but that they were successful in preventing natural disasters and droughts and controlling the movement of the stars. According to the *Biography*, Jien's ability to successfully perform these rituals was unlike anything witnessed in the past or present, and claims that it was largely due to the performance of these rituals by Jien that there was peace and order in the world.

The expressions used in the *Biography* to express Jien's relationship to the emperor as a "protector" of the state is also interesting: "For the Lord of the Myriad Teachings (referring to the Retired Emperor), he is the Honorable Teacher of Protection.

[39] *Zoku Tendaishū zensho shiden 2:* p. 406.

For all people rich and destitute, he is the Mortal Body of Control. As the Fierce General of the Monk's Ritual Platform, he wields the Sword of Wisdom and subdues the Realm of Evil. As the Upright Minister of the Buddhist Palace, he suspends the Mirror of Wisdom and through it illuminates man." (萬乘君王爲護持之尊師。普天貴賤爲調御之生身。僧壇之猛將也。振智劍以伏魔界。佛庭之直臣也。懸惠鏡以照人閒。)[40] Although these words are clearly poetic expressions, they tell us what elements of Jien's persona was important for their community to remember: he was a powerful figure endowed with Buddhist wisdom and compassion, but also the furiousness of a military general with the power to subdue evil through the practice of rituals. The phrase "he wields the Sword of Wisdom and subdues the Realm of Evil" is based on the iconography of Fudō Myōō. The association with Fudō Myōō is also emphasized in the following lines, when the text offers praise of Jien's "harsh and painful practices" (*nangyō kugyō* 難行苦行) of one thousand days, ending his practice at Katsuragawa 葛川. According to the *Biography*, this is where Jien had a mystical vision of *kurikara* 倶利迦羅*,* the name of Fudō's Sword.[41]

Of course, these words of praise and mystical accounts need to be read critically and can be seen as attempts to legitimize their institution of Shōrenin by memorializing Jien as an exemplary and powerful figure, not only for his ties to the court nobility, but for his ritual power and protector against "evil spirits." The fact that his disciples also requested the issuing of his posthumous name, *Jichin-kashō* 慈鎮和尚, or the "Priest of Compassionate Pacification," indicates that there was not only a need to legitimize the

[40] *Zoku Tendaishū zensho shiden 2,* pp. 405-406.
[41] *Zoku Tendaishū zensho shiden 2,* p. 406.

religious community, but also that “pacification” was an important aspect of their ritual practices. Specifically, one of the important claims highlighted here is that the Jien, and therefore his disciples at Shōrenin monzeki, were equipped with the ritual technologies to maintain peace through the subjugation and control of malevolent forces. I will return to this point later in the dissertation when I discuss what kind of rituals Jien established at Shōrenin.

Again, although these claims of Jien acting as the wrathful figure who subdues evil is rhetorical in nature, the difference we see in the presentation of Jien’s identity here and the one that has been presented in modern scholarship as seen in the works of Tsukudo and Taga is striking. What makes Jien exemplary from the perspective of his disciples is not in his ability to write poetry or to compile an elaborate historical narrative. There is only one short phrase mentioned in passing that Jien composed poetry and the *Gukanshō*, which is known today as Jien’s major work and the focus of most scholarship on Jien today, is not mentioned once in the *Biography*. This should suggest to us that although the vision of Jien as a “ritual subjugator of evil” is one that was constructed by his disciples, the interpretation of Jien as an exemplary literary figure is equally one that has been constructed through modern scholarship. This is not to say that we should not study Jien’s poetry or *Gukanshō*. They have great value as literature and provide an insight into the cultural sensitivities of literature in medieval Japan. It is necessary, however, to re-evaluate our perception of Jien as a literary figure.

The *Biography* presents a very different vision of the historical figure Jien than what has been painted in more recent years, which emphasize his internal struggle as a

conflicted poet and intellectual historian. It is not my intent to suggest that "Jien the ritualist" is in some sense more true to his identity than Jien as poet or literati/historian, but I do want to suggest that these various elements of Jien should not be seen as mutually exclusive. To think that the qualities of Jien as a poet and historian as conflicting with his conceived role as a religionist that employs rituals of subjugation to maintain peace in the world is a problem only to those who attempt to interpret his actions through the lens of modern scholarship. From the perspective of Jien's disciples, it is clear that Jien's writing of the *Gukanshō* and his activities as a poet were only of secondary importance, and it was rather his success in establishing centers for the practice of exoteric and esoteric Buddhist rites for the protection of the state that was seen as his greatest accomplishments.

Although concepts of "Principle" or *dōri* 道理 as it appears in Jien's historical work, the *Gukanshō*, has been a major focus in evaluating Jien's religious thought, we can see that the writing of the *Gukanshō* was only a small part of a much broader religious operation that involved the performance of various forms of exoteric and esoteric Buddhist rituals, the establishment of innovative Buddhist architectural structures and ritual space, and the commissioning of new religious education centers, such as the *kangakukō* at Mudōji for the monks of Mt. Hiei and Shorenin monzeki for the training of dharma princes. When we step outside of the *Gukanshō* and place him in his historical context by considering the various religious activities he was involved in throughout his career as a religious figure, a different side of Jien will be revealed as one who not only had a keen awareness of the growing precariousness of political

structures caused by the growing military class, but also as a figure who attempted to effectively respond to the imminent dangers that threatened to undermine the status of the Kujō family. As I will discuss in more detail in the following chapters, the social and political concerns addressed in Jien's historical project of the *Gukanshō* must also be read as a topic that is deeply intertwined with his religious concerns, and it is important that we consider how these elements fit in their entirety. While the *Gukanshō* may be considered to be a great accomplishment in his work, it is important that we clarify more specifically what the purpose of the *Gukanshō* may have been within his broader projects and how his construction of his historical narrative corresponds with his other religious and political activities throughout his life.

Furthermore, if we can call into question the narrative of the conflicted poet-monk that has been constructed by Taga, how do we understand Jien's early career and his "dramatic shift" from a life of seclusion to his involvement with the political endeavors of Kanezane? Perhaps this notion that Jien only passively and reluctantly got involved in "worldly affairs" with the strong encouragement from Kanezane is in itself misleading and draws away from our analysis of how Jien was extremely tactful in using his position as a practitioner of Buddhist rituals, not only to assist Kanezane's political endeavors, but also to effectively address the issue of disorder. Instead of viewing Jien as the "torn Buddhist poet" he is depicted to be, if we focus on Jien's actions, it is clear that there was an immediate collaboration between Kanezane and Jien in the years following Jien's first appointment as *zasu*. They worked together to establish new ritual centers and in reviving Buddhist learning on Mt. Hiei, and Jien fully operated as private

ritualist for various patrons from the aristocracy and imperial family directly connected to Kanezane. Importantly, all of these ritual activities also had important social and political implications. The religious activities Jien was involved in during these years was essential for establishing his own reputation among the capital elites, but perhaps more importantly also could be seen as benefiting Kanezane's own political ambitions. Furthermore, there is a clear connection between the ritual projects that Jien and Kanezane collaborated on early in Jien's career to the ideas that were also at the core of Jien's later projects, the most important being the construction of his ritual center at Daisangehōin, which I will discuss more in the final chapter of the dissertation. In this sense, rather than there being a conflict of interests between Kanezane and Jien early in his life that Jien needed to "overcome" it is clear that the Buddhist ideals and worldviews that Jien held throughout his career were ones that were both constructed and held in collaboration with his brother Kanezane.

Kujō Kanezane and Jien's Collaboration to Realize the "Flourishing of the Buddhist Teachings"

One of the earliest indications of Kanezane and Jien's collaboration was their involvement in the rebuilding of Tōdaiji. Their religious and political motivations are addressed in a *ganmon* 願文 that was composed by Kanezane in the second year of the Jyūei era, to commemorate the rebuilding of the Tōdaiji, which was burned down by Taira no Shigehira 平重衡 (1157-1185) in 1180, and to offer a Buddhist relic to be stored

within the Great Buddha Statue.[42] This *ganmon*, found in the *Heian Ibun* 平安遺文 as text number 4096, is particularly important for our discussion, as it illustrates that many of the religious and political ideals that later become the foundation for Jien's ritual projects later in life was already present in this project that was headed by Kanezane. The *ganmon* is characterized by a vision of history as one that is marked with decline, a call for the restoration of an ideal form of governance marked by the cooperation between the imperial family and the ministers, and the emphasis on relic worship and the performance of the *butsugen hō* 仏眼法, or "Ritual of the Buddha Eye," as a means to realize peace in the world. The *butsugenhō,* specifically mentioned at the end of this *ganmon*, also became a ritual performed throughout Jien's career and had important implications with the political endeavors of the Kujō family, as evidenced by its active use by Kanezane, Jien, and Kanshō.[43] Of course, the *butsugen hō* was only one of the many rituals that Jien was tasked with performing in the early years of his career as a Buddhist priest. Kanezane's diary, the *Gyokuyō*, gives us a glimpse of the extent to which Jien was relied upon to perform various forms of rituals for the benefit of the Kujō family and there is little here to indicate that Jien was reluctant to be involved in these matters.

Another indication that Jien may not have been conflicted as has been previously suggested is how quickly Jien advances in his career after the death of his master,

---

[42] Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三. Ed. *Heian Ibun: komonjo hen dai hakkan* 平安遺文 古文書編第八巻, Tokyo: Tokyo dō shuppan, 1965, p. 3094-3096. For analysis of this *ganmon*, see Obara Hitoshi 小原仁 [Ed.] *Gyokuyō o yomu: Kujō Kanezane to sono jidai* 玉葉を読む—九条兼実とその時代. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2013. pp. 3-31.

[43] For discussions on the relationship between these three figures, see Shimizu Shinchō 清水真澄. "Jien no kiseki—Kujō ke ni okeru buppō kōryū wo megutte" 慈円の軌跡—九条家における仏法興隆をめぐって. Shōtoku Daigaku Gengo Bungaku Kenkyūjo Ronsō, Vol. 14, 2006, pp. 195-232.

Kakukai Hosshinnō. Kakukai Hosshinō passed away on the sixth day of the eleventh month on the fifth year of the Jishō era (1181). On the same date, Jien received the rank of *hōin* 法印, was given additional administrative positions as the *bettō* 別当 of Gokurakuji 極楽院 and Hōkōin 法興院 and as *kengyō* 検校 of Sanmaiin 三昧院 and Jyōjuin 成就院. It was also around this time that Jien changed his name from his previous name of Dōkai 道快 to Jien, perhaps marking a new phase in his life. The name Jien first appears in *Gyokuyō* on the sixth day of the eleventh month on the first year of the Yōwa era (1181). Taga Munehaya suggests that the change of his name and his acceptance of these positions was a dramatic turning point in Jien's life, and reflective of his realization that he must leave the mountains and enter into the capital in order to realize not only his goals of spreading the Buddhist teachings, but also to accept his responsibility to support the Kujō family.[44] Whether we read the dramatized changes in Jien's psychology into this or not, it is clear that this was indeed an important stage in Jien's life in which he was placed with the responsibility, perhaps regardless of his own intentions, to administer institutions appointed to him. However, the swift, in fact immediate, appointment of Jien in these positions indicates that Jien quickly accepted these administrative positions.

For the amount of "internal struggle" that has been emphasized in the telling of Jien's story, there is actually little evidence to indicate that the transition and acceptance of these so-called "worldly" administrative positions caused great internal strife for Jien. Furthermore, almost immediately after Jien's appointment to the *zasu* position, it is clear

[44] Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Kōhon Shūgyokushū* 校本拾玉集. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1971, p. 771.

that Jien had a substantial plan on how to deal with the issue of growing disorder on Mt. Hiei, which, in collaboration with Kanezane, was addressed through the establishment of the *kangakukō*. We also see Jien's immediate involvement in rituals that were performed for the safe-birth of an imperial son. In other words, if we focus on the actions that Jien took, rather than the vision of the "conflicted Buddhist poet," we see a pro-active, politically savvy, fully engaged ritual practitioner who used his newly acquired position to fully support the political agenda of his brother Kanezane.

In the years immediately following Jien's "descent" to the Heian capital from Mt. Hiei, we see most of Jien's ritual activities focusing on rites performed for the benefit of Kanezane. In 1183, Jien performed the *Fukūkenjyakuhō* 不空羂索法 and *Yakushihō* 薬師法 at Mudōji temple to address the illness of Fujiwara no Yoshimichi 藤原良通 (1167-1188), Kanezane's eldest son. In 1184, Jien performed the *Yakushi goma* 薬師護摩 at Shōrenin and the *Fudōbō* 不動法 at Mt. Hiei, both commissioned by Kanezane. Kanezane seemed to have great expectations for his eldest son Yoshimichi as the next in line for the Kujō family, but the rituals performed did not bear fruit and Yoshimichi passed away in 1188, at the young age of 21. Fujiwara no Yoshitsune 藤原良経 (1169-1206) became next in line after Yoshimichi's passing, and it appears that Kanezane was aware of the possibility that Yoshitsune would have to take Yoshimichi's place a few years before his death. In 1185, out of the fifteen rites that are recorded in the *Gyokuyō*, seven were commissioned by either by Kanezane himself or his younger son Fujiwara no Yoshitsune. The *Fudō goma* 不動護摩 and *Goshin* 護身 were performed by Jien at Mudōji and Kanezane's living quarters. These protective rites could have been for the

protection of his ill son, or perhaps to ensure that Yoshitsune would be stay healthy as the second in line after Yoshimichi after he fell ill. Either way, Kanezane seemed quite intent to have Jien perform protective rites for his descendants, who were key elements in ensuring the continued prosperity and future of his lineage.

Another way Jien supported Kanezane's political motivations was the rites he performed for Kanezane's daughter, Kujō Taeko 任子, who as mentioned above, was the imperial consort to Emperor Go-Toba. The *Butsugen goma* 仏眼護摩, was performed in 1189, also at Kanezane's living quarters and while the commissioner for this rite is simply indicated as a "woman of Fujiwara no Kanezane" (藤原兼実女), it was most likely performed for Kujō Taeko. In the following year, she was officiated as the an imperial consort, or *nyōgo* 女御, in accordance with Emperor Go-Toba's coming of age ceremony (*genpuku* 元服). At this time, Jien performed a *Fudōku* 不動供, or a "Prayer to the Fudō Myōō," to pray for her entrance into the Imperial quarters. In 1193 Jien performed a *Fudōku,* this time at Byōdōin Godaidō 平等院五大堂, in response to Taeko's promotion of becoming the imperial wife（*rikkō* 立后）. In other words, as Kujō Taeko made her way into the Imperial Palace to become the consort and official crown wife of the Emperor, Jien was performing various rites to ensure that she would succeed in establishing a crucial link between the Kujō family and the imperial family. Jien also played a crucial role in performing a wide range of Buddhist rites that prayed that Taeko would give birth to an imperial son, which as discussed above, would have ensured political stability for Kanezane.

Table 1: Rituals Performed by Jien for Kujō Taeko

Ritual	Date
Butsugen hō 仏眼法	20th day of 12th month, 4th year of Kenkyū
Butsugen hō 仏眼法	20th day of 1st month, 5th year of Kenkyū
Fudōku 不動供	8th day of 7th month, 5th year of Kenkyū
Fudōku 不動供	19th day of 11th month, 5th year of Kenkyū
Shichibutsu yakushi hō 七仏薬師法	15th day of 7th month, 6th year of Kenkyū
Kariteimo jūgo dōji tōgu 訶梨底母十五童子等供	14th day of 6th month, 6th year of Kenkyū
Nyohō butsugenhō 如法仏眼法	29th day of 6th month, 6th year of Kenkyū

It was in the eighth month of the sixth year of the Kenkyū era (1195) that Kujō Taeko gave birth to a daughter, Shōshi naishinnō 昇子内親王, and it is clear from these records that there was great reliance on these Buddhist rites to ensure the safe birth of a child and that Jien participated very actively in these efforts. However, despite these efforts, or perhaps because of the high hopes placed in the birth of a son, it is recorded in the *Gukanshō* that Kanezane felt great regret (*kuchi oshii* 口惜しい) that a daughter was born. As already mentioned above, this birth of a daughter became one of the many factors that led to Kanezane's eventual downfall in the court.

While it is clear that Jien supported the Kujō family through his practice of rituals that promoted its protection and prosperity, he also took on crucial administrative positions that also assisted in supporting Kanezane's growing network of influence. A prime example of this was Jien's appointment in 1186 at the Byōdōin as the adminstrator (*shūin* 執印). As is well known, the Byōdōin was established by Fujiwara no Yorimichi 藤原頼通 and since then, the maintenance of the temple was put in the hands of the regent family in power. In previous years, the administrator of Byōdōin was

chosen by the Matsudono lineage 松殿家 and Konoe lineage 近衛家, who favored priests from Miidera 三井寺. However, when Kanezane took the position of regent, he was given the authority to appoint the person of his own choice and appointed Jien. To no surprise, Miidera objected by saying that someone from their temple should be chosen instead, but Kanezane did not lend an ear to their requests. In the fifth month of the following year 1187, Jien was also appointed as administrator of Hōjōji Temple 法成寺, which was also another temple institution under the supervision of the leading regent family. In this manner, Kanezane, using his position as regent, was able to extend his influence onto the territories of Buddhist intuitions that he didn't have access before, and through Kanezane's help, Jien was able to achieve an unparalleled status in the Buddhist world. The attainment of the highest status in the Buddhist hierarchy was just one step ahead. In the eleventh month of the third year of the eleventh month of the Kenkyū era (1192), Jien acquired the status of the 62nd *zasu* of Enryakuji 延暦寺, attaining one of the most prestigious and powerful positions in the Buddhist hierarchy. This too, was largely due to Kanezane's strong recommendation. On the fourth day of the first month in the fourth year of the Kenkyū era, Jien was also appointed as the "protector monk" or *gojisō* 護持僧 of Emperor Go-Toba. From this point onward, we see Jien's ritual practices focus on the prosperity and protection of the emperor.

Jien as Emperor Go-Toba's Personal "Protector Monk"

For Jien to be appointed as Emperor Go-Toba's personal "protector monk" was the beginning of a long intertwined relationship that would largely shape Jien's religious

and literary activities for the remainder of his life. This direct relationship with Emperor Go-Toba as his ritual protector also held immense social capital and seemed to secure stability for the future of the Kujō line. When Jien composed the *Origins of the Principle Deity* (*Honzon engi* 本尊縁起) for the purpose of providing the theoretical basis for his ritual practices in the first year of the Jōkyū era (1219), which also marked the beginning of Emperor Go-Toba's reign as "Retired Emperor," he specifically mentions that it has been his personal responsibility to "protect the body of the emperor" (護持玉躰) from the time of Emperor Go-Toba's coming of age ceremony at the age of eleven. Jien's decision to open his treatise on ritual practice shows the extent to which Jien himself was aware of his role and his identity as the protector of Emperor Go-Toba, and his determination to continue to act as his ritual protector during his reign as the Retired Emperor.

It was during this time that Jien first performed the major Tendai rites for the protection of the state (*Shijōkōhō* 熾盛光法, *Shichibutsu yakushi hō* 七仏薬師法, *Fugen enmei hō* 普賢延命法, *Anchin hō* 安鎮法), which was the primary responsibility of the Tendai *zasu*.[45] On the first month of the fourth year of the Kenyū era, only three months after his appointment as *zasu*, Jien performed the *Shichi butsu yakushi hō* for the purpose of treating Emperor Go-Toba's case of the small pox (*hōsō* 疱瘡). Other rituals he performed during his first tenure as the Tendai *zasu* for Emperor Go-Toba included the *Nyoirin hō* 如意輪法 and the *Fudōbō* 不動法. This was merely the start of Jien's role

[45] For a discussion of the development of these Tendai rituals on Mt. Hiei, see article by Dolce, Lucia. "Taimitsu Rituals in Medieval Japan: Sectarian Competition and the Dynamics of Tantric Performance." In: Keul, Istvan, (ed.), *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond.* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter Publishers, pp. 329-364.

as one of the most prominent ritual practitioners for the court, which would last for another 30 years, until he reached the age of 65. He would continue to perform the representative rituals of the Tendai school over forty times in his lifetime to pray for the safety of the Emperor, Retired Emperor, and later the Shogunate.[46]

Conclusion

Scholars such as Tsukudo and Taga were foundational figures in establishing the study of Jien as an exemplary literary figure, however, certain biases in their efforts to paint Jien as a poet have led them to envision Jien as the "internally" torn Buddhist-poet who dreamed of seclusion. However, when we shift our focus to the larger historical context of Kanezane's rise and fall within Heian court politics and the actions that Jien took during the early years of his career, it is clear that he was an active partner in assisting Kanezane's endeavors to obtain and maintain influence in the court. Once we start to see the extent to which Jien assisted Kanezane in providing rituals that would ensure the prosperity of the Kujō line, the vision of Jien as a "torn Buddhist poet" seems to sink into the background. When we consider Jien's rapid ascendance into the high ranks and administrative appointments of the Buddhist hierarchy and the fact that he was highly active in performing ritual events, mainly within the residence of aristocratic families in the capital, for the safe-birth of an imperial son and for the health of the imperial body, we see that Jien as an active practitioner of Buddhist rites was a central part of his identity and should not be neglected. This is not to say that Jien did not compose poetry or was not an exemplary poet in his own right. We should, however,

[46] Taga, p. 100.

keep in mind that the image of the ideal poet who wishes to retreat into the mountains should not keep us from recognizing the fact that Jien was extremely involved “in the world,” and importantly, we should not assume that this false dichotomy of secular concerns “in the world” on the one hand, and the religious or aesthetic concerns “outside of the world” caused an internal tension for Jien. This is crucial to keep in mind as I attempt to re-assess the motivations that drove Jien to compose his most well known historical work, the *Gukanshō*, which will be the focus of the next two chapters.

Chapter 2:

Reassessing Jien's Motivations for Writing the *Gukanshō*

Introduction

In the analysis of Jien's early career in the previous chapter, I argued that the popular image of Jien as an exemplary literary figure was constructed through modern scholarship and suggested that Jien's ritual activities were inseparable from the political concerns and ambitions of his brother Kanezane. This chapter will focus on Jien's most well-known work, the *Gukanshō*, and will illustrate how this text can also be interpreted as sharing a consistent theme related to his early activities, in other words, as a text that was primarily concerned with the political concerns of the Kujō family, but also one that reflects religious concerns, particularly in the way he addresses the issue of protecting the world from "evil" influences and using Buddhist rituals to restore order in the world. The *Gukanshō*, completed around 1220, is known as one of the first histories of Japan written by an individual that actively incorporated Buddhist concepts in its presentation of historical change, such as the notion of the "period of the latter dharma" *mappō* 末法, the protection of the nation (*chingo kokka* 鎮護国家), and which put forth the idea that there were Principles (*dōri* 道理) that govern the world at different stages in the history of Japan.

Seven volumes in length, the text is composed of three major sections: 1) Volumes 1 and 2 consist of an imperial chronicle beginning with Emperor Jimmu 神武天皇 and concluding with Emperor Juntoku 順徳天皇, 2) Volumes 3 through 6 present a historical description focusing on political transitions, and 3) Volume 7 offers a summary of the contemporary state of the Japanese polity, where Jien elaborates most on his notion of "Principle" as an underlying theme to make sense of historical change.

Importantly, in the *Gukanshō* Jien claims that the rise of the military clans that he witnessed in his lifetime was not only a sign of growing social disorder, but also the result of the natural outcome due to the Principles of that historical moment. In the concluding sections of the *Gukanshō,* Jien provides some pragmatic advice as to how to establish an ideal structure of governance to restore order, in which he suggests that a cooperative relationship between the imperial family, the Fujiwara family, and the Kamakura Bakufu was necessary for good governance that would prevent further disorder in the world. In previous studies of the *Gukanshō*, scholars have focused on the pragmatic elements found in the text and it is often described as a text that was written for political reasons, with the intention to thwart what eventually ended in a clash between Retired Emperor Go-Toba and the Kamakura Bakufu in 1221, known as the Jōkyū Rebellion. Although the political motivations in the *Gukanshō* are certainly central themes of the work, I will argue in this chapter that an overemphasis on the pragmatic, rational elements of the work has also caused scholars to overlook the importance of the so-called "supernatural" elements that also run through the historical narrative. The purpose of chapter is to clarify the significance of the appearance of vengeful spirits in the *Gukanshō* and to show that the appearance of vengeful spirits (*onryō* 怨霊) into Jien's historical narrative had a specific function that should be taken seriously. In other words, vengeful spirits in Jien's historical narrative are not "odd elements" that are incompatible with Jien's political and intellectual knowledge, but rather should be seen essential elements in Jien's understanding of the world that help us to re-evaluate his motivations for composing the work. Through an analysis of the inclusion of vengeful

spirits in his interpretation of history, I argue that the *Gukanshō* is not simply a re-telling of historical events written for the pragmatic purpose of preventing the clash between the imperial family and the Bakufu, but could be read as a text written not only to elevate the Kujō family, but to promote his ritual lineage as a necessary asset for the maintenance of world order. Re-assessing the *Gukanshō* in this way also sheds light on our understanding of Jien's identity as a Buddhist ritual practitioner and to understand the extent to which his literary, religious, and political activities intersected. In other words, Jien's identity as a Buddhist priest with concerns for the prosperity of the Buddhist Law and his concerns for the prosperity of the Kujō lineage and imperial family should not be seen as something that can be separated from one another, but for Jien, were one and the same.

Furthermore, it is equally important to fully recognize the extent to which the *Gukanshō* is concerned with promoting the image of Jien himself as a capable ritual practitioner. In fact, I will argue in this chapter that a close reading of the narrative history he presents in Volumes 3-6 and Jien's commentary on his own understanding of the forces that drive historical change seen in Volume 7 reveal that the *Gukanshō* was carefully crafted in a way that leads the reader to arrive at the conclusion that vengeful spirits are responsible for leading the world toward destruction. In this sense, the "problem" that the *Gukanshō* presents is not confined to "intellectual" or "political" issues, but also involves religious concerns and presents a solution that incorporates a recognition of ritual in maintaining world order.

Basic Structure and Summary of the *Gukanshō*

The *Gukanshō* is composed of seven volumes. Volumes 1 and 2 provides an imperial chronology (皇帝年代記), which simply lists basic information and important dates regarding the reign of each emperor from Emperor Jimmu 神武天皇 to Emperor Go-Horikawa 後堀河天皇. Volumes 3-6, referred to as the "separate volumes" (*betsu jyō* 別帖). It is in these sections that Jien provides a more detailed account of historical events in each emperor's reign, and the volumes that he provides a "historical narrative." Volume 7 is referred to as the "appendix" (*furoku* 付録), but it is in this final volume that Jien provides his most extensive analysis of the concept of "Principle" (*dōri* 道理) and its relation to shifts in political power structures throughout history. In other words, it is not only a summary of the major flows of the historical narrative that he illustrates in Volumes 3-6, but also can be seen as the sections where he presents most clearly, his commentary on the significance of these historical changes, the causes of disorder, and importantly, what needs to be done to restore order during a time of social decline.
In this sense, a consideration of what Jien presents in the "appendix" is crucial in assessing the motivations of why he composed the text. Here, Jien elaborates on his understanding of the notion of "Principle" that include not only the "Principle of the Buddhist Teachings" required to restore order, but also importantly the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits," which Jien explains is one of the root causes of social disorder seen in Japan's recent history. It is also important to note that there are linguistic differences seen between the sections of the "imperial chronology" and the "narrative history" and "appendix" sections of the *Gukanshō*. Whereas the imperial chronology was written

using the Chinese grammatical structure (*kanbun* 漢文), the remaining sections were composed in *kana*. As some scholars have argued, the use of *kana* in Jien's presentation of history indicates that he was attempting to make the work available for a broader audience. The difference between these sections is not only in Jien's decision between different forms of writing, but more importantly, in how these two sections have entirely different functions. Although somewhat an obvious point, it is in the volumes where Jien writes his historical narrative that include passages where we see the injunction of the voice of the narrator (Jien) in the text as he comments on the various events that unfold throughout history.

Before discussing some of the more specific passages in the *Gukanshō*, it is perhaps important to provide a basic summary of the "narrative history." The period covered in Volume 3 covers the traditional reign of Emperor Jinmu 神武天皇 (711 BC-585 BC)[47] to that of Emperor Ichijō 一条天皇 (986-1011). It focuses on the appearance of various forms of "Principles," and places particular focus on the Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1028) as the ideal regent who supported the reign of the Ichijō administration. Volume 4 covers the latter part of the reign of Emperor Ichijō to the early years of the reign of Emperor Go-Shirakawa 後白河天皇 (1155-1158) and presents this period as a transitional period where there was a shift away from the ideal form of governance marked by a close relationship between the regency and the imperial family and a gradual fall into a world marked with disorder. However, Jien also emphasizes in this volume that Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164) continued to serve as an

[47] The dates of the earliest figures of the imperial lineage are based on mythological accounts as seen in the *Nihonshoki* that modern historians do not accept as historically accurate.

effective regent during this time, suggesting that he was largely responsible for still maintaining order in the world. Volume 5 covers the latter part of the reign of Emperor Go-Shirakawa to the reign of Emperor Go-Toba (1183-1198). Importantly for Jien's presentation of history, this is the point that enters into the "era of the warriors" (*musha no yo* 武者の世), with the Hōgen Rebellion as marking a turning point in history and lamented by Jien as the start of the "age of disorder" (*ranse* 乱世). In this section, Jien introduces Minamoto no Yoritomo, the founder and first *shōgun* of the Kamakura shōgunate, as a new type of leader who also supported the Buddhist Law, but places the most emphasis on his brother Kujō Kanezane as the exemplary "wise minister" of this period. Volume 6 is perhaps the most important as it includes information regarding the most "recent" history that Jien covers, and it is in this section where we see reflected the most concrete political concerns facing Jien as he composed the text. It begins with a discussion of the collaboration between Yoritomo and Kanezane in governing the land, with particular emphasis on the series of events that begin with Kanenari Shinnō 懐成親王 becoming the Tōgū 東宮 on the 26th of the 11th month of the 6th year of Kenpō (1218) to when Kujō Yoritsune 九条頼経 moved to Kamakura as the successor of Shōgun on the 25th of the 6th month in the 1st year of Jyōkyū (1219). Particularly evident in this volume is Jien's support of the Kujō family and lament over the Konoe family gaining more favor from the imperial house as a result of Kanezane's forced resignation from his position as regent. For example, according to Jien, Retired Emperor Go-Toba understood that Kujō Yoshitsune 九条良経, who was the son of Kanezane, would be a capable administrator, but that his untimely death gave him no choice but to appoint

Konoe Iezane 近衛家実 (1179-1243), who was the son of Konoe Motomichi, to the position of Chancellor. In the *Gukanshō* Jien is not shy in expressing his discontent of the Konoe family, taking every chance to criticize members of the Konoe line as incompetent, and suggesting that a return to favoring the Kujō line would be the correct course of action. As one would expect, as a member of the Kujō family and his close collaboration with his brother Kanezane, this shift that the Retired Emperor Go-Toba showed in favoring the Konoe family over the Kujō family was seen by Jien as the most unfortunate turn of events, and as we will see, the working of "unseen" superhuman actors. In other words, Volume 6 also shows that one of the central concerns that lies at the basis of his presentation of history focuses on the most current shifts in power among with lineages of the Fujiwara family and Jien clearly attempts to present the Kujō family as the most capable in serving the emperor and state.[i] The claims of the superiority of the Kujō lineage and Jien's harsh, disparaging remarks regarding members of the Konoe family should not be taken lightly, and clearly reflect Jien's own biases as he produced this work of history. In other words, while the *Gukanshō* is often presented as a reliable historical source, like all works of history, we should be aware that it was also produced under specific motivations and biases of the author.

Analyzing the Title: the *Gukanshō* as "Modest Views of an Ignorant Priest"

The title *Gukanshō* has been translated into English as "Miscellany of personal views of an ignorant fool," " Miscellany of Ignorant Views"[48] or more simply as "Some

[48] Brownlee, John S. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki (712) to Tokushi Yoron (1712).* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.

modest views."[49] When we consider the scholarly erudition that Jien showcases in this work through his display of past historical events and his understanding of the political issues of his time, the title of the text is misleading, and perhaps was intentionally so. These English translations are based on an interpretation of the compound of the Chinese characters, *gukan* 愚管 as an expression of modesty. This is also the interpretation initially provided by Nakajima Etsuji in his *Gukanshō hyōshaku* 愚管抄評釈, in which he reads *gu* 愚 as "foolish" and *kan* 管 as also indicating a sense of modesty, based on other uses of the character in compounds used to express narrow mindedness, such as *kanken* 管見 or *kanki* 管窺 (literally to "peer through a tube").[50] He provides some examples from Classical Chinese texts to support his analysis, 「管中窺豹、時見一斑」（書言故事）, and 「是直用管闚天、用錐指地、不亦小乎」（荘子秋水篇）. As for the character *shō* 抄, Nakajima sees this as being analogous to *shō* 鈔 and meaning "excerpts," concluding that this is simply another indication of Jien's modest stance in writing this text.

However, we should be aware that this act of referring to his own writing as one composed by a "fool" is a performative one, and be careful not to let this image of modesty cloud our interpretation of what Jien is trying to accomplish through this work. Although the title suggests that Jien views himself as a "foolish" priest, a careful assessment of the content of the work, and specifically the manner in which Jien projects himself into the text, gives us a very different picture. As I will argue, quite far

[49] Hambrick, Charles H. "The "Gukanshō": A Religious View of Japanese History" *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* Vol. 5, No. 1 (Mar. 1978), pp. 37-58.
[50] Nakajima Etsuji 中島悦次. *Gukanshō zen chūkai* 愚管抄前註解. Tokyo: Yōseidō Shuppan, 1969.

from what one may initially expect from a "modest Buddhist priest," when one considers the content of the text as a whole, it is carefully structured in a way that implicitly directs the reader to come to the conclusion of that Jien is one of the most accomplished priests of his age. This discrepancy between the image of the "fool" in the title and the high praise he has for himself and his own lineage at the expense of others should prompt us to reconsider what Jien is doing, especially with regard to what kind of self-image he is constructing for himself. When reading the *Gukanshō,* one should not forget that Jien was an administrator of a vast network of temples, served as the abbot of Mt. Hiei, and as discussed in Chapter 1, was also closely involved with the political endeavors of his elder brother, Kanezane. The projection of himself as a "fool," therefore, needs to be taken with a grain of salt, and it is imperative that when interpreting the content of the text, we keep in mind the broader political and religious roles that he played outside of the text. However, this image of Jien as a modest priest who used his literary erudition to write a history of Japan in order to address political issues of his age appears repeatedly and is particularly evident in English scholarship.[51] This image of Jien as the "intellectual Buddhist" and pragmatic historian has colored the way the *Gukanshō* has been interpreted in modern scholarship, and it is important that we see how the academic disciplines and frameworks used in studying the text has

[51] English Scholarship on Jien and *Gukansho*: 1) Hambrick, Charles Hilton. "The '*Gukanshō*': A Religious View of Japanese History," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* Vol. 5, No. 1 (March, 1978), pp. 37-58. 2) Brown, Delmer M. and Ichirō Ishida. *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. 3) Marra, Michele. "The Conquest of *Mappō*: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (December, 1985), pp. 319-341. 4) Brownlee, John S. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki (712) to Tokushi Yoron (1712).* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991. 5) Faure, Bernard. *The Red Thread: Buddhist Approaches to Sexuality.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1998.

largely shaped our current understanding of the motivations that drove Jien to compose his historical narrative.

A History of the Study of the *Gukanshō*

Jien's *Gukanshō* is one of the most well known historical works in Japan, available in modern Japan translation at the common bookstore and included in high school textbooks as an example of pre-modern Japanese literature that students need to memorize for their exams. However, it is important to note that this was not always the case and what we know today regarding the authorship of the *Gukanshō* and the intended purpose for which it was written was a result of a long history of scholarship on the text.[52] In fact, of all the existing original copies (*shahon* 写本) of the *Gukanshō,* none of them indicate a date when the text was written or the name of the author.[53] Therefore, the question of its authorship, when it was written, and the motivations for its composition have all been important questions throughout the long history of scholarship on the *Gukanshō*. Furthermore, it is important to highlight that the *Gukanshō* as a text had very limited influence as a historical work at the time of its composition and it was primarily through the academic study of the text in the modern period that it became elevated as an exemplary work of Japanese history.

[52] Much of the literary review presented here is based on Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: rekishi katari no jikogenkyūsei wo koedete*『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉—歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006.
[53] Fukazawa, p. 321.

The first time the title *Gukanshō* appears is in the *Honchō shoseki mokuroku* 本朝書籍目録 that was compiled in the late 13th century.[54] However, there is no indication that the text was widely known or read at this time. Even in Kitabatake Chikafusa's *Jinnō shōtōki* 北畠親房『神皇正統記』, a historical work written in the 14th century that is often compared with the *Gukanshō*, there is little evidence that the *Gukanshō* had any influence over its composition or whether Kitabatake knew of its existence.[55] There is, however, some evidence that the *Gukanshō* may have had limited readership. The *Sayo no nezame* 小夜の寝覚[56] an instructional text written by Ichijō Kaneyoshi 一条兼良 (1402-1481) in 1479 for Hino Tomiko 日野富子 (1440-1496), the wife of Ashikaga Yoshimasa, the 8th Shōgun of the Ashikaga Shogunate, incorporates the concept of "Principle," a central concept seen in the *Gukanshō*, when introducing Hōjō Masako 北条政子 as an effective political leader.[57] However, as the Ichijō family is one of the five regent lineages to come from the Kujō line, it seems probable that the *Gukanshō* was only known and distributed within the members of the Kujō line. The limited number of existing *shahon* of the *Gukanshō* is also another indication that the text was most likely confined in its distribution until much later. The Awa-bon (阿波本) held by Tokyo University, is considered the oldest version of the *Gukanshō*, but the dates are unknown and it only includes a small part of the entire text. The oldest full version of the

[54] Fukazawa, p. 320.
[55] Ōsumi Kazuo. *Nihon no meicho: Jien / Kitabatake Chikafusa*. Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1971, p. 268.
[56] Suzuki Kazuo 鈴木和夫. trans. *Yoru no nezame* 夜の寝覚. *Shinpen nihon koten bungaku zenshū* vol. 28. Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1996.
[57] For a discussion of the various forms of literature that may have been influencial on the composition of the *Gukanshō,* see Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō to sono zengo* 愚管抄とその前後. Osaka : Izumi Shoin 和泉書院, 1993.

Gukanshō is the Bunmei-bon (文明本) stored at the Archives and Mausolea Department of the Imperial Household Agency 宮内庁書陵部蔵, dated to the eighth year of the Bunmei era (1476).[58] This was used as the source text for the publication of the *Gukanshō* in Shintei izō kokushi taikei 新訂増補国史大系[59] and Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.[60] All other existing *shahon* date to the Edo period, the most well preserved version is the Shimahara-bon 島原本, stored at the Nagasaki Prefecture Shimabara Kōminkan 長崎県島原公民館, but the dates are unknown for the text. The Tenmei-bon 天明本, also preserved at Archives and Mausolea Department of the Imperial Household Agency 宮内庁書陵部蔵, was copied in the eighth year of the Tenmei era (1788), and its title is also included in the 史籍集覧.[61] This copy was used for the first extensive commentary on the *Gukanshō* published in 1931 by Nakajima Etsuji 中島悦次, the *Gukanshō hyōshaku* 愚管抄評釈.[62]

As these *shahon* indicate, it was only in the Edo period that we start to see a larger distribution and copying of the *Gukanshō*. This also correlates with the time that the *Gukanshō* starts to be viewed as an object of study on a wider scale, outside of the descendants of the Kujō family. The earliest example where we see an attempt to study the *Gukanshō* as a historical work is seen in the chapter "Reading the *Gukanshō*" (*doku gukanshō* 読愚管抄) in *Hikobae* 比古婆衣, a study of historical works by Kokugaku

[58] Fukazawa, p. 321.
[59] *Kokon chomonjū, Gukanshō.* Shintei zōho kokushi taikei vol. 19 新訂増補国史大系 第 19 巻. Tokyo: Kokushi Taikei Kankōkai. 1930.
[60] Okami Masao 岡見正雄 and Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Gukanshō* 愚管抄. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1967.
[61] Fukazawa, p. 321.
[62] Nakajima Etsuji 中島悦次. *Gukanshō zen chūkai* 愚管抄前註解. Tokyo: Yōseidō Shuppan, 1969.

scholar, Ban Nobutomo 伴信友 (1773-1846).[63] He was the first one to suspect that Jien was the likely author of the text, and based on the final dates of the imperial timeline (皇帝年代記) included in Volume 2 of the *Gukanshō*, Ban Nobutomo concluded that Jien must have started composing it in the second year of the Jōkyū era (1220), and completed it sometime after the Jōkyū Rebellion, by the first year of the Gennin era 元仁元年 (1224). However, based on the fact that Jien appears in the third person within the *Gukanshō* this view that Jien was the author of the *Gukanshō* was questioned by other Kokugaku scholars, such as Kurokawa Harumura 黒川春村 (1799-1867), who viewed the text as an apocryphal text, and there was yet to be a consensus as to the author of the text.[64] The *Gukanshō* also appears in other studies of Japanese history written in the Edo period, such as the *Tokushi yoron* 読史余論[65] by Arai Hakuseki 新井白石 (1657-1725) and *Taisei santen kō* 大勢三転考 by Date Chihiro 伊達千広 (1802-1877).[66]

In the Meiji period, the *Gukanshō* became a focus of interest again among scholars as discussions regarding which period of Japan's past were most appropriate to think about Japan's own cultural and national identity. At this time, the *Gukanshō* was seen as an important primary source that illustrated the governing structures in the early Kamakura period, and studies regarding its authorship and the timing of its composition became a contested issue, particularly because it was directly related to the value of the

[63] Ban Nobutomo. *Hikobae*. Zonsai sōsho Vol. 83-88. Tokyo: Kondō Keizō, 1887.
[64] See Shimizu Masayuki 清水正之. *Gukanshō ni okeru rihō to rekishi—dōri no gainen wo chūshin ni* 『愚管抄』における理法と歴史ー道理の概念を中心に. *Rinrigaku nenpō* Vol. 25, 1976, pp. 159-172.
[65] Matsumura Akira, Bitō Masahide, Katō Shūichi. Eds. *Arai Hakuseki*. Nihon shisō taikei vol. 35. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975.
[66] Matsumoto Sannosuke and Ogura Yoshihiko. Eds. *Kinsei shironshū*. Nihon shisō taikei vol. 48. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.

text as a historical work. The first issue was regarding the authorship of the text. The issue of whether the text was written by Jien or another unknown, anonymous author was important to clarify, as it was would change the value of the text as a reliable historical source. It was, in other words, the difference between seeing the *Gukanshō* as a reliable historical work written by a known historical figure (Jien) or viewing it as an "apocryphal" text, which as a historical work, would be deemed far less valuable. To address this issue of authorship, the historian Miura Hiroyuki 三浦周行 (1871-1931) conducted a survey of documents held in the collection at Shōrenin and discovered manuscripts that were handwritten by Jien. Through a close analysis of the common themes and terminology seen in these manuscripts and the *Gukanshō*, he demonstrated with more empirical evidence that there was a high probability that Jien was indeed, the author of the *Gukanshō*. This breakthrough study that was successful in specifying Jien as the "author" of the text was published in his article, *Gukanshō no kenkyū* 愚管抄の研究 in 1920, and was also included as a chapter in his *Nihon shi no kenkyū* 日本史の研究, published in 1922.[67]

Miura's point regarding Jien as the author of the *Gukanshō* was quickly accepted among scholars, however, the issue regarding the timing of its composition was more complicated as it also raised issues regarding the motivation behind its composition. In 1917, Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉(1873-1961) published a work titled *Bungaku ni awaretaru waga kokumin shisō no kenkyū: kizoku bungaku no jidai* 『文学に現れたる我

[67] Miura Hiroyuki 三浦周行. *Nihon shi no kenkyū* 日本史の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1922.

が国民思想の研究　貴族文学の時代』,[68] in which he stated his view that the *Gukanshō* was written as a reflection on the events of the Jōkyū Rebellion after they happened, with the implication that it was not a historical work, but written as if it were a prophetic text (*mirai ki* 未来記) that claimed to foresee the events before they happened. As mentioned above, despite the fact that the *Gukanshō* included a few details of events that occurred after the Jōkyū Rebellion in 1222 (such as the death of Hōjō Yoshitoki in 1224), the text does not mention the events of the Jōkyū Rebellion itself. Considering that it was a text that called for the cooperation between the imperial family, the regent family, and the military family in the concluding sections of the work, it would be strange if it did not address the Jōkyū Rebellion, a political conflict that occurred between the imperial family and the Kamakura shogunate. The battle fought at this time was between the forces of Retired Emperor Go-Toba and those of the Hōjō clan, the regents of the Kamakura shogunate, which ended in the defeat and exile of Retired Emperor Go-Toba to the Oki Islands. If the *Gukanshō* was, in fact, composed after this drastic clash between the imperial family and the Kamakura shogunate, it is certainly strange that these events would have been excluded from the text. As if to respond to Tsuda's theory, and perhaps as a way to present *Gukanshō* as a more historically reliable text, Miura posed a different view in his *Nihon shi no kenkyu* 日本史の研究, published in 1922,[69] suggesting that Jien finished the work in the second year of the Jyōkyū era (1220), a year prior to the Jyōkyū Rebellion, and that the few accounts in the text that

[68] Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉. *Bungaku ni awaretaru waga kokumin shisō no kenkyū* 文学に現れたる我が国民思想の研究. *Bekkan 2-5* of *Tsuda Sōkichi zenshū*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1966.
[69] Miura Hiroyuki 三浦周行. *Nihon shi no kenkyū* 日本史の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1922.

happened after the Jyōkyū Rebellion regarding Emperor Go Horikawa (1212-1234) and the death of Hōjō Yoshitoki in 1224, were added to the text at a later time. In response to Miura's article, Tsuda wrote another article in 1924, titled "Doubts regarding the Composition Date of the *Gukanshō"* (*Gukanshō no chosaku nendai ni tsuite no utagai* 愚管抄の著作年代についての疑) and restated his own theory that the *Gukanshō* was written as a pseudo-prophetic text after the Jōkyū Rebellion. [70]

In order to address this debated issue of when the *Gukanshō* was written, Muraoka Tsunetsugu 村岡典嗣 (1884-1946) wrote an article titled "Thoughts on the *Gukanshō*" (*Gukanshō kō* 愚管抄考).[71] In the article, Muraoka criticizes previous studies for relying too heavily on external texts in drawing their conclusions about the *Gukanshō* and instead focuses on a close analysis of the content of the work. Through an assessment of what was (and was *not*) included in the text, Muraoka draws the conclusion that the *Gukanshō* could not have been written after the Jōkyū Rebellion, as Tsuda's theory suggested. Furthermore, the historian Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀 also argued for the position that the *Gukanshō* was written before the Jōkyū Rebellion in his 1957 publication of *The Study of Kamakura Buddhism* (*Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究).[72] In his work, he cross examined the contents of the *Gukanshō* with newly discovered manuscripts and focusing specifically on Jien's engagement with the cult of Prince Shōtoku, using texts such as the *Shōtoku Taishi den reki* 聖徳太子伝暦

[70] Tsuda Sōkichi 津田左右吉. "Gukanshō no chosaku nendai ni tsuite no utagai" 愚管抄の著作年代についての疑. *Shisō* Vol. 1, 1924. pp. 1-16.
[71] Muraoka Tsunetsugu 村岡典嗣. "Gukanshō kō" 愚管抄考. In *Nihon shisōshi kenkyū* 日本思想研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940.
[72] Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957.

and *Shōtoku Taishi mirai ki* 聖徳太子未来記. As a result of these studies, it is generally accepted today that the *Gukanshō* was written prior to the Jōkyū Rebellion, with the conclusion that Jien had the historical knowledge and erudition to understand how dangerous it was for the imperial court to strain its relationship with the Kamakura Shogunate. As for the motivations for composing the text, it is now generally understood that Jien composed *Gukanshō* for the purpose of warning Retired Emperor Go-Toba not to be antagonistic towards the Shogunate in order to prevent the inevitable clash between the imperial family and the Kamakura Shogunate. Although there has been some recent scholarship that questions this view, this interpretation is still the most commonly held view regarding the composition of the *Gukanshō.*

As respect for the imperial family came to be heightened during the years of the Pacific War, the *Gukanshō* came to be viewed in a more negative light. For example, Japanese nationalist Ōkawa Shūmei 大川周明 wrote in his review of Japanese history, *The 2600 Year History of Japan* (*Nihon nisen roppyaku nenshi* 日本二千六百年史) in 1939 that the ideas expressed in the *Gukanshō*, which voiced criticism and disrespect to the imperial family, was "unforgiveable" and included phrases that could incite ignorance.[73] Ironically, these negative evaluations of the *Gukanshō* by nationalist writers during the years of World War II encouraged a new wave of work by scholars who specialized in Japanese literature. They focused on re-branding Jien as an exemplary literary figure and prolific *waka* poet who was worthy of academic attention for his contribution to literary history. Tsukudo Reikan's publication, *Jien: State, History, and*

[73] Ōkawa Shūmei 大川周明. *Nihon nisen roppyakunen shi* 二千六百年史. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1939.

Literature (*Jien-kokka to rekishi oyobi bungaku* 慈円：国家と歴史及び文学),[74] discussed at some length in the first chapter of the dissertation, was highly influential for his approach of using a large variety of Jien's writings, including a vast amount of his poetry, to illustrate his biography. This was followed by a detailed study of Jien and his poetry by Manaka Fujiko 間中富士子, published as *Study of the Priest Jichin* (*Jichin kashō no kenkyu*『慈鎮和尚の研究』) in 1943[75] and *Study of Priest Jichin and the Shūgyokushū* (*Jichin kashō oyobi shūgyokushū no kenkyū* 慈鎮和尚及び拾玉集の研究) in 1974.[76] Perhaps the most important scholar who appeared at this time was Taga Munehaya, who compiled a collection of Jien's works in his 1945 publication of *Jien Zenshū* 『慈円全集』,[77] which also featured a vast collection of his poetry and short documents that reflected Jien's activities as a Buddhist priest and administrator of Buddhist temples. This work laid the foundations for Jien scholarship to thrive in the post-war era. Taga went on to publish a comprehensive biography of Jien in his 1959 publication of *Jien*,[78] and a culmination of a lifetime of scholarship was made available in 1980 in his publication of *The Study of Jien* (*Jien no kenkyū* 慈円の研究),[79] the most comprehensive study of Jien to date. Taga focused on Jien as a Buddhist priest and his identity as an exemplary Buddhist poet. By illustrating that Jien established a close and trusting relationship with Retired Emperor Go-Toba through his activities as a literary

[74] Tsukudo Reikan 筑土鈴寛. *Jien: kokka to rekishi oyobi bungaku* 慈円：国家と歴史及び文学. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1942.
[75] Manaka Fujiko 間中富士子. *Jichin kashō no kenkyū* 慈鎮和尚の研究. Tokyo: Morikita Shoten, 1943.
[76] Manaka Fujiko 間中富士子. *Jichin kashō oyobi shūgyokushū no kenkyū* 慈鎮和尚及び拾玉集の研究. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1974.
[77] Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945.
[78]Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Jien* 慈円. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1959.
[79] Taga, 1980.

and religious figure, he attempted to show that Jien was not the disrespectful figure that the Japanese nationalists claimed him to be in previous scholarship. In many ways, the work of these scholars who focused on Jien's as an exemplary literary figure could be seen as an attempt to "humanize" Jien and to illustrate how Jien was a poet and intellectual who was simply responding to the political issues of his time.

Largely due to the efforts of the Japanese literature scholars, the *Gukanshō* came to be viewed as an important example of pre-modern Japanese culture and thought. With the publication of *The Classics of Japan: Jien / Kitabatake Chikafusa* (*Nihon no meicho – Jien / Kitabatake Chikafusa* 日本の名著　慈円・北畠親房)[80] in 1971, the *Gukanshō* was translated into modern Japanese along with Kitabatake Chikafusa's *Jinnō Shōtōki* as exemplary works of Japanese historical thought and made available for the non-specialist to read. In the introduction to this publication, Ōsumi Kazuo introduces Jien's vision of "Principle" as driving factors of historical change as one of the foundational concepts of a distinctively "Japanese method of historical thought." This new approach of highlighting the philosophical and religious concepts that underscore Jien's understanding of history in the *Gukanshō* was further explored in his 1986 publication of *Reading the Gukanshō: Historical interpretation in medieval Japan* (*Gukanshō wo yomu—chusei nihon no rekishikan* 愚管抄を読む—中世日本の歴史観).[81] The focus on elements of Jien's historical thought and the *Gukanshō* as an example of political theory was a new trend in scholarship in the 1970s-90s. For example, as part of

[80]Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二 (Ed.), trans. by Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄, Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二, Kasamatsu Hiroshi 笠松宏. *Nihon no meicho 9: Jien Gukanshō, Kitabatake Chikafusa Jinnō shōtōki* 日本の名著９：慈円『愚管抄』、北畠親房『神皇正統記』. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1971.

[81] Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄. *Gukanshō o yomu: chūsei nihon no rekishikan* 愚管抄を読む—中世日本の歴史観. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1986.

the *Nihon no shisō* series, *Collection of Historical Thought* (*Rekishi shisō shū* 『歴史思想集』)[82] published in 1972, a scholar of political theory Maruyama Masao 丸山真男 interpreted Jien's conception of "Principles" in the *Gukanshō* as a political "theory of military strategy" (*heigaku shisō* 兵学思想). According to Maruyama, Jien's view of "Principles" was not just a philosophical construct, but a pragmatic approach that taught its reader how to deal effectively with political confrontations. His ideas were later included in his 1992 publication, *Loyalty and Rebellion: the psycho-historical stance in transformative moments in Japanese history* (*Chūsei to hangyaku: tenkeiki nihon no shishinshi teki isō* 忠誠と反逆—転形期日本の精神史的位相),[83] a work in which he attempts to uncover the "underlying layer of historical thought" （*rekishi ishiki no kozō* 「歴史意識の『古層』」） seen in major historical works from pre-modern to modern times. Along with Maruyama, Ishida Ichirō also worked on the exposition of the Gukansho in the *Rekishi shisō shū* and went on to publish a number of articles that focused on the political and religious thought in the *Gukanshō*. The articles were later compiled in his 2000 publication, *The Study of Gukanshō—its development and thought* (*Gukanshō no kenkyū—sono seiritsu to shisō* 『愚管抄の研究—その成立と思想』).[84] These developments in scholarship that attempted to read the *Gukanshō* as a "political history" had a significant impact in the way the text came to be studied in English scholarship. In fact, the first English translation of the text was a collaborative project

[82] *Rekishi shisō shū* 『歴史思想集』（筑摩書房）
[83] Maruyama Masao 丸山眞男. *Chūsei to hangyaku: tenkeiki nihon no shishinshi teki isō* 忠誠と反逆—転形期日本の精神史的位相. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1992.
[84] Ishida Ichirō 石田一良. *Gukanshō no kenkyū: sono seiritsu to shisō* 愚管抄の研究—その成立と思想. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000.

between Delmer M. Brown and a Japanese scholar Ishida Ichirō, who emphasized the "intellectual" aspects of the *Gukanshō* in his own research. This translation, *Gukanshō*, *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219,* was published in 1979, laid the foundation for the study of *Gukanshō* in English scholarship.[85]

English Scholarship on the *Gukanshō*

This brief overview of the history of scholarship on the *Gukanshō* in Japan provides a good foundation to better assess how the *Gukanshō* has been studied and understood in English scholarship. Much of the scholarship on the *Gukanshō* seen in English follows the trends covered above in postwar Japanese scholarship, which emphasized the elements of political theory and religious "thought." The history of scholarship on the *Gukanshō* is far more limited, and most articles focus on the *Gukanshō* as a historical work, following in the footsteps of post-war scholarship in Japan that emphasized the text as an example of "historical thought." When we look at these works, there are two notable characteristics that require further consideration: 1) the tendency to frame Jien as a "rational" thinker and an intellectual historian, and 2) understanding the motivations behind writing the *Gukanshō* as a fundamentally political concern. By addressing these points, I will illustrate how this dissertation will attempt to questions some of the shortfalls of previous scholarship.

[85] Brown, Delmer M. and Ichirō Ishida. *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

One of the earliest works on Jien in English is a dissertation by Charles Hambrick in 1978, "The *Gukanshō*: A Religious View of Japanese History." Here, Hambrick introduces Jien and the *Gukanshō* as a distinctively "Buddhist" vision of history, and focuses on how Buddhist philosophical concepts, such as his notion of "Principle," are what distinguish this text from other written histories of pre-modern Japan. He describes Jien as "Japan's first great historian" and characterizes *Gukanshō* as a text that is primarily "Buddhist in outlook."[86] Hambrick also emphasizes that the *Gukanshō* was a historical work written as a "practical approach" to address issues of its time. Hambrick explains that the *Gukanshō* was "written for the purpose of resolving a contemporary crisis Jien felt as critical to the very existence of the nation" and that Jien chose the medium of history because "he believed that history was the most adequate and clear cut mode of the appearance of the absolute and of man's apprehension of and conformity to the movement of that absolute."[87] For Hambrick, what informed Jien in his interpretation of history was his understanding of fundamental Buddhist notions of knowledge:

> In accordance with Buddhist tradition he accepts the presupposition that man's fundamental problem is ignorance and that the solution consists of gaining knowledge or enlightenment. His unique contribution in the *Gukansho*, however, is to characterize that knowledge as historical. Neither speculative nor metaphysical, neither an intuitive awakening nor a paradoxical satori experience, this knowledge is very practically rooted in Japanese man's historical existence. The knowledge Jien was concerned to communicate was to be seen most clearly, if not exclusively, in the history of the Japanese nation. He wrote the *Gukanshō* to help people, especially the nation's leaders, understand the movement of *dori* through Japanese history and thus to shape a desirable future. To understand

[86] Hambrick, Charles Hilton. "The '*Gukanshō*': A Religious View of Japanese History," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* Vol. 5, No. 1 (March, 1978), p. 39.
[87] Hambrick, p. 43.

> history implied an understanding of the pattern and direction of the changes, contingencies, and movements in the sweep of events.[88]

In addition to the claim here that the *Gukanshō* was written as a history to address practical issues of the state as an altruistic means to "help people" through the writing of history, Hambrick also attempts to frame the *Gukanshō* as a text that "represents a new departure in Japanese historiography" by suggesting that it is "the first of several major *shiron* 史論, or interpretive histories, works written from a self-conscious religious perspective."[89] Hambrick's work on the *Gukanshō* was indeed important, as it shed light on what he correctly argued was an interesting departure from previous works of history by focusing on how Jien employed Buddhist terminology in his analysis of the past.

An article by Michele Marra in 1982, "The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa," takes a different approach from Hambrick.[90] While he acknowledges that Jien incorporates Buddhist concepts in his historical analysis, he suggests that his primary concern was political. Marra describes Jien as a political thinker who attempted to overcome the deterministic nature of *mappō* by "demonstrating that within the structure of *mappō* thought there was still space for human activity and hope, thus showing that not all of the people living in thirteenth century Japan were pray to despair."[91] While Marra describes Jien as an example of Kamakura intelligentsia who took a "religious, magical stand," he also suggests that Jien was also different from his contemporaries in that "although he was bound to the same religious fear of his age, he

[88] Hambrick, pp. 44-5.
[89] Hambrick, p. 39.
[90] Marra, Michele. "The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (December, 1985), pp. 319-341.
[91] Marra, p. 330.

did his best to find an effective cure for such fear."[92] Marra argues that Jien finds this "cure" in the theory of *mappō*, and argues that it was his fundamental interest in finding a *political* solution to his current time that he was able to break free from the shackles of a "religious" or "magical" worldview. This notion, clearly influenced by a Marxist view of history, is also reflected in some of the conclusions Marra makes regarding Jien's motivations for composing the *Gukanshō*, claiming that "Jien was interested more in political issues than in religion."[93]

In his interpretation of the *Gukanshō* as a work of political history, he argues that Jien was a man of intellect and reason:

> Jien, who was essentially a practical man, knew quite well that a clash with the military would have brought the aristocracy to complete ruin. With this conviction, he tried to explain to Go-Toba that his hostility to the *bakufu* after Sanetomo's assassination was a great mistake, and that the result would have been a political crisis, such as actually occurred a few years later, after the Jokyu war of 1221. Jien warned the Retired Emperor, suggesting concrete actions to be taken in order to counter this looming crisis."[94]

Although Marra is correct in his suggestion that we should acknowledge the political motivations that are driving the composition of the *Gukanshō*, his understanding that Jien was "more interested in politics than religion" seems to be the cause of some pitfalls in his interpretation of the text, especially in his tendency to emphasize Jien's "political" motivations at the expense of his "religious" concerns. In his attempt to read the *Gukanshō* as primarily a "political" text, Marra downplays the philosophical or religious elements seen in the text. Regarding some of the Buddhist concepts that were

[92] Marra, p. 320.
[93] Marra, p. 323.
[94] Marra, p. 324.

the focus of earlier scholarship on the *Gukanshō*, Marra explains, "to overemphasize these elements in the attempt to demonstrate the *Gukanshō's* commitment to *mappō* thought would lead us to forget that in thirteenth century Japan *mappō* ideas were the only world view available for explaining history and human existence. Jien was interested more in political issues than in religion, as his stated purpose for writing the *Gukanshō* amply demonstrate."[95] Marra's main point here about the importance of recognizing the political implications of the text is well taken, but the suggestion here that the Jien was *more* interested in politics than religion is not only questionable, but I argue, mischaracterizes the purpose of the work.

There are some problems with the way Marra argues that the *Gukanshō* is primarily a "political" work. For example, he suggests that the frequent use of words *masse* 末世 (Final Age), *matsudai* 末代 (Final Reigns), *ranse* 乱世 (Chaotic Age), and *akusei* 悪世 (Evil Age) seen in the *Gukanshō* are all terms that have "political connotations."[96] Although these terms do have political connotations, it is also important to recognize that all of these terms that express social disorder is not confined to what modern scholars might assume is confined within political concerns. In 13th century Japan, discourses on "political" decline also included "religious" concerns of decline and these two categories should be understood as interrelated and inseparable. In fact, I will argue that a closer examination of how Jien uses terms like "*akuse*" and "*ranse*" in the *Gukanshō* show that they include concerns regarding "supernatural" causes of disorder and decline, which require religious and ritual solutions. Another shortcoming in Marra's

[95] Marra, pp. 322-3.
[96] Marra, p. 323.

interpretation is his understanding of the "invisible realm" that Jien discusses in the *Gukanshō.* Marra argues that Jien wrote the *Gukanshō* to show how the "will of kami and buddhas" dictate historical change, pointing to Jien's view that the history of Japan can be divided into seven stages, with each characterized with a different balance between the influence of "visible/seen" (*ken* 顕) actors and "invisible/unseen" (*myō* 冥) actors. He explains: "Jien wrote the *Gukanshō* to show the course of Japanese events as the result of the will of kami and buddhas who first caused the pattern of Emperor-Regent and then that of Emperor-Shōgun to be a historical necessity."[97] While this is not necessarily a wrong assessment, Marra excludes an important group that should be included as actors within the "invisible realm" that Jien claims dictates historical change: the role of avatars and vengeful spirits. In the *Gukanshō*, Jien argues that there are not only good principles and actors that dictate the course of history, but also evil ones. He also suggests that a "wise" person is necessary to restore order in the world, and this "wise" person is not only those who are able to understand "good principles" that help govern the world, but also a person who is also able to correctly perceive the invisible "evil principles" that are increasingly more influential in the way people in the "seen" realm are governing the state. Whereas most previous scholarship, including Marra's assessment in his article, have been interested in Jien's thought as it pertains to the views of the "good principles" needed for governance, not enough attention has been given to the importance of "evil principles" in his vision of history.

In the points that Marra makes regarding the *Gukanshō*, he appears to be basing his conclusions on an assumption that "political" concerns can be separated from

[97] Marra, p. 323.

"religious" concerns, or perhaps he is simply not interested in elaborating more on the "religious" or "supernatural" elements in Jien's writings. However, it begs us to ask to what extent Marra's claim that Jien was *more* interested in "politics" than "religion" really helps us to understand the complexities of Jien's work. It is perhaps more constructive to recognize that for Jien, the realms of "political" and "religious" were not viewed as mutually exclusive but on the contrary, were seen as intertwined, inseparable factors. In other words, the *Gukanshō* needs to be read as a historical narrative that addresses the intersection of political and religious concerns, in which issues of an ideal vision of governance and the practice of Buddhist rites were both seen as viable and necessary perspectives to address the issue of social disorder and world maintenance. Rather than viewing these two categories as something that can be cleanly separated and distinguished, we should consider how the text engages simultaneously with issues of politics and religion, and to think about what implications this has to Jien's broader activities as a Buddhist priest.

Gukanshō as a "Philosophy of History"

This tendency to view the *Gukanshō* as a "practical" or "intellectual" work that is primarily interested in politics and philosophy can also be seen in John S. Brownlee's discussion of the *Gukanshō* in his work, *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki (712) to Tokushi Yoron (1712)* published in 1991.[98] Here, Brownlee

[98] Brownlee, John S. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki (712) to Tokushi Yoron (1712).* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.

describes the *Gukanshō* as "the first great work of philosophy of history in Japan," that is characterized by a deep philosophical engagement with Buddhist thought:

> "[Jien's] book is extraordinarily complex and yields numerous interpretations, because of the depth of the Buddhist concepts pertaining to the passage of time and the meaning of life cycles... Jien found the processes [of historical change] unpleasant, and future prospects dismaying. *However, he reacted creatively and sought fresh terms to make events intelligible*. In the end, his system of understanding history in terms of the period of the Latter Law and the action of Principle imparted deep meaning to history."[99] (emphasis added)

As mentioned above, there has been quite a lot of consideration regarding the intentions of the text in previous scholarship based on an analysis of the content in relation to the broader historical events that were unfolding at the time of its composition. As discussed above, Ishida Ichirō argued that Jien's intentions for writing the *Gukanshō* was to prevent the Jōkyū Rebellion by convincing Retired Emperor Go-Toba that it was not in his best interest to have an antagonistic relationship with the growing military power of the Kamakura Bakufu. Ishida suggests that when it was clear that the clash between Retired Emperor Go-Toba and the Kamakura Bakufu was imminent, Jien composed the *Gukanshō* in haste. Importantly, it was due to a combination of Jien's matured philosophical views and scholarly understanding of historical events with his advanced skill as a *waka* poet that allowed him to quickly compose the *Gukanshō* to attempt to prevent the Jōkyū Rebellion from happening.[100] Very much in line with these Japanese scholars, Brownlee also suggests that the *Gukanshō* was written for these pragmatic and political reasons and Brownlee assumes that Jien's work of history was written to

[99] Brownlee, p 102.
[100] Ishida Ichirō 石田一良. *Gukanshō no kenkyū: sono seiritsu to shisō* 愚管抄の研究—その成立と思想. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000, pp. 195-214.

inform people about the past in order to "head off the impending war with a convincing admonition based on an understanding of history."[101] In line with his perception of the *Gukanshō* as a practical work of history, Brownlee also makes value judgments regarding the quality of *Gukanshō,* and suggests that it is unfortunate that as a work of history, it is "disorderly" and lacks order. However, this suggestion that the *Gukanshō* is difficult to read could be seen as reflecting Brownlee's own expectations of what a historical work *should* look like. Rather than judging the *Gukanshō* against a preconceived notion of what a history should look like, perhaps it is more constructive to assess the content and structure of the text for what it is.

In the same vein, perhaps the assumption that the *Gukanshō* should be primarily "political," to the point that the "religious" is downplayed and relegated to the background, tells us more about the perceptions and values of the scholars who are writing about the *Gukanshō*, than the *Gukanshō* itself. In other words, their reading of the *Gukanshō* is colored by their assumptions of what historical writing *should be*. Particularly in Brownlee's assessment of the *Gukanshō* he seems to want the *Gukanshō* to be an orderly work, one that has the pragmatic purpose of displaying past events in an orderly manner to help its readers better understand the political structures that ran through different stages of Japanese history. Although it would be foolish to suggest that political concerns are not important to the text, it is problematic when we see the relegation of "religious" and "superstitious" elements as somehow inferior to the pragmatic and political features of the work. Not only is this a misrepresentation of the text, but also arguably a misunderstanding of Jien as a historical figure. As discussed in

[101] Ishida (2000), p. 206-207.

Chapter 1, the way Jien was involved in his ritual activities were inseparable from his political ties to his elder brother Kujō Kanezane. We should take this into account when we analyze Jien's historical work as well.

With regard to both Marra and Brownlee, it is perhaps important to emphasize that the tendency to read the *Gukanshō* as examples of "historical thought" and as a "pragmatic" response to political issues was very much in line with the contemporary scholarship in Japan at the time. It is, however, worth questioning the assumptions that the scholarship, both in Japanese and in English, has brought in their interpretations of the text. If we read the *Gukanshō* without the preconception that it should read as an exemplary work of history, there will no longer be the need to critique it as lacking the structure that a historical work *should* have. In fact, I would argue that there is a clear structure to the *Gukanshō*, although perhaps not in the way that one would expect from a work of history. The problem is not in the *Gukanshō* itself, but in the way that it has been interpreted as a "history." When we approach the text not as "a great philosophical work of history," but focus on the worldview that Jien constructs through his storytelling, we can perhaps start to see that there is a logical structure that runs through the work.

Studying the *Gukanshō* as Literature

In more recent years, there is increasingly more scholarship on the Jien by scholars of Japanese literature. However, the image of Jien that is presented by these scholars of Japanese literature tends to focus on his identity as a *waka* poet. Ishikawa

Hajime's *Jien waka ronkō* 慈円和歌論考[102] published in 1998 and *Jien hōraku waka ronkō* 慈円法楽和歌論考[103] published in 2015 are both commendable studies that attempt to assess Jien's poetic activities through an analysis of the large corpus of Jien's poetic work, which includes over 6000 poems. However, because the focus is primarily on Jien's poems, there is little consideration of how the *Gukanshō* may overlap with Jien's poetic activities. Yamamoto Hajime's 1999 work, *Jien no waka to shisō* 慈円の和歌と思想[104] attempts to explore the ideological characteristics seen in Jien's poetry. Although the final section of the book, *Gukanshō to sono shūhen* 愚管抄とその周辺, includes four chapters that touch upon the *Gukanshō*, his main concern lies in highlighting the potential relationship between *Gukanshō* and the *Tale of Heike*, a work highly regarded in the study of pre-modern Japanese literature.

The issue of the potential relationship between *Gukanshō* and *the Tale of Heike* is also shared by Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇, explored in detail in his first publication in 1993, *Gukansho to sono zengo* 愚管抄とその前後,[105] where he analyzed various *setsuwa* literature to assess what literary works may have influenced, or have been influenced by the *Gukanshō*. The underlying purpose of this study was to situate the *Gukanshō* within the larger network of other major literary works of its time, and carving out a space within the study of Japanese literature for a consideration of the *Gukanshō* as a legitimate object of study within the category of the study of Japanese literature (*kokubungaku* 国文学). In the introduction to the work, Ozaki explains that the purpose

[102] Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien waka ronkō* 慈円和歌論考. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin 笠間書院, 1998.
[103] Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien hōraku waka ronkō* 慈円法楽和歌論考. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2015.
[104] Yamamoto Hajime 山本一. *Jien no waka to shisō* 慈円の和歌と思想. Tokyo: Taiyōsha, 1999.
[105] Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō to sono zengo* 愚管抄とその前後. Osaka : Izumi Shoin 和泉書院, 1993.

for him to embark on his study of the *Gukanshō* from the perspective of *setsuwa* literature is because he saw that the *Gukanshō* had been studied primarily from the disciplines of history and intellectual history, and that there had not been enough work on understanding the *Gukanshō* as a work of literature and analyzing its literary structure.[106] In this study, Ozaki shows how one of the characteristics of the *Gukanshō* is that it expresses itself as a text that incorporates information that has been "orally transmitted" (*kuden* 口伝), pointing to various passages in the text that end with the phrase "it has been said" (申伝へタリ) or "it has been told" （語リ伝エタリ）.[107] Ozaki suggests that this mode of writing and expression of "oral transmission" is similar to the literary voice seen in other *setsuwa* literature that were composed in around the same time as the *Gukanshō*. He reminds the reader that *setsuwa* literature such as the *Kojidan* 古事談*, Hosshin shū* 発心集, *Ujishūi monogatari* 宇治拾遺物語, *Zoku kojidan* 続古事談*, Kankyo no tomo* 閑居友, *Kyōkun shō* 教訓抄*, Ima monogatari* 今物語, *Senshū sho* 撰集抄, *Jikkin shō* 十訓抄, and *Kokon chomon shū* 古今著聞集, were all composed within 20-30 years from the time the *Gukanshō* was written, suggesting that it was *setsuwa* literature that was not only the representative form of literature during the time the *Gukanshō* was composed, but also arguing for the importance of recognizing the broader literary context under which the *Gukanshō* was composed and potential relationships that can be drawn between the *Gukanshō* and other *setsuwa* literatry works.[108]

[106] Ozaki (1993), p. 3.
[107] Ozaki (1993), p. 9.
[108] Ozaki (1993), pp. 3-11.

This fundamental idea of re-assessing the *Gukanshō* through an assessment of its literary qualities and characteristics continued to be a major thread of Ozaki's scholarship. In his second monograph published in 2004, *Gukanshō no sōsei to hōhō* 愚管抄の創成と方法,[109] he states the importance of his approach more explicitly, saying that the previous studies of the *Gukanshō* that claim that the motivations for its composition were primarily political in nature, and specifically driven by a desire to prevent the confrontation between Retired Emperor Go-Toba and the Kamakura bakufu was far too simple. In this work, he again focuses on a close reading of the content and structures of the *Gukanshō* to show that the motivations behind its construction should be seen as far more complicated and multi-dimensional, just as Jien himself was a multi-dimensional person with ties to the Imperial family, Mt. Hiei, and the Kujō family. He attempts to situate the *Gukanshō* in a larger picture of Jien's role as the eldest member of the Kujō family after the death of his elder brother Kanezane, and provided a fascinating analysis of the role of Shōtoku Taishi in the *Gukanshō* and how it related to not only to Jien's appointment as the administrator of Shitennōji 四天王寺, but also showing how Shōtoku Taishi came to be viewed as a central figure used to claim the legitimacy and necessity of the Fujiwara family's position as the regent to the emperor.[110]

Ozaki Isamu, in his *Gukanshō no sosei to hōhō*, also has an interesting observation regarding Jien's intentions for writing the text and suggests one should consider the significance of Jien's position as the eldest figure of the Kujō family (after

[109] Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō no sōsei to hōhō* 愚管抄の創成と方法. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2004.
[110] Ozaki (2004), pp. 80-100.

the death of Kujō Kanezane) and the timing of its composition as close to when Jien became the head of Shitennōji. He focuses on the irregular structure of the *Gukanshō* when compared to earlier official histories and "succession tales" and points out the thematic parallels it has to the *Shitennōji engi* 四天王寺縁起（formally 『荒陵寺御手印縁起』) and the *Shōtoku taishi denryaku* 『聖徳太子伝暦』.[111] He concludes that Jien composed the Imperial Lineage (Vol. 1-2) and the narrative history (Vol. 3-6) of the *Gukanshō* as part of an effort to re-construct the Imperial Lineage that was said to have been composed by Prince Shōtoku and was lost in a fire at Shitennōji, and that Vol. 7 could be seen as a commentary to the narrative history that explained the "principles of the world," which incorporated the ideas also seen in the *Shitennōji engi* and *Shōtoku taishi denryaku*. His analysis focuses specifically on the elements concerning the Prince Shōtoku cult found within the text and is a valuable perspective on the *Gukanshō*. This recognition of the possible intersections of the *Gukanshō* with the growing Shōtoku cult is a valuable perspective that could help to question earlier interpretations of the *Gukanshō* that have focused on it as a work of political history.

Finally, in his publication of *Gukanshō no gengo kukan* 愚管抄の言語空間 in 2014, Ozaki again argued that the motivations for the composition of the *Gukanshō* was not in order to prevent the Jōkyū Rebellion, but was primarily guided by his interest in supporting the flourishing of the Kujō family. According to Ozaki, a close cross examination of Jien's various writings, including the infamous "Records of Dreams" 慈鎮和尚夢想記 and the *Gukanshō*, show that what was at the foundation of Jien's

[111] Ozaki (2004), p. 101-121.

motivation for all of his literary works was a concern for the future of the Kujō family that sought ways to legitimize his familial lineage for future generations.[112]

These recent studies of the *Gukanshō* help us to interpret the text in a different light. Whereas previous studies that emphasized the intellectual and pragmatic elements of the *Gukanshō*, the study by literature scholars provided a much more detailed assessment of the structure of the text as a work of literature and through a cross examination with other literary texts showed that did not necessarily fit nicely into the category of works of history or intellectual thought. It is also important to recognize, however, that much of the focus of these studies by scholars of Japanese literature was also guided by an attempt to frame the *Gukanshō* as a valid object of study within the established academic discipline of Classical Japanese Literature. It's relevance, therefore, was argued not from a close reading only of the content of the *Gukanshō* itself, but through an analysis of how its literary expressions, tropes, and textual structures resonate with other well established works of literature within the academic discipline of *kokubungaku*.

Perhaps the most innovative and provocative study of the *Gukanshō* to date, is *The Truths and Fictions of the Gukanshō—beyond the self-reflective voice of historical narrative* (*Gukanshō no uso to makoto—rekishi gatari no jiko genkyūsei wo koe dete* 『『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉――歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て』) by Fukazawa Tōru, also a scholar of Japanese literature. [113] In his conclusion, he states

[112] Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō no gengo kūkan* 愚管抄の言語空間. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2014, pp. 71-115.
[113] Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: rekishi katari no jikogenkyūsei wo koedete* 『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉―歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006.

that his interest in studying the *Gukanshō* is not as a text that offers empirically reliable historical truth or in it's value as a philosophy of history. Rather, as the title of his book suggests, he is interested in reading the *Gukanshō* as literature, as a historical *narrative* (*rekishi gatari* 歴史語り), and specifically in the elements of "fiction" that it exhibits. According to Fukazawa, the essence of literature (*bungaku* 文学) is "fiction" (虚構・フィクション). The question that drives his interpretation of the *Gukanshō* is to ask what kind of "fictions" Jien constructed in order to overcome the historical realities of his present and create a vision of the future. He explains in the conclusion of the work, "In previous scholarship, there has not been enough consideration of the "fictions" (〈ウソ〉) that were used in constructing the foundation of the work...the *Gukanshō* is a work of literature that views the reality of the "here and now" as something that cannot be fully controlled, and therefore puts forth an idealized vision [of the world] as a "lie/fiction" (*uso* 嘘)."[114] In other words, what lies at the heart of Fukazawa's study of the *Gukanshō* is his observation that the *Gukanshō* is a text in which elements of "fiction" and "fact" worked together to re-write history and he is particularly interested in exposing Jien's subjectivity (*shutai no arikata* 主体のあり方) through an analysis of the mechanisms of its narrative structures.

With regard to the question of the motivation of its composition, Fukazawa has an interesting analysis regarding of the perceived audience of the text, which he deems as

[114] (Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: rekishi katari no jikogenkyūsei wo koedete* 『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉—歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006, 327.

the "non-existent other" (*hizai no tasha* 非在の他者).[115] According to Fukazawa, the text is written in a manner in which the audience is intentionally left ambiguous. However, Fukazawa also suggests that while there is space open for any audience as the "non-existent other," the most likely audience that Jien intended as the immediate readers of the text was most likely Emperor Chūkyō 仲恭天皇 and Kujō Yoritsune 九条頼経, both young members with deep connections to the Kujō family and who were both envisioned by Jien as figures who would serve as the next sovereigns of the political world.

Regarding the audience of the *Gukanshō,* historian Mori Shintarō also recently published an article, "The Theory of Jien's *Gukanshō* as an Educational Text for the Young—with an emphasis on a consideration of its intended audience" (*Jien Gukanshō yōgakusho setsu—sono sōtei dokusha ni chakumoku shite* 慈円愚管抄幼学書説—その想定読者に着目して).[116] This article provides an even stronger argument that the *Gukanshō* was written, not necessarily intended for Retired Emperor Go-Toba, but as an educational treatise for the young promising leaders, Kujō Mitora (later Shōgun Yoritsune) and Kanenari Shinno (later Emperor Chūkyō). In this sense, it should not be viewed as a treatise that was written in haste to address the immediate threat of Retired Emperor Go-Toba's clash with the Kamakura Bakufu, but rather looked further into the future in hope that it would educate the leaders of the next generation, not only on how

[115] Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: rekishi katari no jikogenkyūsei wo koedete* 『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉—歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006. pp. 140-50.

[116] Mori Shinnosuke 森新之介. "Jien 'Gukanshō' yōgakushosetsu: sono sōtei dokusha ni chakumoku shite" 慈円『愚管抄』幼学書説–その想定読者に着目して. *Nihon shisō shigaku* 47 (September 2015): 56-71.

to govern the state, but also to ensure that the members of the Kujō lineage would continue to be viewed as important partners in governing the state. As discussed briefly in Chapter 1, it is clear that the place of the Kujō family, and the growing precariousness of its status in court politics, was a central concern that needed to be addressed by Jien. The *Gukanshō* should also be seen as a part of these larger concerns for the future of the Kujō line and an attempt to argue for the legitimacy of the Kujō family's place in the court. As I will discuss in the following chapter, as a practitioner of exoteric-esoteric Buddhist rituals, Jien effectively incorporated religious or "supernatural" concerns into his historical narrative as one way to address the need to legitimize and restore the Kujō family's status in court politics.

Conclusion

Particularly in recent years, much progress has been made in questioning previously held interpretations regarding Jien's motivations for composing the *Gukanshō.* However, there is still an element of the text that has not been properly addressed, and that is the status of "vengeful spirits" (*onryō* 怨霊) in the *Gukanshō*. While previous studies have read the *Gukanshō* as a history dealing with politics and philosophical concepts and in the process, disregard these "unseen" elements of the text in their prioritization of the text as a pragmatic work, this recognition of the elements of the "unseen" (or "supernatural") in the text allows us to re-evaluate what the motivations could have been in writing the work. I am not suggesting that political concerns are unimportant to the *Gukanshō*, but it is clear that Jien's interests go well beyond political

concerns. As I discuss in the following chapter, the foundations of what must be done to restore and maintain world order, according to Jien, involved how to deal with the problems of "other worldly" beings in the "unseen/invisible" realm. Much attention has been placed on *Gukanshō* as a pragmatic effort to prevent the conflict between Retired Emperor Go-Toba and Kamakura Bakufu. However, a close reading of the *Gukanshō* shows that we should take seriously the fact that Jien's worldview includes both considerations of the "visible" realm of human actions in history as well as "invisible" realms, which includes the auspicious protections of buddhas and kami, as well as the malevolent influences of vengeful spirits and fox spirits. As such, the solution that Jien proposes also goes beyond political and pragmatic issues, but should also incorporate religious concerns, which claim that there is a need to rely on religious institutions and rituals as a way to counter malevolent influences in the court. In fact, Jien's discussion of vengeful spirits hold a much more important place than has previously been studied. A re-examination of Jien's historical narrative with an attempt to take the "supernatural" elements of vengeful spirits more seriously will reveal that these spirits played a much more important role in the *Gukanshō* than has previously been assumed. In the next chapter I discuss the role these vengeful spirits played in Jien's historical narrative, how they contributed to the discourse of historical decline and destruction, and point to how they have larger implications regarding the self-image Jien presents in the work.

Chapter 3:

Re-assessing the *Gukanshō* as a Treatise About Vengeful Spirits

Introduction

As illustrated in the previous chapter, scholarly studies of the *Gukanshō* have often concluded that Jien's motivations for embarking on his historical project were based on political concerns, the most prominent being the understanding that Jien composed the *Gukanshō* as a way to prevent the inevitable clash between the imperial family and the military family, now known as the Jyōkyū Rebellion. Although these political concerns were undoubtedly an important part of Jien's project, I will argue that confining an interpretation of the *Gukanshō* simply in terms of political and pragmatic concerns is limiting and even misleading. Given his extensive network with the high echelons of Heian court society and the great acumen he shows in his writings, it is perhaps in the realm of possibility that Jien foresaw the rising tensions between the Retired Emperor Go-Toba and the Kamakura Bakufu as previous scholars have suggested, but to explain that the *Gukanshō* was written as a preventative measure for an historical event that had yet to happen is questionable. Although Jien was certainly aware of the rising tensions between the Retired Emperor Go-Toba and the Kamakura Bakufu, his writing of the *Gukanshō* cannot be defined as simply motivated by "political" concerns. Rather, the historical narrative in the *Gukanshō* should be read as a religious discourse and the other qualities of his writings, such as the political issues it addresses, the poetic and rhetorical refinements as an exemplary literary work, or the understanding that the text can be read as a pedagogical device, derive from a fundamental concern that can be seen as religious in nature.

This religious characteristic of Jien's historical narrative and the implications that Jien's worldview has on his activities outside of the text have not received enough scholarly attention. This is, as I have argued in the previous chapters, due to the fact that the work has been interpreted as a text that is primarily understood as a "historical" or "political" undertaking, and religious, or "superstitious" elements of the *Gukanshō* have been relegated to the background as less important to the primary motivations of the work. Specifically, the discussion of vengeful spirits that is weaved throughout the *Gukanshō* has largely been viewed as less crucial to Jien's more "philosophical" or "political" concerns, and even described as "odd elements" that should not belong in the text. In this chapter, I argue that it is precisely the way in which Jien incorporated the presence of vengeful spirits into his interpretation of history that reveal the crux of what the *Gukanshō* intended to express. Furthermore, the presence of vengeful spirits in the *Gukanshō* has implications that go beyond the confines of the text, and help us understand how Jien's historical project intersects with his larger ritual projects, specifically his establishment of the ritual center at *Daisangehōin* in the proximity of the Heian capital.

Questioning Vengeful Spirits as "Odd Factors" in the *Gukanshō*

The appearance of vengeful spirits in the *Gukanshō* is something that has been pointed out in previous studies of the *Gukanshō*, but they are often dismissed as simply reflecting common beliefs of the time. As discussed in the previous chapter, previous scholarship has focused primarily on the "good" principles, and Buddhist concepts, such

as the notion of *mappō*, understanding Jien's concepts of the nature of historical change. What has been largely left out of the discussion is that Jien also places emphasis on "evil" principles, as illustrated in what he calls the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits." (*onryō no dōri* 怨霊の道理).

The lack in scholarship regarding the significance of vengeful spirits can be seen as partially due to the fact that they were viewed as superstitious elements within Jien's historical writing, and were deemed as less worthy of serious consideration. For example, Brownlee discusses the appearance of "ominous natural phenomena and vengeful spirits" as if they were elements of Jien's writing that should not belong in what is otherwise considered the intellectual and practical prose of a historian. Rather than attempting to explain how these elements function within Jien's historical narrative, Brownlee explains the appearance of vengeful spirits as simply a factor of pre-modern times and an anomaly of what is otherwise the thought of a rational man:

> Jien's scheme for understanding history was not neat, but the allowance of random factors seems to render it chaotic. *Nevertheless it was necessary to take account of ominous natural phenomena and vengeful souls, because their existence was universally believed without question*. They were facts of life that could not be disregarded on the grounds that they did not fit logically into an explanation of history. Their acceptance by Jien probably caused him no logical discomfort, and certainly brought no criticism. All systems of thought contained the same element, and it was not regarded as distorting...In addition to these *odd factors in his thought,* according to the research of Akamatsu Toshihide, dreams were important to Jien.[117] (emphasis added)

In addition to referring to these accounts of vengeful spirits as simply accepted by Jien as they were "universally believed without question," Brownlee also refers to these accounts as "odd factors in his thought" as though they should not belong in the text.

[117] Brownlee, 101.

However, this interpretation of the elements of the supernatural and vengeful spirits as "odd factors" in his thought should be seen as more of Brownlee's projection of what he views is appropriate for a work of historical writing. In other words, it is Brownlee's attempt to paint Jien as a historian and philosopher that places a limit on his interpretation of the text. Scholars who have interpreted the *Gukanshō* as a work of history and political thought have assumed that the work was written by a practical man, endowed with reason and a sense of purpose not only to address the political issues of the world, but also with the intention to illuminate a moral way of life based on his understanding of Buddhist teachings. While these interpretations may not be entirely false, this emphasis on Jien's "thought" and the vision of Jien as a "pragmatic" and "rational" historian has lead scholars to leave out an important, and what I will argue is the central, elements of the text.

In fact, efforts to de-emphasize elements that are deemed "superstitious" and the attempts to re-imagine Jien as a poet or intellectual historian were not only a tendency seen in English scholarship on Jien and the *Gukanshō*, but can also be seen in the work by Japanese scholars. In this regard, the work of historian Akamatsu Toshihide was particularly influential. Akamatsu published his two major works on Jien in his two-volume compilation of articles, titled *A Study of Kamakura Buddhism (Kamakura bukkyo no kenkyu* 鎌倉仏教の研究)[118] in 1957 and *A Study of Kamakura Buddhism Returns* (*Zoku Kamakura bukkyo no kenkyu* 続鎌倉仏教の研究)[119] in 1966. Basing his analysis

[118] Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957.
[119] Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Zoku Kamakura Bukkyō no kenkyū* 続鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1966.

on newly discovered primary documents of Jien's votive texts (*ganmon* 願文), Akamatsu described Jien as "a historian well beyond his time," who was endowed with "rational principles" and motivated by an intention to illuminate the people of his time by presenting an objective history that would prevent further political conflicts with the rising military class. This attempt to frame Jien as an "intellectual historian" was influential on subsequent studies, but it is perhaps not an accident that his insistence on the rational character of Jien also caused Akamatsu to make dismissing judgments of elements in the *Gukanshō* that did not fit the "rational figure" he hoped to portray in his scholarship.

In his analysis, supernatural elements found within the *Gukanshō*, for example regarding oracles from *kami* or stories about vengeful spirits, are explained as if they were an anomaly, suggesting that "[Jien] must have been in an flustered mindset when he heard these oracles and wasn't able to calmly reflect on what he was writing."[120] It is clear that Akamatsu is working under a presumption that the majority of the *Gukanshō* was written with the rational mindset of a historian, and any place where irrational or superstitious elements of the supernatural appear in the text is brushed off as merely moments of deluded thought, caused by his unfortunate reliance on *kami* worship. Another indication of Akamatsu's preconception regarding Jien's reliance on superstition is also seen in his assessment of votive texts that express Jien's request to rebuild architectural structures for the practice of Buddhist rites. Akamatsu uses these votive texts to suggest that although there are sections in the *Gukanshō* that suggest that at a time when Jien's mind was still "deluded" through his reliance on superstitious belief in

[120] Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957. p. 276.

the *kami* and their oracles, and that Jien's commitment to Buddhist rites seen in these votive texts show a development in Jien's character (and intellect), as someone who was finally able to go beyond his deluded belief in the *kami* oracles and dedicate himself to Buddhist practice. It is rather strange that Akamatsu makes a distinction here between *kami* oracles and the practice of Buddhist rites, suggesting that Jien's belief in *kami* oracles should be considered within the realm of superstition and Buddhist practice of rituals are considered "proper" religious conduct. Perhaps this assessment of Jien's religiosity stems from a his negative view of state Shintō in postwar Japan, but regardless of where this comes from, it is clear that Akamatsu's view of Jien and his analysis of his writing of the *Gukanshō* is shaped by his own personal judgments regarding the distinction between "proper" religious conduct and belief, labeling Shinto as superstitious belief and Buddhism as the rational alternative. Due to this problematic framework, anything Akamatsu deems as within the realm of the "superstitious" within Jien's historical analysis is understood as a limitation of Jien's capability as an intellectual. While it would be misleading to suggest that all subsequent work on Jien uncritically accepted Akamatsu's problematic assumptions, it seems clear that his work has had significant influence in the direction of *Gukanshō* scholarship, which have prompted scholars to project notions of the "rational historian" onto their analysis of the text, viewing the *Gukanshō* as pragmatic work, primarily concerned with addressing the political issues of his time. However, this overemphasis on the pragmatic aspects of historical thought, at the expense of disregarding elements of the supernatural has limited the way in which the text has been studied and this tendency to divorce the

"supernatural" elements from the "rational" is a product of modern intellectual thought and should not be projected onto our interpretation of the text.

As seen above, elements of Jien's life that veer toward what might be deemed "superstition," having to do with the "supernatural" have conveniently and consciously been de-emphasized in the analysis of Jien's accomplishments. In other words, while much research has been done on elements of Jien as a political figure, a historian, and poet, there is still much to be said about what he did in his role as a religious figure. Once we fully recognize Jien as a practitioner of Buddhist rites, we can start to see how the "evil" principles he discusses in the *Gukanshō* relate to his broader ritual activities.

Jien's Vision of Disorder as Both Political and Religious

In order to re-evaluate Jien's motivations for composing the *Gukanshō*, there is perhaps no better place to start than with Jien's own words.[121] In the very opening lines of the volume 3, Jien speaks about his motivations for embarking on this historical project. In his assessment of the order in which the *Gukanshō* was composed, Mori suggests that there is good evidence that Jien began writing vol. 3 first. This means that although this section is located at the beginging of vol. 3 as it is currently ordered, this section may reflect Jien's initial intentions as he embarked on this historical project. [122] Here, Jien explains that his motivations for composing the *Gukanshō* stems from his

[121] For the English translations provided through the thesis, I relied heavily on Brown, Delmer M. and Ichirō Ishida. *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979. The primary source material of the *Gukanshō* is from Okami Masao 岡見正雄 and Toshihide Akamatsu 赤松俊秀, eds., *Gukanshō*, *Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, Vol. 86, Iwanami shoten, 1997, and for my own interpretation of the text, I also consulted Nakajima Etsuji 中島悦次. *Gukanshō zen chūkai* 愚管抄前註解. Tokyo: Yōseidō Shuppan, 1969.
[122] Mori Shinnosuke 森新之介. "Jien 'Gukanshō' yōgakushosetsu: sono sōtei dokusha ni chakumoku shite" 慈円『愚管抄』幼学書説–その想定読者に着目して. *Nihon shisō shigaku* 47 (September 2015): 56-71.

realization that he must do something about the current state of affairs, which he sees is characterized as “unfavorable matters” (*waroki koto* ワロキ事) :

> With the passing of the years and days, I have thought only of the principle of things, in part seeking diversion from the sleeplessness of old age as I approach the end of life. As I have long watched the affairs of the world, the Principle that has changed [with the times] has become clear to me. While I do not know about the age of Kami, since the age of man and the enthronement of Emperor Jinmu, I hear that there are one hundred reigns. With only a limited number of remaining reigns left at the current reign of the 84th Emperor, nobody has written about the [reasons behind] the appearance of the Hōgen Rebellion nor has there been any succession tales written that tell the story of what has happened since. I have heard that there are a few here and there, but I have yet to see it. These [stories of world affairs] have only recorded matters of praise, and since the world has been in disorder since the Hōgen Rebellion and there are only unfavorable matters (*waroki koto* ワロキ事) in the world, people have hesitated to write this down. *Realizing the foolishness of this, I thought that I should, with determination, write about the unwavering law of the changing times and its degeneracy*. Thinking in this way, I have come to realize that [this principle] is in fact, the truth. However, people do not always agree with this, and as there are minds that go against this “principle,” the world has become disordered, leaving only unsettling matters. I have decided to write, so that I may bring peace to my mind that has meddled over these matters.” (emphasis added)
>
> トシニソヘ日ニソヘテハ。物ノ道理ヲノミオモヒツヅケテ。老ノネザメヲモナグサメツツ。イトド年モカタブキマカルママニハ。世ノ中モヒサシクミテ侍レバ。ムカシヨリウツリマカル道理モアハレニオボエテ。神ノ御代ハシラズ。人代トナリテ神武天皇ノ御後百王トキコユル。スデニノコリスクナク八十四代ニモナリニケル中ニ。保元ノ乱イデキテ後ノコトモ。又世継ガ物ガタリト申物ヲカキツギタル人ナシ。少少アルトカヤウケタマハレドモ。イマダエ見侍ラズ。ソレハミナタダヨキ事ヲノミシルサントテ侍レバ。保元以後ノコトハ。ミナ乱世ニテ侍レバ。ワロキ事ニテノミアランズルヲハバカリテ。人モ申ヲカヌニヤト。オロカニオボエテ。ヒトスヂニ世ノウツリカハリ。オトロエタルコトハリヒトスヂヲ申サバヤト思テオモヒツヅクレバ。マコトニイハレテノミオボユルヲ。カクハ人ノヲモハデ。コノ道理ニソムク心ノミアリテ。イトド世モミダレ。ヲダシカラヌ事ニテノミ侍レバ。コレヲオモヒツヅクルココロヲモヤスメント思テカキツケ侍也。[123]

[123] Brown and Ishida, pp. 19-20; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 129.

Here, we see Jien present himself as a troubled author, who has no choice but to write out his thoughts regarding the degenerate state of world affairs, not only to appease his own mind, but also to offer clarity to the clouded, misguided minds of others. The fact that the world is in a state of decline and characterized by "unfavorable matters" seems to be a taken for granted, and he does not take the time to explain why he believes this to be the case. The more important point here, however, is that Jien states this as the fundamental reason and motivation for embarking on this project. With the premise that the world is in an undeniable state of disorder, the clearly stated motivation for composing a re-telling of historical events is to explain *how* things came to be in the destitute state that it is. He also suggests here that he has come to realize that these historical changes did not happen by chance, but that there are certain "Principles" that have dictated historical change.

Another important point that Jien makes here is that part of the motivations for composing the *Gukanshō* comes from his dissatisfaction with earlier attempts to narrate history, which he calls "succession tales" (*yotsugi monogatari* 世継ぎ物語). His criticism of these previous historical works is that due to their emphasis on praising the sovereign and members of the court, they have failed to directly address the "unfavorable matters" seen in Japanese history. This is an important element that, in Jien's own words, distinguishes his historical project from those that came before it. Jien also presents himself as one who is driven with a sense of duty, presenting himself as one who reluctant, and yet feels the responsibility to clarify how the state of affairs has come to this state of disorder because nobody else has stepped up to the task. Jien makes it

explicit here in the opening sections of the historical narrative two important points that lie at the foundation of his historical project: 1) that he understands that the current state of the world is marked with disorder and destruction, with a significant turning point being the Hōgen Rebellion, and 2) that not only has he realized that he has grasped the Principle of things (*dōri* 道理) that govern the world, but that he is willing to share this knowledge of the Principles with the reader. In other words, here Jien clearly expresses the main purpose of the *Gukanshō*: to clarify the causes of the current state of social disorder and to offer a solution to this problem. This emphasis on the "problem" of disorder in the world and his claim that he has the "solution" to restore order is a major component of the *Gukanshō* and it is significant that Jien uses the opening lines of the historical narrative to "set the stage," and clearly illustrate to the reader that this is the underlying points he will be addressing through this work.

In fact, these same points are emphasized again in the final sections of the volume 6, which concludes Jien's narrative history. It should not be seen as a mere coincidence that, just as in the start of his narrative history, it is also in the concluding sections that he reiterates his intentions for composing the *Gukanshō*:

> Now, changes [in authority] among the Emperors/Ministers and the Military Class has gradually become clear as I have written down these events. In thinking about this in relation to the "principle of things," and furthermore seeing that there are an unfathomable amount of transgressive acts (*higagoto* 僻事) in the world, I have written this in hope that that people will come to realize these matters and to take it to heart, that people of later generations would be careful to administer the state well, to correctly distinguish the both malicious and correct laws, both good and evil principles, to work in accordance with the principle of the Degenerate Age, to become the receptacles of the works of the Buddha and Kami for the benefit of sentient beings, and within the remaining 16 generations of the One-Hundred Reigns of the Kings, to protect the Buddhist Law and

> Imperial Law, as this is the original intent [of the Buddhas and kami] to benefit sentient beings for all eternity and in accordance to the unseen powers of the Buddhas and kami.
>
> サテ此日本國ノ王臣武士ノナリユク事ハ。事ガラハコノカキツケテ侍ル次第ニテ。皆アラハレマカリヌレド。コレハヲリヲリノ道理ニ思ヒカナヘテ。然モ此ヒガ事ノ世ヲハカリナシツルヨト。其フシヲサトリテ心モツキテ。後ノ人ノ能々ツツシミテ世ヲ治メ。邪正ノコトハリ善悪ノ道理ヲワキマヘテ。末代ノ道理ニ叶ヒテ。仏神ノ利生ノウツハ物トナリテ。今百王ノ十六代ノコリタル程。仏法王法ヲ守リハテンコトノ。先カギリナキ利生ノ本意。仏神ノ冥應ニテ侍ルベケレバ。ソレヲ詮ニテ書ヲキ侍ル也。[124]

Here too, Jien indicates that what is driving him to write the *Gukanshō* is the fact that there are many "transgressive acts" (僻事 *higagoto*) seen in the world. In Brown's translation of the *Gukanshō*, this term is translated as "mistake." However, the way this term appears in the text suggests that there is more weight placed on the term than simply a "mistake." In the way Jien uses this term, *higagoto* is perhaps closer to the term "transgression," in that the actions that are described using this term suggests that it is an act that goes against the correct course of action based on good Principles. Not only do people have to be more aware of not repeating these "transgressive acts," Jien also insists that in order to improve the situation of the state, which is currently marked with disorder and bound for destruction, it is imperative that emperors and ministers have a better understanding of the Principles that govern the world. Importantly, he emphasizes that it is important to read history with the understanding that there are both "good" and "evil" Principles, and that what is important in administrating the state is not only the adherance to good Principles, but also the ability to correctly perceive both correct law *and* malicious law, both good *and* evil principles. In other words, Jien seems

[124] Brown and Ishida, p. 198; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 317.

to suggest here that it is only when you have an understanding of why things went wrong that you are able to prevent future problems, and this is what it means to truly understand the "principle of things." It is also significant that in addition to the more political implications in his assertions here, he also clearly calls for his readers to become the receptacles of the Buddhist Law, especially at the time of the Degenerate Age (*mappō*), and recognizes the unseen powers of both buddhas and kami. It is clear, in other words, that for Jien, the faith in both the Buddhist teachings and the protection offered by buddhas and kami are essential elements to successfully administer the state, and that Jien's motivations for composing the text cannot be explained as contained within just "political" matters. It is clear, at least in Jien's own words as seen here, that religious concerns have equal, if not larger, weight to the driving point he is attempting to get across to his reader. Again, if we are to take Jien's worldview seriously, "political" and "religious" matters cannot be separated, and rather than try to parse out the "religious" or "superstitious" elements from Jien's historical or political discourse, we should try to have a better understanding of how religious and political concerns intersect in Jien's presentation of his historical narrative.

As indicated in the opening and concluding sections of the narrative history in volumes 3-6, Jien's presentation of historical events is an attempt to show how and what precipitated the gradual decline of principles and, according to Jien these include not only a consideration of detrimental political decisions made by previous emperors and regents, but also a claim that there were "unseen" agents influencing these decisions, which drastic consequences when seen within the larger flow of historical

events. In other words, a crucial element of Jien's explanation of social decline is based on an understanding of a world that is under the influence of a conflict not only between actors in the political or human realm, but importantly also dictated by both "good" and "evil" beings in the "unseen realms," which include not only buddhas and kami, but also critical for Jien's presentation of his narrative of decline, the malevolent influence of vengeful spirits.

Deterioration of Relations between Emperor and Regent

This claim regarding the influence of vengeful spirits is important for several reasons. First, it gives Jien the liberty to be more critical of the actions of previous emperors. In claiming that the root cause of "transgressive acts" by emperors is caused by "unseen" beings, the criticism is no longer directed at the emperor, but to the "evil" influences that lurk behind their actions without their knowledge. This is precisely what Jien does throughout the *Gukanshō*, and perhaps one reason why the vengeful spirits play such an important role. Right after Jien's well-known "fish and water" metaphor he uses to explain the inseparable relationship between a sovereign and his Regent or Chancellor, Jien explains how "transgressive acts" (*higagoto*) became more prevalent as time went on. Here, when Jien uses the term "transgressive acts" he is specifically referring to feelings of resentment and grudge between emperors and regents, and describes these personal feelings of "grudge" as the most antithetical and destructive force that goes against the ideal form of governance. Jien gives the specific example of

Retired Emperor Shirakawa's treatment of Tadazane, which he attributes as one of the major causes that lead to the world falling into a state of disorder:

> Retired Emperor Shirakawa certainly damaged the state with his transgressive acts (*higagoto*) of treating Tadamichi's father, Lord Chisoku-in Tadazane, so badly: placing him under house arrest and dealing with his son in ways that would estrange father from son. Regarding this, it is clear that the two ways of the invisible (*myō* 冥) and the visible (*ken* 顕), and the conflicts between good and evil spirits, could be seen both manifesting in form and hidden within.
>
> コノ中ニ白河院ノ、知足院ドノヲヒシト中アシクモテナシテオヒコメテ、ソノ知足院ノ子法性寺殿ヲ別ニ取リ放ツヤウニ使ヒ立テサセ給ヒタル御僻事ノ、ヒシト世ヲバ失ヒツルニテ侍ルナリ。コレニツケテ定カニ冥顕ノ二ツノ道、邪神善神ノ御タガヘ、色ニアラハレ内ニコモリテ見ユルナリ。[125]

Although this is a short passage, it reveals a lot about Jien's understanding of the world and what he argues as the intricate interaction between the "invisible" realms of spirits and the "visible" realm of human action. The focus here is Retired Emperor Shirakawa's decision regarding the treatment of Tadazane. His decision to place him in house arrest is a public gesture, and is "visible" to all. Jien, however, suggests here that this should not be interpreted only through as a decision made in the visible realm, but suggests that not only was there also "invisible" influences behind Retired Emperor Shirawaka's public decision, but that this entire course of actions were a result of the "conflicts between good and evil spirits." (コレニツケテ定カニ冥顕ノ二ツノ道、邪神善神ノ御タガヘ、色ニアラハレ内ニコモリテ見ユルナリ。) The implications of this passage is quite important, and Jien's suggestion of the influence of "invisible" realm should not be neglected as something "odd" or "out of place" as previous studies of the *Gukanshō*

[125] Brown and Ishida, p. 216. Okami and Akamatsu, p. 334-335.

might have liked to view it. In fact, the very boldness of Jien's claim here that Retired Emperor Shirakawa's actions were "transgressive" and caused "great damage to the state" could be interpreted as an irreverent claim and the sheer audacity of his statement should make one think about the potential gravity of this critical statement made toward the previous emperor. Why would Jien go out of his way to make such a critical remark against the previous emperor? Perhaps this is precisely what Jien was referring to in his suggestion that previous historical treatises failed to address "unpleasant" matters (*waroki koto*). The claims that he makes here about Retired Emperor Shirakawa and the implications of his statements should be understood within in the larger point he making in his historical project, and one that is related to Jien's concerns regarding not only the past, but of the "present moment." In other words, this critique of the previous Retired Emperor appears in the *Gukanshō* as an important precursor to a clear message he has regarding the "grave concern of transgressive behavior" that, according to Jien, could be seen in the *present* sovereign, Retired Emperor Go-Toba:

> During this Final Age we have been moved inexorably toward the Principle that state affairs are not to be peaceful. And since it is the destiny of the times that we come to a point at which evil demons and bad Kami are purposefully and definitely making things worse, even the beneficial power of the Three Treasures of Buddhism, and of the good Kami, is ineffective. Therefore, the rise of each incident precipitates further deterioration, and we come in this way to what is called the Final Age. Under conditions of the Final Age the present Retired Emperor has come to feel more and more strongly that there should be no strong, bothersome Regent. This is a really serious mistake. It seems that His Majesty would be displeased with the appearance of a Regent or Chancellor who, as a strong man enjoying both the power of learning and military might, could not be moved one bit [from doing what he thought he should do.] So now the state is being ruined. The Retired Emperor should become deeply aware of this

> Principle [of unity between a sovereign and such a Regent or Chancellor] and desist, once and for all, from making trangressions.
>
> ソレガイカニ申ストモカナウマジキ事ニテ侍ルゾトヨ、世ノ末ニ世ノ中ハヲダシカルマジト云フ道理ノ方ヘ、フフトウツリウツリシ侍ルナリ。ソレニ悪魔邪神ハヒシトワロガラセント取ナス処ニ、時運シカラシメヌレバ、又三宝善神ノ化益ノ力オヨバズ成リテンズト、事イデキテハヲトロヘオトロヘシマカリテ、カク世ノ末ト云フコトニナリクダリ侍ゾカシ。[126]

There is a lot to unpack in this passage, but it is one that deserves attention, as it points to some of the most pressing issues that Jien is attempting to get across in the *Gukanshō.* According to Jien, the "grave matter" at hand is the fact that the present Retired Emperor does not fully comprehend how important it is to rely on a capable regent in order to be successful in governing the state. However, the distrust (or "annoyance" as Jien describes) that the Retired Emperor Go-Toba feels against a capable regent is described as not a personal fault, but rather explained the result of not only a longer inevitable decline of the times and a gradual loss of Principle in the world, but also framed as the natural result of a conflict between the "unseen" actors, in which the "evil demons and bad kami" have gained so much influence that the good teachings of Buddhism and protection by the "good kami" are becoming ineffective. In other words, here too we see Jien's claim that the "ruin of the state" is caused not only by political decisions or concerns contained with the human realm, here emphasizing the relationship between Retired Emperors and regents, but also through the balance of the "unseen" actors. Jien continues to elaborate on the negative effects that these invisible beings may have on the sovereign:

[126] Brown and Ishida, p. 227; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 346.

> The emperor should handle everything in strict accord with Principle. If he does not yield completely to Heaven Way, and does things according to non-Way, he will be subjected to the punishment of invisible beings (*myōbatsu* 冥罰). Under conditions of these final reigns, if the sovereign comes to conduct affairs of state just as he pleases, and then incidents break out, the state will be thrown into disorder even before the advent of the 100th reign...His majesty should therefore be careful to govern the state by thinking and planning in ways that are in accord with the sacred Kami plan. At extremely miserable times, people resentfully say such things as "Invisible beings (*myōshu* 冥衆) do not really exist!" But in truth there is not a single moment—even at the end of this deteriorating half of the present small kalpa—when invisible beings do not exist. Moreover, we are aware—even now—that particularly miraculous events occur when people think and plan in accordance with [constructive] Principles.
>
> ソレヲバ一同ニ、事ニノゾミテ道理ニヨリテ萬ノコトノヲコナハルベキ也。一同ニ天道ニ任セ参ラセテ、無道ニ事ヲ行ナハバ冥罰ヲ待タルベキナリ。末代ザマノ君ノ、ヒトヘニ御心ニ任セテ世ヲ行ナハセ給ヒテ事出デ来ナバ、百王マデヲダニ待チツケズシテ、世ノ乱レンズル也。タダ憚ラズコトハリニ任セテ仰セフクメラレテ御覧ノアルベキ也。サテコソ此ヨハシバシモヲサマランズレト、ヒシトコレハ神々ノ御計ラヒノアリテ、カク沙汰シナサレタルコトヨト、明ラカニ心得ラルルヲ、カマヘテ神明ノ御計ラヒノ定ニアヒ適ヒテ、思シ召シ計ラヒテ、世ヲ治メラルベキニテ侍ルナリ。「冥衆ハヲハシマサヌニコソ」ナド申スハ、セメテアサマシキ時、ウラミマイラセテ人ノイフコトグサ也。誠ニハ劫末マデモ冥衆ノオハシマサヌ世ハ片時モアルマジキ。マシテカヤウニ道アルヤウニ人ノ物ヲ計ラヒ思フ時ハ、コトニアラタニコソ当時モオボユレ。[127]

Here, it is clear that the term "*higagoto*" is not simply just a "mistake," but refers to actions that go against the Principle of things, a deviant act that not only will bring about the end of the ordered world as projected by the notion of the 100 reigns of the Emperor, but also makes one subject to a "divine punishment," which Jien calls "the punishment by unseen beings (*myōbatsu* 冥罰)." This is a clear message directed at the sovereign that there are "invisible" beings, both "good" and "evil," that influence human action, and Jien is making a clear claim here that the sovereign should not only be aware of this

[127] Brown and Ishida: p. 230; Okami and Akamatsu: pp. 348-349.

higher order, but also be cognizant of the consequences of acting against it. It is, in other words, meant as a warning, or perhaps even an intimidation, against the Retired Emperor and the tendencies he has shown to have feelings of aggression or annoyance toward the regent. As mentioned in Chapter 1, if we consider that the *Gukanshō* was written after Kanezane's fall from his position as regent, it is quite possible what Jien is actually referring to here is the sovereign's decision to the support the Konoe family over the Kujō family. He may be suggesting that Kanezane's forced resignation from his position as regent was a result of the emperor's dissatisfaction with having a "strong man of learning" in his presence, and as a member of the Kujō family, Jien is suggesting that this was a grave mistake and that the sovereign, with the correct understanding of Principles, should understand the importance of relying on a capable regent to govern the state. Regardless of what is driving Jien to voice criticism toward the Retired Emperor, the abruptness of Jien's criticism here is alarming, and Jien seems to fully understand that he may be perceived as overstepping his limits of his critical remarks toward the Retired Emperor. In a manner that averts personal responsibility for these claims, Jien suggests that he is merely the messenger, the conduit of higher powers that are beyond his own control.

> I have really written some surprising things here! Although I am the writer, I have not been the least bit aware that these things were written by me. This is something that cannot be expressed! Alas, if this were a time when Kami and Buddha were speaking, I should like to ask them some questions.

> コハ以テノ外ノ事ドモ書キツケ侍リヌル物カナ。コレカク人ノ身ナガラモ、ワガスル事トハスコシモオボエ侍ラヌ也。申スバカリナシ申スバカリナシ。アハレ神仏モノノ給フ世ナラバ、トヒマイラセテマシ。[128]

Perhaps it is only when we see the gravity of the actual claims he is making in the *Gukanshō*, which include direct harsh criticisms of the sovereign's behavior, that we can start to see why it was so important for Jien to "play the fool," and present himself as the "ignorant priest" as indicated in the title of the work.

Jien's Advice on How to Restore Order

Now that we have a better understanding of what Jien means by "transgressive acts" that perpetuate disorder in the world, what does he say about the solutions? How does one overcome the inevitable decline of order and the counter the growing influence of these "evil" spirits? It would seem like the solution may be to restore the relationship between the emperor and the regent. However, Jien suggests that it may not be that simple. Returning to Jien's discussion of the historical precedent of Go-Shirakawa's "transgression," Jien suggests that Emperor Toba helped to rectify the situation by restoring the relationship between the emperor and regent, but also suggests that restoring the relationship between the emperor and regent is not enough:

> Toward the end of Toba's administration, His Majesty appears to have thought about the matter and understood that his actions in treating the Regent in such a way was a transgression. So Toba consulted with Tadamichi, followed Tadamichi's advice, and had Go-Shirakawa placed on the throne [in 1155]. This should have corrected the situation, but since history was moving along toward deterioration in this way, the political conditions could not be corrected. Therefore the destiny of the Japanese

[128] Brown and Ishida, p. 231; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 350.

> state continued to work itself out: a great rebellion broke out [in 1156] and we came definitely to the Military Age (*bushi no yo* 武者ノ世).
>
> サレドモ鳥羽院ハ最後ザマニ思シ召シ知リケン、物ヲ法性寺殿ニ申シ合ハセテ、ソノ申サルルママニテ、後白河院位ニ即ケマイラセテ、立チ直リヌベキトコロニ、カヤウニ成行ハ世ノナオルマジケレバ、スナハチ天下日本国ノ運ノツキハテ、大乱ノイデキテ、ヒシト武者ノ世ニナリニシ也。[129]

While it was significant that Toba's administration attempted to amend the problem by restoring the relationship between the emperor and regents, he also claims that with the advent of the "military age" starting with the Hogen Rebellion of 1156, a return to old ways is simply not enough to counter the impending destruction of the state. If, as Jien asserts, it is not enough to restore order by returning to the previous forms of governance that was characterized as the healthy collaboration between the emperor and regent, what must be done? Jien provides concrete advice on how the sovereign should deal with the inevitable deterioration of principles, with both practical advice regarding how the sovereign should engage with the military families, but also, advice on how religious and ritual are necessary to remedy the situation. In another section that is voiced as expressing words of advice for the sovereign, Jien claims that a reflection of these past events has allowed him to grasp what must be done in order to prevent further deterioration.

> If we look back over the ages that have come and gone since ancient times, we see that now—after a long period of precipitous deterioration—we have come to another time of improvement. If deterioration were to become worse, what deterioration it would be! There remain a few who study Chinese historical and literary works and the Confucian classics. And it seems that a few are studying law. *We hear that there are also some Buddhist priests of both the esoteric and exoteric persuasions who have no faults.* In calculating where we stand with respect to the allotted

[129] Brown and Ishida, p. 216; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 335.

> one hundred reigns, we see that sixteen are now left. When these two-year-old boys grow up, they will either destroy the state completely or bring about substantial improvement. So you soldiers should not make acts of transgression (*higagoto*) in the next 20 years. If you do not, it will be easy to keep others from doing so. After generous new grants of estates have been made to Buddhist temples and Shinto Shrines and to Buddhist and Shinto priests, strict orders should be handed down asking that these institutions and priests "pray that evil spirits ruining the states be suppressed by the power of Buddhas and Kami, and that if evil persons are inclined to rebel, they be arrested before such inclinations develop." Thus will bribery and corruption be checked. (emphasis added)

> 昔ヨリ成リ行ク世ヲ見ルニ、スタレ果テテ又起コルベキ時ニアイ当タリタリ。コレニ過ギテハ失セムトテハ、イカニ失セムズルゾ。記典・明経モスコシハ残レリ。明法・法令モ塵バカリハアンメリ。顕密ノ僧徒モ又過失ナクキコユ。百王ヲ数フルニイマ十六代ハ残レリ。今コノ二歳ノ人々ノ大人シク成リテ、世ヲバウシナイモハテ、ヲコシモタテムズルナリ。「ソレ今廿年マタンマデ、武士ヒガコトスナヒガコトスナ、ヒガコトセズハ自余ノ人ノヒガコトハトドメヤスシ」ト仰セキカセテ、神社・仏事、祠官・僧侶ニヨケラカナラン庄薗サラニメヅラシクヨセタビテ、「コノ世ヲ猶失ナハン邪魔ヲバ、神力・仏力ニテ押サヘ、悪人、反道ノ心アラン輩ヲバ、ソノ心アラセヌ先ニ召シ取レト祈念セヨ」ト、ヒシト仰セラレテ、コノマイナイ献芹スコシトドメラレヨカシ。[130]

Important to the solution that Jien suggests is necessary for improving inevitable decline of the state is to first recognize that the military families and their soldiers must be part of the equation. He suggests that a sovereign should reach out to the military families and tell them, in surprisingly detailed manner, "not to act in transgressive ways for the next 20 years." The 20 years may seem arbitrary, but this number is based on concrete concerns regarding the next rulers of the state. He suggests that there are "two year old boys" that will dictate the future of the state, claiming here they would either destroy the state completely or bring about substantial improvement. By the "two year old boys" he is clearly referring Chūkyō and Yoritsune. In other words, it is clear that Jien is

[130] Brown and Ishida, p. 224; Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 342-343.

concerned that there may be a chance of rebellion while these two boys are in their adolescence and he is trying to offer concrete advice to Retired Emperor Go-Toba on how he should engage with the military families and keep them in check, at least until the boys have grown to maturity. Unfortunately, we know that this vision was cut short and neither of these boys were able to serve in leading roles as Jien envisioned here. However, in addition to Jien's political concerns of potential rebellion by the military families as expressed here, he also argues that there needs to be a reliance on religious institutions to guarantee improvement in social order. Jien advises that the sovereign should offer generous new grants of estates to Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines, and that the rituals performed at these institutions would have a direct effect in keeping bribery and corruption under control through its prayers to suppress the malevolent influence of evil spirits.

Jien's earlier claims that there are "unseen" actors that are influencing the actions of individuals can be seen as leading up to this passage. Here, it is clear that the "evil spirits ruining the state" and "evil persons included to rebel" are viewed as two symptoms of the same problem of disorder in the world, and as long as "evil spirits" are involved, part of the solution must be, as Jien highlights here, a reliance on the rituals performed at religious institutions that house buddhas and kami, who will ultimately be able to counter the malign influences of the "evil" spirits who are ruining the state. Finally, although all of these passages appear to be directly addressing Retired Emperor Go-Toba, the concluding words of this particular set of passages indicate that this message is also for another audience:

> Alas, there is much to be written, and I have written only a small part. It would be good to have these children [Chūkyō and Yoritsune] read this book when they grow up. What will they think about it? I have merely written about the "single course of Principle" without including any falsifications whatsoever, knowing that no one else has written in this way about the most true of all true aspects of temporary change.
>
> アナヲヲノ申ベキコトノヲオサヤ。タダチリバカリカキツケ侍リヌ。コレヲコノ人々大人シクオハシマサンヲリ御覧ゼヨカシ。イカガ思シメサン。露バカリソラコトモナク、最真実ノ世ノナリユクサマ、カキツケタル人モヨモ侍ラジトテ、タダ一スヂノ道理ト云フコトノ侍ヲカキ侍リヌル也。[131]

Although stated as a rhetorical question, it is clear that Jien is writing the *Gukanshō* with the hope that Chūkyō and Yoritsune, who he foresees as the *future* leaders of the land would also lay their eyes on this work, a point that Mori also made in his suggestion that the *Gukanshō* could have been written as an educational treatise for the young, future sovereigns of the state.[132] In this sense, the *Gukanshō* could be interpreted as a text that both speaks to "present" leader (i.e. Retired Emperor Go-Toba) and written with the hope that it would be also be continued to be read by the future sovereigns (i.e. Chūkyō and Yoritsune). The message Jien has for both the current and future leaders is that the key to improving the matters of governing the state includes advice regarding the return to a co-dependent relationship between the imperial family and the regent to keep the military families in check, but importantly that in addition to this, also suggests that the fundamental root of disorder stems from the malevolent "evil spirits" and that a vigorous support of religious institutions is necessary to keep "evil spirits" under control.

[131] Brown and Ishida, p. 224; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 343.
[132] Mori Shinnosuke 森新之介. "Jien 'Gukanshō' yōgakushosetsu: sono sōtei dokusha ni chakumoku shite" 慈円『愚管抄』幼学書説–その想定読者に着目して. *Nihon shisō shigaku* 47 (September 2015): 56-71.

In the commentary of the *Gukanshō* written by Nakajima on this particular set of passages, he expresses a "disappointment" in the fact that Jien is calling for the rulers to rely on religious matters as solutions to the problems of the world he paints, suggesting that these statements diminish the value of the *Gukanshō* as a historical work. He writes, "Jien's claims here that worshiping buddhas and kami are necessary for achieving peace in the state is regrettable, as it diminishes and weakens this work as a historical discourse. As a religious specialist and product of his time, it was perhaps unavoidable for him to do so."[133] Here we see again the tendency of the historian scholar to project their own values onto their interpretation of the text, claiming that Jien's interest in "religious" solutions in some way obstruct his historical project. It is however, more important to recognize that when Jien says that his historical narrative is a reflection on the "changes seen in the absolute truth of the true world" (最真実ノ世ノナリユクサマ), this reflects a view of the world that recongizes that both political *and* religious factors have contributed to the decline of Principles seen in Japanese history. According to Jien, in order to restore order in the world, it must include both a re-establishment of the relationship between the emperor and regent and a reliance on religious practices that subdue the negative influences of "evil spirits." In this sense, the "religious" elements of Jien's claims shouldn't be brushed off as unsophisticated aspects in the text that hurt Jien's "theory of history," but recognized as an integral part of Jien's vision of the world, his interpretation of history, and most importantly, an integral part of the message he hopes to express to his audience.

[133] Nakajima, p. 626.

When we take seriously the fact that the presence of vengeful spirits play a central role in the historical vision that Jien presents to his readers, how does that change our reading of the *Gukanshō*? In the following sections, I will first look at the ways in which vengeful spirits are subtlety weaved into Jien's historical narrative in volumes 3-6 and will look at how Jien conceptualized the nature of vengeful spirits in what he refers to as the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits" in volume 7 of the *Gukanshō*.

Appearance of Vengeful Spirits in Jien's Narrative History

In order to understand how the *Gukanshō* introduces vengeful spirits into the historical narrative as a way to explain the conditions of its gradual decline, it is first important to show that Jien offers an ideal model from which the decline occurs. The narrative of decline and the claim that the world has fallen into "disorder" is predicated on the idea that there was once a time in the past when there was still order in the world. In the *Gukanshō*, Jien suggests that there was a golden age that can be traced back to the time of the gods in which both visible and invisible Principles were in perfect balance, however, it is in his discussion of Michinaga, described as having the same "glow" as that of the emperor, where Jien offers a more concrete picture of what he views is the ideal form of governance that serves as a model to which the deterioration of the relationship between the emperor and regent in subsequent years is measured. What makes Michinaga an ideal regent and partner to the emperor, however, is highlighted in his relationship with Emperor Ichijō. In the *Gukanshō*, Jien clarifies to the reader that Michinaga should be seen as the ideal regent, not because Emperor Ichijō favored him, but precisely because Michinaga was able to follow through with his obligations *despite*

the fact that the emperor spoke ill of him. This is illustrated in a scene in which Emperor Ichijō is depicted as going against Michinaga's advice. Rather than stepping down and submitting to Emperor Ichijō's requests, Michinaga takes the rather drastic measure of ripping apart and burning the Imperial Mandate issued by the emperor:

> Because he had felt deep in his heart that this was his destiny, he wished to live on—not developing ill will toward the deceased Emperor and not raising questions about why the Emperor had written the Mandate—in order to conduct memorial services for the deceased Emperor Ichijo. His feelings were unlike those of other people under similar circumstances, high or low. He had rolled up the document that looked like an Imperial Mandate and burned it, feeling that it should not ask why the Emperor had written it or whether the things written were true. It is clearly understood that the Sun Goddess and the Great Hachiman Bodhisattva really wished to protect Michinaga and that therefore lived long (until 1027) and came to be admired for the splendid way he lived and died.
>
> 御心ノ内ニコレヲフカク見トヲシテ。イカニゾヤ悪心モヲコサジ。ワレトドマリテカク御追福ヲイトナム。タカキモイヤシキモ御心バヘノニスモアリ。又イカニゾヤ。キカフコトハスコシモイカニト思フベキコトナラズトテ。巻コメテ焼アゲサセ給ケムヲバ。伊勢太神宮。八幡大菩薩モアハレニサトラレ玉イケントコソアラハニサトラレ侍レ。サレバコソ其後萬壽ノ年マデ久クタモチテ。サル臨終ヲモ人ニハ聞レサセ給へ。[134]

Although a short passage, there are several points here that have broader implications to Jien's larger message that runs throughout the *Gukanshō*. The first point is the emphasis here that Michinaga did not have "ill will" toward the Emperor's negative actions toward him. As we saw earlier, one of the "transgressive acts" of Retired Emperor Shirakawa was his "annoyance" he felt toward capable regents and the distrust between the emperor and regent, according to Jien, was one of the prime factors of the destruction of the state. Michinaga, on the other hand, was an excellent regent because not only was he was able to conduct his duty as the regent without letting his personal

[134] Brown and Ishida, p. 59. Okami and Akamatsu, p. 174.

feelings get in the way, he was also able to resolve situations of personal conflict without making matters worse. In addition to the emphasis here that Michinaga's actions were not the result of personal feelings, the second point here is the suggestion that these actions were supported by an higher order, in other words, by the Sun Goddess and the Great Hachiman Bodhisattva. As "evidence" that this was the case, Jien says that Michinaga enjoyed a long life, admired by others, that was under the protection of these kami. The protection of these "good" kami and the ability to fulfill one's duties without being directed by personal feelings of grudge, even if it means going against the orders of an emperor, are signs of virtue and necessary characteristics needed to maintain order. It is important to note, however, that Jien does not paint Michinaga as a perfect ruler, and points to a very specific fault of Michinaga, which is related to his way of handling the problem of vengeful spirits.

The introduction of vengeful spirits in Jien's historical narrative begins very subtly. The reader is introduced to a change of tone when Jien starts to talk about Emperor Sanjō and the misfortunes associated with him at the beginning of volume 4, and this is also where the first explicitly malevolent "vengeful spirit" appears in the text as the cause of misfortune.[135] Jien tell us that Emperor Sanjō ascended the throne when he was 36 years old, but within five years of his enthronement, he had to abdicate the throne and enter into the Buddhist order due to developing trouble with his eyesight. Jien refers to these unfortunate circumstances as something "difficult to comprehend," but what does he mean by this? For Jien, these unfortunate circumstances that Emperor Sanjō faced is considered "difficult to comprehend" precisely because Emperor

[135] Okami and Akamatsu, p. 178.

Sanjō's predecessors, in particular Kujō Kaneie and Michinaga, did a magnificent job serving the imperial line and maintaining order.

The preceding sections in volume 3 focused on the successful collaborations between the Fujiwara family and the imperial line and Jien reminds the reader of the miraculous incident in 967 when Emperor Reizei was successfully placed on the throne due to Lord Kujō Morosuke's sincere and devout prayers to the Buddhas and Kami. If Emperor Sanjō's immediate predecessors conducted their affairs properly and in a way that would accumulate good karma to assure the prosperity of their descendants, how does one explain the fact that Emperor Sanjō was born into a life of misfortune and illness of losing his eyesight, making him incapable of remaining on the throne? Were the prayers to the Buddhas and Kami ineffective? Were not the predecessors of Emperor Sanjō exemplary beacons of leadership that accumulated great karmic merit for their descendants? As a way to explain this turn of events that mark the first signs of the decline of the state, Jien suggests that the curse of Motokata's vengeful spirit was the cause of Emperor Sanjō's unfortunate fate:

> Motonaka's soul became vengeful because Motokata had died in disappointment over Prince Hirohira's failure to reach the throne. And due to the curse of Motokata's vengeful soul, Emperor Reizei abdicated in 969, after a reign of two years. Emperor Enyū's reign (969-984) went well, but the affairs of his successor, Emperor Kazan, were indescribably bad. *Did not Sanjō's misfortunes occur because Motokata's vengeful soul also wished to destroy him, a young brother of Kazan?* Only the lives—not the reigns—of Reizei and Kazan were rather long. (emphasis added)
>
> 廣平親王ハカヒナキ事ニテアリケルヲ。オモヒ死ニシテ悪霊トナリニケルニヤ。冷泉院ハ御物氣ニヨリテ。中一年ニテヲリサセ給ヒヌ。サテ円融院ノ御方メデタケレド。花山院ノ御事ナドアサマシト云モコトヲロカナリ。ソノ御弟ニテ三條院オハシマスヲ、イタヅラニナシマイラセントオモヒテ、

カカルヤウドモハ出キケルニヤ。サテ冷泉院・花山院ハアヤニク御命バカリハ長長トシテオハシマシケリ。[136]

While being a rather bold statement, Jien does not go into detail about this incident regarding the curse of the vengeful spirit of Fujiwara no Motokata 藤原元方 (888-953).[137] This is the first indication in Jien's narrative history where we see the suggestion that vengeful spirits may exert power and influence over the success or decline of members of the court. The question of how to deal with these vengeful spirits is addressed more explicitly however, in the case of the vengeful spirit of Fujiwara no Akimitsu 藤原顕光 (944-1021), particularly in the manner in which Michinaga was unsuccessful in comprehending the gravity of the issue:

> Seeing her tears fall into the ashes of the brazier as it made the coals sizzle, Akimitsu thought, "how it pains my heart" and through his deep despondence, eventually became a vengeful spirit. This is what people have claimed and it is entirely possible that this was the case. Now, while it is true that [strange] things happened around Michinaga due to this vengeful spirit, it was not to a serious degree. While one may say that this

[136] Brown and Ishida, p. 63. Okami and Akamatsu, p. 178.

[137] Perhaps a likely reason for this decision is because this incident was already quite well known among those in the court, perhaps by word of mouth, but also appearing in previous narrative histories such as the *Okagami* 大鏡 and *Eiga monogatari* 栄花物語（月の宴）. It is important, however, to think about what elements of these earlier "succession tales" he is incorporating into his own narrative history and what he is doing different. The differences seen in the way in which vengeful spirits are handled is particularly interesting to consider, as I will argue it is precisely related to Jien's intentions for composing the *Gukanshō*. The section on the "Legends of Morosuke" 師輔伝 in the *Okagami* includes some discussion regarding vengeful and malevolent spirits and here it goes into more detail regarding the process in which Motokata became a vengeful spirit. The fascination with malevolent spirits in the "Legends of Morosuke" section can be seen as adding dramatic effect to the re-telling of historical events, but also has the important function of elevating Morosuke's status by showing that he was endowed with superhuman powers that allowed him to combat malevolent spirits. As this account suggests, part of Morosuke's greatness was that he himself was able to take initiative and recite esoteric Buddhist dharanis to exorcize demons, with the implication of course that he did not have to rely upon Buddhist monks to do so. In this sense, Morosuke's position as a great protector of the family lineage is emphasized and the *Okagami* also suggests that he continued to serve as a protector even after his death. While the *Okagami* suggests that there were vengeful spirits that caused trouble to subsequent emperors and employs scenes of the appearance of malevolent spirits that disrupt court life, one could say that these were primarily used as a narrative tools to elevate the superhuman abilities of Morosuke, and when asked to answer why Morosuke didn't resolve the issues caused by vengeful spirits, the text refuses to elaborate on this any further.

> was a mistake on the part of Michinaga, he cannot be blamed for something as minor as this. He simply thought the matters of the world would head in a good direction and it was due to his optimistic and light hearted thinking that the vengeful spirit appeared.
>
> 火桶ノ火ノ灰ニウヅモレリケルガ。シハリシハリト鳴ケル。涙ノ落サセ給ヒケルガ。火ニカカリテナリケルヨト見テ。アナ心ウヤト悲ミフカクテ。ヤガテ悪霊トナリニケリトゾ人ハカタリ侍ルメル。サモアリヌベキ事ナリ。サレバ御堂ノ御アタリニハ。コノ例ハヤウヤウニ事モアリケレドモ。サマデノ大事ハエナキニヤ。コレラハ御堂ノ御トガトヤ申ベカランナレド。コレマデモスコシモ我ガアヤマチニハアラズ。タダ世ノ中ノアルヤウガ。カクテヨカルベクテナリユクトゾ。ウラウラトコソハ御堂ハヲボシメシケンヲ。アサクヲモイテ悪霊モイデクルナルベシ。[138]

There are two important things happening here in this short section about Akimitsu. The first indicates that the reason why Akimitsu turned into a vengeful spirit was due to strong emotional pain, suggesting to the reader that anyone who feels a sense of immense grudge could also potentially turn into a vengeful spirit. What is equally important, however, is how Jien talks about Michinaga's responsibility in dealing with this situation. It is suggested here that Michinaga may have had the opportunity to deal with the vengeful spirit while it was not yet a serious matter. This suggests that, in accordance with Jien's view of history in that follows gradual decline, that the power or influence of vengeful spirits, although insignificant at first, later would become a more difficult problem to deal with. It also suggests that while Michinaga was depicted as an ideal leader in volume 3, it is still significant that Jien depicts Michinaga here as one who was not capable of fully understanding the potential threat and influence that vengeful spirit would have on the future of the state. The implication that Jien is making is that this "light heartedness" by Michinaga, while it seemed harmless at the time, later

[138] Brown and Ishida, p. 69-70; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 186.

became something far more serious. Jien employs the same rhetoric when speaking about Retired Emperor Sutoku 崇徳院 (1119-1164) in volume 7 when he claims that things that initially seem to be a trivial matter, will eventually get out of hand and cause great destruction and disorder in the world if left untended. The important point Jien is makes here, and a point he will elaborate more in Volume 7, is that if the vengeful spirits are not properly dealt with, they will gradually become more powerful and cause great destruction to the state.

In another story Jien shares in his historical narrative, he illustrates that in order to counter the influence of these vengeful spirits, they must rely on someone with the ability to correctly ascertain the cause of misfortunes and to employ Buddhist rituals to prevent the potential destruction they may cause. As the story goes, Emperor Shirakawa wanted very much to have an imperial son by Morozane's adopted daughter Kenshi, and requested to the famous priest of Miidera, Raigō 頼豪 (1002-1084), to pray for the birth of their son. At this time, he promised Raigō that he would grant him any wish if he could give him a son. When they were successful after Raigō exerted himself in prayer, he requested to have an ordination hall built at Miidera. Emperor Shirakawa, understanding that this would cause great disputes between Miidera and Enryakuji, refused to grant him his wish to establish an ordination platform at Miidera.

> Raigō said, I was praying [for the son] with this request in mind. If it is not granted, I will die in disappointment. And when I die, the Imperial son which was born in response to my prayers will also die." Raigō then returned to Miidera and secluded himself in his Buddha-statue Hall.

カナヒ候マジクバ今ハ思ヒ死ニコソ候ナレ。死候ナバ祈リ出シマイラセテ候王子ハ取リマイラセ候ナンズトテ。三井ニ帰リ入テ持仏堂ニコモリ居ニケリ[139]

The implication of this story is that it was Emperor Shirakawa's broken promise to Raigō that was the cause of his grudge, and which led him to not only perform curse rituals during his lifetime that brought misfortune to Emperor Shirakawa, but also continued to cause trouble for his family as a vengeful spirit even after his death. In other words, while there was not anything implicitly wrong with what Emperor Shirakawa did in his decision to refuse the ordination platform, in fact, Jien seems to agree that this was a good decision. However, it was in Emperor Shirakawa's lack of ability to handle the situation well, and to foresee the consequences of his actions and treatment toward Raigō, that led to the great misfortunes that were caused by the ever-growing grudge of Raigō's spirit. Jien, however, also makes an important point here that the vengeful spirit of Raigō was eventually placated through the performance of Buddhist rituals:

> Retired Emperor Shirakawa had been extremely fond of his daughter, an Imperial Lady known as Yūhō-mon In, but the vengeful spirit of Raigō attached itself to her and cursed her. Although Zōyō and Ryūmei of Miidera prayed that the curse be removed, their prayers were not answered. So Shirakawa called Ryōshin of Mt. Hiei, who arrived at the palace with 20 priests that had resided at the Central Hall of Mt. Hiei for long periods of time. They prayed earnestly that the curse be removed; and their prayers were answered. Retired Emperor Shirakawa was delighted.
>
> 白川院御ムスメニ郁芳門院ト申女院ヲハシマシケルガ、イフバカリナクカナシウヲモヒマイラセラレタリケルニ、猶三井ノ頼豪ガ霊ノツキテ、御物ノ氣ヲコリケルヲ、三井ノ増誉、隆明ナド祈リ申ケレドカナハザリケレバ、山ノ良真ヲメシテ、中堂ノ久住者廿人グシテ参リテ、イミジク祈リヤメ参ラセテ、悦ビ思召ケル程ニ。[140]

[139] Brown and Ishida, p. 83; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 201.
[140] Brown and Ishida, p. 87; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 204.

This particular series of accounts related to Raigō is important to Jien's presentation of vengeful spirits, as it indicates that the most effective method or solution to the problems caused by vengeful spirits are the performance of Buddhist rituals. There is also a slight, and yet significant, suggestion here that the rituals associated with the Buddhist practitioners on Mt. Hiei (the Sanmon lineage to which Jien belonged) was more powerful than those of Miidera, and that the best rituals to deal with the problem of vengeful spirits are those practiced by those trained on Mt. Hiei. In this way, every time a vengeful spirit enters into the historical narrative, Jien provides the reader with gradually more information regarding the inherent dangers associated with these vengeful spirits, as well as hinting that there are potential ways to counter these threats. Another important element in the way Jien introduces vengeful spirits in his narrative is that when observed as a whole, the appearance of these vengeful spirits can be seen as gradually becoming a greater threat, with the Hōgen Rebellion marking a boiling point that indicates not only the beginning of a new era of disorder, but also, according to Jien, a turning point in history that produced two powerful vengeful spirits that significantly precipitated the deterioration of world order.

Two Great Vengeful Spirits as Outcome of the Hōgen Rebellion

Whereas the accounts of the vengeful spirits are dispersed throughout the narrative history, in volume 7, Jien clarifies to his readers that these seemingly random appearances of vengeful sprits should be viewed as operating under a "principle" of its

own and should be taken more seriously.[141] To elevate a sense of urgency, Jien points specifically to the vengeful spirits who he claims came into existence as the outcome of the Hōgen Rebellion. According to Jien, Retired Emperor Sutoku and Lord Uji Tadazane, who became vengeful spirits as the result of the Hōgen Rebellion, are introduced as having the power to "throw the state into disorder" and Jien also makes the startling claim that it was these two spirits that caused the fall of Lord Hoshoji Tadamichi's household:

> If we look closely at state affairs, we see that Lord Hoshoji Tadamichi's house was on the verge of being destroyed, since nothing was being done to appease the souls of Retired Emperor Sutoku and Lord Uji Tadazane. The early death of the 'interim lord' Konoe Motozane [in 1166], the things that happened to Lord Matsu Motofusa and Lord Kujo Kanezane, the frequent dismissals of Lord Konoe Motomichi, the destruction of Motomichi's house by his living on and playing around until the present day, and the things that were continuing to happen during the Go-Shirakawa administration were all certainly brought about by vengeful souls that were simply responding to, and bringing about the realization of, destructive Principles in these various ways.
>
> フカク世ヲ見ルニハ、讃岐院、知足院殿ノ霊ノ沙汰ノナクテ、タダ我ガ家ヲウシナハント云フ事ニテ、法性寺殿ハコナガラ余リニ器量ノ、手ガクベクモナケレバニヤ、ワガ御身ニハアナガチノ事モナシ。中ノ殿ノ疾ク失セザマ、松殿・九条殿ノ事ニ合ハレヤウ、コノイ殿ノタビタビ取ラレ給ヒテ、今マデ命ヲイケテ遊ビテコノ家ヲウシナハレヌル事ト、後白河一代明ケ暮レ事ニ遭ハセ給フコトナドハ、アラタニコノ怨霊モ何モタダ道理ヲ得ル方ノコタフル事ニテ侍ルナリ。[142]

Jien continues to explain that even greater disasters could have happened as a result of the lack of proper care of these vengeful spirits, but that this was luckily averted due to the fact that Kujō Tadamichi (1097-1164) had a "superior ability" that made it impossible

[141] Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō to sono zengo* 愚管抄とその前後. Osaka : Izumi Shoin 和泉書院, 1993. p. 119-140.
[142] Brown and Ishida, p. 220; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 338.

for the vengeful soul of his father to affect him. This does not mean, however, that the threat of the vengeful spirits was not there. On the contrary, it suggests that while the state was fortunate enough to have an individual with the "superior ability" (unsurprisingly someone from the Kujō family) to keep the vengeful spirits at bay, the threat would be only return after his death. As indicated in the quote here, Jien lists various strange events that happened since the Hōgen Rebellion, suggesting that the various misfortunes that experienced by the Fujiwara family were, in fact, caused by the destructive principles of vengeful spirits. Furthermore, the urgency of the situation and the palpable influence of vengeful spirits as related directly to the decline of the Fujiwara family is also expressed through Jien's claim that there were specific members within the Fujiwara family that were under the influence of these malevolent vengeful spirits:

> While Lord Konoe Motomichi and Lord Konoe Iezane were born into a regental house and held the position of Regent or Chancellor, they knew, heard, saw, or learned absolutely nothing about either state administration or house customs. Furthermore, they gained possession of deeds to the land of the regental house but lost, and never recovered, most of them. Because these two Konoe lords have not yet been destroyed and are still living, it seems clear that we are in an age when the fish and water relationship between sovereign and his Regent or Chancellor has really disappeared. And yet, the powerful and correct way by which Lord Kujo Kanezane—recently known to both sovereigns and ministers—considered state affairs was willed by the ancestral Kami of the Imperial House and of the Fujiwara and Minamoto clans. Should we not therefore continue to follow that way?"...
>
> Konoe Motomichi was a man who, knowing nothing at all and being childishly foolish, was promoted from Middle Commander (Second Rank) to the nominal position of Chancellor [in 1179] as a result of the rebellion by which the Taira Shogun really threw the state into turmoil. Is it in accord with the will of the Great Hachiman Bodhisattva that the question of "house disgrace" is raised by a man who is so stupid that he does not know that *he is being purposefully protected by a vengeful soul* and

allowed to live long in order to destroy his own house? It is a situation beyond the reach of words!" (empahsis added)

近衛殿ト云フ父子ノ、家ニハ生マレテ、職ニハ居ナガラ、ツヤツヤト掻イ払ヒテ、世ノヤウヲモ家ノ習ヒヲモ、スベテ知ラズ、聞カズ、見ズ、習ハヌ人ニテ、シカモ家領文書カカヘテ、カク取ラレヌ、返サレヌシテ、イマダ失セズ死ナデオハスルニテ、ヒシト世ハ王臣ノ道ハ失セ果テヌルニテ侍ルヨト、サハサハト見ユル也。ソレニ、王モ臣モマヂカキ九条殿ノ世ノ事ヲ、思ハレタリシ。力ノ正道ナル方ハ、宗廟社稷ノ本ナレバ、ソレガ通ルベキニヤ。。。平将軍ガ乱世ニ成リ定マル謀反ノ詮ニ、二位中将ヨリ、ツヤツヤ物モ知ラヌ人ノワカワカオロカオロカトシタルニ、摂籙ノ臣ノ名バカリサヅケラレテ、怨霊ニワザト守ラレテ、ワガ家ウシナハンレウニ久シクイキタルゾト、エ思ヒシラヌ程ノ身ニシテ、「家ノハヂ也」ナドイハバヤ、大菩薩ノ御心ニ適フベキ。「言フニ足ラズ」ト云フハコレナリ。[143]

As discussed in Chapter 1, Jien is writing the *Gukanshō* at a pivitoal moment in the rivalry between the different lineages of the Fujiwara family, particularly between the Kujō lineage to which Jien belonged and the Konoe lineage that Jien harshly criticizes here. Considering the underlying theme of the ideal form of governance as the co-dependence of the Regent and Imperial families and the idea that vengeful spirits were responsible for the dismantling of this form of order, this suggestion here that the Konoe family are "being protected by vengeful spirits" should not be taken lightly. It is not an accident that the "principle of vengeful spirits" is discussed in further detail in the concluding sections of the *Gukanshō.*

The Principle of Vengeful Spirits

While these accounts of the vengeful spirits in the *Gukanshō* may seem dispersed, appearing randomly throughout the historical narrative, Jien brings them together under the umbrella of the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits" in volume 7, the final

[143] Brown and Ishida, p. 217-218; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 335-336.

volume of the *Gukanshō.* In fact, regarding the purpose of this particular section of the *Gukanshō*, Jien says that whereas the in the previous sections, he simply listed out events that came to maind about examples of Principles that change from reign to reign, the purpose of the final section is to "summarize those Principles and to point to the essence of their meaning" (ソレヲ又ヲシフサネテソノ心ノ詮ヲ申シアラハサントヲモフ).[144] In this sense, the final volume acts very much like a commentary that attempts to "make sense" of the historical narrative that runs through volumes 3-6.

It is in volume 7 that Jien makes a clear case that these seemingly insignificant events of the vengeful spirits are part of a larger impending threat that needs to be addressed. In what I see is the most important passage in the entire work, Jien reiterates the reasons for writing this treatise and provides a specific answer to this critical question that is driving the his historical project: what kind of governing structure is most appropriate and necessary to deal with the current disorderly state of affairs at a time of *mappō* when there are no good Principles to rely on? Here is Jien's answer to this question:

> It is because it is difficult for people to correctly perceive how the world changes and how the Principle of things evolve that I have decided to write about this, but even those who read this, if they do not put this into their heart, my message will be in vain. Then what should we do about this? Indeed, the way I see it, should not the Regent Family and Military Family come together as one, and through the combination of learning and military might to protect the world and to be in assistance to the Emperor? In order to do this, we must recall the events of the past and reflect upon the preset, and bringing oneself to the correct state of mind, be mindful of the path of removing evil and returning to right intentions. First and foremost, one must deeply suspect whether this [appointment of the next Shogun from the Regent/Chancellor house] was according to the plan of

[144] Brown and Ishida, p. 203; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 322.

> the Great Bodhisattva or was the doing of *tengu* and *chigu*. In relation to this suspicion, since ancient times it is the *principle of vengeful spirits* to destroy the world and bring ruin to people and one should first offer prayers to the Buddhas and Kami.
>
> スコシハ、世ノ移リ物ノ道理ノ変ハリ行クヤウハ、人コレヲワキマヘガタケレバ、ソノレウニコレハ書キ付ケ侍レド、コレヲ見ム人モ我ガ心ニ入レ心ニ入レセンズレバ、サラニカナフマジ。コハイカガシ侍ルベキ。サレバ摂籙家ト武士家トヲ一ツニナシテ、文武兼行シテ世ヲ守リ、君ヲウシロミ参ラスベキニ成リヌルカト見ユルナリ。コレニツキテ昔ヲ思ヒ出デ今ヲカヘリミテ、シヤウイニ落トシ据エテ、邪ヲ捨テ正ニ帰スル道ヲヒシト心得ベキニアヒ成リテ侍ルゾカシ。先ヅコレニツキテ、是ハ一定大菩薩ノ御計ラヒカ、天狗・地狗ノ又仕業カト深ク疑フベシ。コノ疑ヒニツキテ、昔ヨリ怨霊ト云フ物ノ世ヲ失ヒ人ヲ滅ボス道理ノ一ツ侍ルヲ、先ヅ仏神ニ祈ラルベキナリ。[145]

In addition to the plea that the regent and emperor work together with the cooperation of the military family to maintain world order, Jien insists that it is important more than ever to be able to correctly perceive the working of the gods and supernatural and directly related to this claim is the suggestion of the necessity to first and foremost pray to the Gods and Buddhas. What is perhaps an interesting detail that has not been stressed enough in previous readings of the *Gukanshō* is how this presentation of the ideal form of governance and "principle" is followed immediately by a discussion of the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits" (*onryō no dōri* 怨霊の道理). Here Jien provides a summary of the specific examples of vengeful spirits that appeared quite randomly throughout his historical narrative. The cause of Consultant Fujiwara no Momokawa's death is said to have been Princess Ikami enacting revenge for his decision to install Emperor Kanmu as the Crown Prince and especially for the anger that accumulated as she was incarcerated in a pit following a dispute over Emperor Kōnin's successor. The death of

[145] Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 336-337.

Junior Counselor Noritaka is explained as being the caused by the vengeful spirit of Middle Counselor Fujiwara Asahira. Noritaka's father, Regent Fujiwara Koretada (924-972), and Asahira is said to have had a nasty dispute that involved Asahira slandering Koretada when they were both competing for a promotion. Years later, when Asahira requested Koretada for a promotion, Koretada denied it based on their personal feud, causing Asahira great anger and turning him into a vengeful spirit. Emperor Reizei is said to have been possessed by Senior Counselor Fujiwara Motokata and Fujiwara Michinaga possessed by the vengeful spirit of Minister Fujiwara Akimitsu, also both regarding disputes regarding succession. By listing out these examples, Jien is suggesting to the reader that there is a certain "principle" to the way in which vengeful spirits appear. He suggests, as he did before, that vengeful spirits arise out of a sense of grudge one has towards another person. These vengeful spirits were also the cause of great misfortune to the possessed, often causing death or illness to the individual or to their close family members. Importantly, Jien follows this discussion of the various examples of vengeful spirits by suggesting that while there has been misfortune brought to individuals within the Fujiwara lineage in the past, that the Regents were never completely destroyed by these vengeful spirits. The reason for this, according to Jien, was due to the continued protection by the Buddhist Law and capable Buddhist practitioners:

> Nevertheless, Regents did not suffer from excessive destruction by such soul possession, since Buddha Law was prospering and many Buddhist priests were wise and well trained in austerities. By sincerely trusting honored priests, people received the blessings of the Three Treasures of Buddhism. We hear that there was such trust by Lord Kujō Fujiwara Morosuke in Grand Preceptor Ji'e, by Fujiwara Michinaga in Kyōen (Abbot

> of the Sanmai Hall) and Kyōmyō (Abbot of Mudō Temple), and by Fujiwara Yorimichi in Myōson (High Priest Shiga).
>
> サレドモ仏法ト云フモノノ盛リニテ、智行ノ僧多カレバ、カヤウノ事ハタタレドモ、事ノホカナル事ヲバ防グメリ。マメヤカニ心底ヨリタウトキ僧ヲ頼ミテ、三宝ノ益ヲバ得ル也。九条殿ハ慈恵大師、御堂ハ三昧和尚・無動寺座主、宇治殿ハ滋賀僧正ナド、カヤウニ聞コユメリ。[146]

It is important to note that all of the priests listed here previously served as Tendai Abbots and it is clear that he is favoring his own Tendai lineage over other Buddhist lineages, again highlighting that the Sanmon lineages specifically will offer the best protection from the impending threat of the vengeful spirits. However, while Jien claimed that the destructive powers of the vengeful spirits were subdued in the past through the help of capable Buddhist priests, he also points out that things the influence of vengeful spirits continue to grow.

As seen above, according to Jien the reason why Lord Hōshōji Tadamichi's house was heading toward the verge of destruction is because the vengeful spirits of Retired Emperor Sutoku and Lord Uji Tadazane had not been properly placated. It is almost as if Jien is suggesting that without a correct understanding of how these destructive vengeful spirits operate, one will not be able to effectively restore order in the world. Jien, speaking with a voice of authority, emphasizes a sense of urgency by suggesting that it is the very nature of a vengeful spirit to cause disorder and that they will infiltrate both the "visible" and "invisible" realms if left unchecked:

> In this human world there is necessarily the misery of resentment and hatred. Therefore, if a person abuses a superior excessively—even with a single word—he will be killed then and there by some powerful blow. The main point about a vengeful soul is that it bears a deep grudge and makes

[146] Brown and Ishida, pp. 219-220. Okami and Akamatsu, p. 338.

> those who caused the grudge objects of its revenge even while the resentful person is still alive. When the vengeful soul is seeking to destroy the objects of its resentment—all the way from small houses to the state as a whole—the state is thrown into disorder by the slanders and lies it generates. The destruction of the people is brought about in exactly the same way. And if the vengeful soul is unable to obtain its revenge while in the visible world, it will do so from the realm of the invisible.
>
> 人間界ニハ怨憎会苦、カナラズ果タストコロナリ。タダロニテ一言、ワレニマサリタル人ヲ過分ニ放言シツレバ、当座ニムズトツキコロシテ命ヲウシナハルルナリ。怨霊ト云フハ、センハタダ現世ナガラ深ク意趣ヲ結ビテカタキニ取リテ、小家ヨリ天下ニモ及ビテ、ソノ敵ヲ掘リマロバカサントシテ、讒言空事ヲツクリイダスニテ、世ノミダレ又人ノ損ズル事ハタダ同ジ事ナリ。顕ニソノムクヒヲ果タサネバ冥ニナルバカリナリ。[147]

The emphasis here on the influence of vengeful spirits in the destruction of social order helps the reader make sense of the historical narrative that Jien presented through volumes 3-6, particularly in understanding what caused and precipitated disorder and destruction in the world. These passages show that vengeful spirits occupy a central place in Jien's discourse of disorder and the inclusion of vengeful spirits, far from being just "odd factors" and a "reflection of the beliefs of Jien's times" as suggested in previous scholarship, should be recognized as fundamental pieces in understanding not only Jien's worldview, but his motivations for composing the *Gukanshō*. For Jien, the world is composed by a dynamic interaction between the "visible" realms of human political activities that is intricately intertwined with the agents of the "invisible" realm. In other words, a central point the *Gukanshō* makes in addition to the political and pragmatic advice Jien may have, is this notion that as long as these vengeful spirits are not correctly dealt with, the world will continue to head toward destruction.

[147] Brown and Ishida, pp. 220-1; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 339.

Another point that Jien suggests in his discussion of the vengeful spirits in volume 7 is the unfortunate reality that both even the most qualified regents and sovereigns of the past did not fully grasp the gravity of the situation and failed to take the proper measures to prevent the vengeful spirits from causing further damage. In other words, although the appearance of vengeful spirits may seem like disparate, unrelated events in the narrative history that Jien provides through volume 3-6, Jien not only suggests that there is a certain "Principle" at work with these vengeful spirits, he is also claiming that he is the first person to have a profound understanding of these principles and is using the *Gukanshō* as a revelatory text to share this knowledge of the "unseen" realms.

If we recall the discussion of vengeful spirits in volume 7, Jien suggested that the vengeful spirit of Retired Emperor Sutoku caused the state to head into great disorder. After Jien lists the number of misfortunes that were caused by Retired Emperor Sutoku's vengeful spirits, Jien makes a clear point that this could have been prevented if proper measures were taken to placate his spirit:

> At first each incident seems to have been quite ordinary but became serious later on. If Sutoku had been called back from exile, allowed to live on in the capital, granted a province, and permitted to compose poems and do good deeds (accumulate merit through Buddhist deeds), probably such incidents would not have occured. Likewise, if Tadamichi had asked to take care of his father and then had him placed in the Jōraku Cloister at Uji, given him some estates, and let him—like Sutoku—enjoy himself playing musical instruments, such things might not have happened. But Tadamichi undoubtedly thought it had been a real achievement to keep his father Tadazane from being exiled. That was a proper conclusion to draw, and so Tadazane's curse did not affect Tadamichi. But such terrible things happened later on because Tadamichi, in his handling of things, did not think deeply about the way to quiet his father's vengeful soul.

> 一ト当タリハタダ易々トアル事ノ、一大事ニハナル也。讃岐ヨリ呼ビ返シ参ラセテ、京ニ置キ奉リテ、国一ツナド参ラセテ、「御作善候ベシ」ナドニテ歌ウチ詠マセ参ラセテアラマシカバ、カウ程ノ事アルマジ。知足院殿ヲモ申シ受ケテ、法性寺殿ノ御沙汰ニハ、宇治ノ常楽院ニ据ヱ申シテ、イマ少シ庄ドモモ参ラセテ、同ジク遊ビシテ管絃モテナシテオハシマサマシカバ、カウ程ノ事ハアルマジキ也。法性寺殿ハ我ガ親ナレバ、流刑ノナキコソソマウノ事ト思ハレタリケルニヤ。ソレモ言ハレタレド、我身ニアラタナル祟リハナケレドモ、イカニ物ノ計ラヒハ、コレ程ノヤウヲ深ク思ヒ解カヌ所ニ、事ハ出デ来ルナリ。[148]

Although Jien suggests that Tadamichi's handling of the vengeful spirits were insufficient, he doesn't place direct blame on him. Considering that Tadamichi was Jien's father, this lack of direct criticism toward his father is expected, but the subtle nuance, that there are certain things that *could have* or *should have* been done is a significant point that Jien makes here. In other words, tthere is also the suggestion here that as long as there is someone who can correctly guide the regents and the emperors in understanding the good and evil principles that govern the world, there are measures that can be taken to prevent these vengeful spirits from doing further damage.

In other words, it appears like there is a certain logic to the way Jien presents his discussion of vengeful spirits. If these vengeful spirits are not properly dealt with, they will continue to cause destruction to their opponents, eventually elevating to cause disorder to the world. The lack of proper dealing with vengeful spirits of Lord Motokata, Akimitsu, and Raigō, all contributed to the weakening of the Fujiwara Regency and the rise of the "*musha no yo*" with the Hōgen Rebellion. Likewise, the lack of proper care of Emperor Sutoku and Tadazane eventually lead to the misfortunes that continued to occur to the Fujiwara families and without proper intervention of Buddhist rituals to

[148] Brown and Ishida, p. 220; Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 338-339.

placate these vengeful spirits, they will continue to cause damage for the state. However, all of this discussion of the role of the vengeful spirit to the inevitable decline and destruction of the state leads up to an important point Jien makes regarding the solusion to this "problem of the vengeful spirit." A crucial part of Jien's solution to restore order is for the sovereign to rely, not only on trusted advisors on these matters, but also to support religious and ritual means to effectively counter the threat of vengeful spirits.

Conclusion

If we look to the concluding sections of the *Gukanshō,* Jien elaborates on this particular issue of the influence of vengeful spirits by explaining that there are both "good" and "evil" principles that govern the world. For Jien, the "evil" principle referred specifically to what he calls the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits" (*onryō no dōri* 怨霊の道理). Examples of historical figures in the *Gukanshō* who Jien claims have become vengeful spirits include Fujiwara no Motokata, Fujiwara no Akimitsu, the Buddhist priest Raigō, Fujiwara no Tadazane, and Emperor Sutoku. These figures were dispersed throughout Jien's historical narrative, but what links them together is that they are all viewed as contributing to the gradual decline of imperial authority, which according to Jien, would inevitably lead to social instability. Furthermore, Jien suggests throughout the *Gukanshō* that more should have been done to pacify these vengeful spirits after their death, and that it was due to a lack of proper postmortem care that allowed the negative influence of these spirits to change the course of history. According to Jien, vengeful spirits have a natural propensity to cause disorder and, importantly, the only way this disorder can

be countered is through the various “principles of the Buddhist teachings,” which Jien describes as “removing evil and grasping the good” (*shaaku jizen* 遮悪持善), and this language, as we will see in the next chapter, will resonate with the rhetoric he used in his stated vow when establishing his ritual program at *Daisangehōin*. In other words, the severity of the “problem” of vengeful spirits that Jien emphasized in his writings go hand-in-hand with his claim that it is his ritual program alone that can be relied on as the “solution” that would bring back peace to the realm. Jien’s craft as a historian should not be assessed by the quality of his writing based on modern notions of historicity, but rather in his ability to weave into his historical narrative the presence of vengeful spirits as agents of historical change. In this sense, the *Gukanshō* should be read as a dominantly religious discourse that emphasizes the necessity of ritual means in maintaining order in the world. In the next chapter, I will elaborate more on this point, focusing on how Jien projects his own persona as a Buddhist ritualist within the historical narrative of the *Gukanshō* and to show how his historical project has important intersections with the ritual program he established at the *Daisangehōin* in the proximity of the Heian capital.

Chapter 4:

Jien's Self-Image and the Intersections Between Historical Writing and Ritual

Introduction

When we re-assess the *Gukanshō* with this underlying issue of the "Principle of Vengeful Spirits" in mind, we can start to see how Jien often speaks of a "wise" and clairvoyant person who is capable of deciphering the "unknown realms" as someone who is necessary to assist the sovereign in practicing good governance and maintaining order. Specifically, Jien talks about the "wise ones" who are able to perceive the principles that govern the world, suggesting that he should be considered as being in the category of these "truly wise men":

> In general the destiny of man (high and low) and the time fate (*jiun*) of the three ages (of past, present, and future) move spontaneously and naturally (*hōni jinen*) [toward deterioration]. Consequently some will think that there is no reason to accept what I have written here, even though I have thought about and fitted things together carefully in this way. But Principles of cause and effect in the past, present, and future have definitely been created. These Principles, and the time fate of the three ages moving toward deterioration spontaneously and naturally, were created together from the beginning. So although there is deterioration, there is also improvement. When a truly wise man really comprehends the great power of these Principles, he will know developments before they occur without the slightest mistake—like one who is able to know the feelings of others and to predict the future. By such comprehension, all wise men—beginning with Confucius and Lao Tsu—have spoken of events before they took place. Even in this deteriorated age a slightly intelligent person will be able to do likewise if he thinks and reflects about things. We hear that a state in which such men are used will be governed well, but that when the state is taken over by persons who are not like that, and who only handle matters with which they are immediately confronted, the state will simply be subjected to deterioration that leads to destruction.
>
> 大方ハ上下ノ人ノ運命モ三世ノ時運モ。法爾自然ニウツリユク事ナレバ。イミジクカヤウニ思ヒアハスルモイハレズト思フ人モアルベケレド。三世ニ因果ノ道理ト云物ヲヒシトヲキツレバ。ソノ道理ト法爾ノ時運トノモトヨリヒシトツクリ合セラレテ。流レ下リモエノボル事ニテ侍也。ソレヲ智フカキ人ハコノコトハリノアザヤカナルヲヒシト心ヘツレバ。他心智未来智ナドヲエタランヤウニ。少シモタガハズカネテモ知ラルル也。漢家ノ聖人ト云孔子老子ヨリハジメテ。皆コノ定ニカネテ云アツル也。コノ世ニモ

> スコシカシコキ人ノ物ヲ思ヒハカラフハ。随分ニハサノミコソ候へ。サル人モチイラルル世ハヲサマリ。サナキ人ノタダサシムカイタル事バカリヲノミサタスル人ノ世ヲトリタル時ハ。世ハタダウセニヲトロへマカルトコソハウケ玉ハレ。[149]

After explaining the most devastating event for imperial family (the loss of the imperial sword) Jien reassures the reader that due to the principle of things, that there still is a potential for things to get better. However, what is needed is a reliance on a clairvoyant person who is endowed with the ability to see things as they truly are, to grasp both the "visible" and "invisible" principles that dictate the world. When understood in this light, Jien's entire historical project can be read as an attempt to illustrate how the deterioration of order was caused by both visible and invisible factors, and providing advice on how to restore order based on the understanding of these "visible" and "invisible" principles.

Jien's Self-Image as the "Capable Priest"

As we have seen above, the solution to the problem of disorder according to Jien included both political and religious means. One way that we saw this expressed in concrete terms was the way Jien advised the sovereign to economically support religious institutions as a way to prevent evil spirits from causing further destruction in the world. In addition to this advise to support religious institutions, the suggestion that it is necessary to have a trustworthy advisor close to the sovereign who is capable of correctly perceiving both the "seen" and "unseen" principles of the world. In volume 7,

[149] Brown and Ishida, pp. 144-5; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 266.

Jien expresses great remorse over the fact that regardless of the fact that a trusted advisor is needed more than ever in the age of decline, it is also marked with a dearth of capable priests:

> No priest with any style whatsoever has appeared at Mt. Hiei since the time of Gyōnen (Abbot of the Shōren Cloister). And more than 60 years have elapsed since his death [in 1155]. Furthermore, we have heard of absolutely no able priests at Miidera since the time of Gyōkei (1105-65) and Kakuchū (1118-77). And as for the Tōji temples, able priest of royal blood existed at Ninna Temple down through the time of Kakushō (1129-69), the fifth son of Emperor Toba. We have heard that the Abbots of Tōji included such good priests as Kanjo (1057-1125) and Kanshin (1084-1153); and when Tōji was prospering, Rishō and Sanmitsu were famous. At temples in the southern capital of Nara there has been no priest of any worth since the exile of Buddhist Judge Eshin. We have heard that Kakuchin (d. 1175) was not bad. And yet, former Senior High Priest Shin'en (1153-1224), one of Lord Hōshōji Tadamichi's sons, should have the ability of a high-ranking man. And is not Shin'en's young brother, Senior High Priest Jien, still living at Mt. Hiei? So what should be done in this age? In reflecting about the deficiencies of man, I simply become depressed and have no confidence that my expectations will be realized. So I now wish only for an immediate and quick death and for correct thoughts in these last moments of life.
>
> 僧中ニハ、山ニハ青蓮院座主ノ後ハ、イササカモ匂フベキ人ナシ。失セテ後六十年ニ多クアマリヌ。寺ニハ行慶・覚忠ノ後、又ツヤツヤト聞コエズ。御室ニハ五宮マデ也。東寺長者ノ中ニハ、寛助・寛信ナド云フ人コソ聞コエケレ。サカリザマニハ理性・三密ナドハ名誉アリケリ。南京方ニハ恵信法務流サレテ後ハ、タレコソナド申スベキ。寸法ニモ及バズ。覚珍ゾ悪シウモ聞コエヌ。中々当時法性寺殿ノ子ニテ残リタル信円前大僧正、上ナル人ノ匂ヒニモ成リヌベキニコソ。又慈円大僧正弟ニテ山ニハ残リタルニヤ。[150]

Now, while this passage ends with words of despair, what Jien is implying to the reader is clear. Although there is a lack of capable priests in the current age within all the various Buddhist institutions to effectively deal with the threat of vengeful spirits, there are only a couple people who are equipped with the task: Jien's elder brother Shin'en

[150] Brown and Ishida, pp. 235-236; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 353.

and himself. In his plea to find a capable Buddhist priest to deal with the troubles that face the leaders it is clear that he is promoting his own lineage and himself as the only reliable people to effectively restore order in the world. While it is not stated directly here, if we look back at how the various Buddhist institutions are discussed throughout the text, Jien consistently depicts his own lineage in a favorable light, while specifying that inability of others.[151] In this sense, the *Gukanshō,* far from being the historical text that was meant to "enlightened the masses" as has been suggested in the past, should be seen as a treatise that was written not only to legitimize the Kujō family as the most capable regent family to restore order, but also to promote the monks on Mt. Hiei, and specifically himself, as the religious professionals to deal with the problem of vengeful spirits. This is further indicated by the specific ways in which Jien presents his self-image in the text. In the middle of the historical narrative, Jien writes a rather detailed account of how he played a crucial role in resolving an issue that faced the court in which there was unusual activity in the heavens:

> During the spring of that year [of 1206 when Lord Yoshitsune died], a great change had occurred in the heavens, one referred to as "the meeting of the stars." With great fear, astrologers reported this to the throne. High Priest Jien was then at the Itsutsuji Palace, where Retired Emperor Go-Toba was temporarily residing, and was beginning to conduct a carefully arranged Yakushi Rite. The three stars (Venus, Jupiter, and Mars) appeared every evening in the western sky, invading each other's spheres. When it was raining, the stars could not be seen; but when the sky cleared, they would re-appear in strange positions. Again, rain would fall and the stars would be hidden. This went on four or five days. People thought it

[151] Examples of sections that illustrate Jien's biases and promotion of his own lineage: 1) Story of the vengeful spirit of Raigo: Miidera priests were ineffective to subdue the vengeful spirit, where Sanmon priest was. 2) Depiction of Buddhist monk whose mind was overtaken by demons, 3) Jien as particularly hostile and critical of "Pure Land" followers as the proponents of "evil teachings." 4) sections where Jien depicts himself and his own lineage in favorable light: a) Jien successfully dealing with vengeful spirit that was afflicting Emperor.

fortunate if the sky did not clear for a while. But when the rain stopped, the stars would be seen still invading each other's spheres. The sky clouded up again on the third day, and from morning until night it looked like rain. After dusk on that day, and while the High Priest [Jien] was offering up incantations, a light rain fortunately fell, and at dawn a report was sent to the throne that the three stars had moved away from each other. And not long afterward, Lord Yoshitsune suddenly died.

An astrologer by the name of Harumitsu explained the phenomenon in this way: "The confluence of the three stars is connected with a great sovereign crisis. The three stars jostled each other but have finally returned to their normal positions because [Go-Toba's] crisis was transferred to Lord Yoshitsune." Probably the vengeful spirit [of Tadazane] was also active at the time. Go-Toba was especially pleased with the [Yakushi] Rite that had been conducted by Jien, and he did such things as offer promotions and awards to participating priests. People expressed such thoughts as these: "No matter how we look at it, the death of Lord Yoshitsune is a regrettable development of the Final Age. How sad it is to have a time fate that such good men are not to remain alive." People felt generally that the deaths of Minister of the Center Kujō Yoshimichi and this Regent Kujō Yoshitsune showed that the vengeful spirit of Tadazane (Lord Chisoku-in) was still taking its revenge against the descendants of Tadamichi (Lord Hōshō-ji). Between and including Tadamichi and Yoshitsune, seven different men had been appointed Regent or Chancellor. If only they had had it in their hearts to earnestly help Tadazane's soul to achieve Buddhahood after death, probably such disasters would not have occurred. Alas, if there had been only two or three officials who had been sincerely thinking about the Principles of things, probably there would have been some confidence [about the future.]

コノ春三星合トテ大事ナル天変ノアリケル。司天ノ輩大ニヲヂ申ケルニ。ソノ間慈円僧正五辻ト云テシバシナリケル御所ニテ。取ツクロイタル薬師ノ御修法ヲハジメラレタリケル。修中ニコノ変ハアリケリ。太白木星火星トナリ。西ノ方ニヨヒヨヒニスデニ犯分ニ三合ノヨリアイタリケルニ。雨フリテ消ニケリ。又晴テミエケルニミヘテハヤガテ雨フリテキエフリテキエ四五日シテ。シバシ晴ザリケレバ。メデタキ事カナニテアリケル程ニ。ソノ雨ハレテナヲ犯分ノカヌ程ニテ現ジタリケルヲ。サテ第三日ニ又クモリテ。朝ヨリ夜ニ入ルマデ雨ヲ惜ミテアリケリ。イカバカリ僧正モ祈念シケンニ。夜ニ入テ雨シメジメトメデタクフリテ。ツトメテ消エ候ヌト奏シテケリ。サテ其雨ハレテ後ハ犯分トヲクサリテ。コノ大事変ツイニ消ニケリ。サテホドナクコノ殿ノ頓死セラレニケルヲバ。晴光ト云天文博士ハ。一定コノ三星合ハ君ノ御大事ニテ候ツルガ。ツイニカラカイテ消エ候ニシカ。殿下ニトリカヘ参ラセラレニケルニトコソタシカニ申ケレ。コノヲリ

フシニサシ合セ。怨霊モ力ヲエケントヲボユルニナン。ソノ御修法ハコトニ叡感有テ勤賞ナドヲコナハレニケリ。サテイカサマニモコノ殿下ノ死ナレタル事ハ。世ノ末ノ口ヲシサ。カカル人ヲエモタフマジキ時運悲シキ哉ト人思ヘリケリ。大方故内大臣良通。コノ摂政カカル死ドモセラレヌル事ハ。猶法性寺殿ノスエニカカリケル事ノ人ノイデクルヲ。知足院殿ノ悪霊ノシツルゾトコソハ人ハ思ヘリケレ。法性寺殿ヨリコノ摂政マデ七人ニナリヌルニコソ。其霊ノ後世菩提マメヤカニタスケトブラフ心シタル人ダニアラバ。今ハカウホドノ事ハヨモアラジカシ。アハレ事ノ道理マコトシク思ヒタル臣下ダニモ二三人世ノ中ニアラバ。スコシハタノモシカリナンモノヲ。[152]

Although there is a lot to uncover in this passage, the most significant is Jien's emphasis here that major disasters could have been prevented had Tadazane's spirit been properly pacified and lead to enlightenment. Also notable is the way Jien situates himself against the astrologer (*onmyoji*) and the way Jien emphasizes the visibility of the stars. Whereas the *onmyoji* is limited in his assessment of the situation based on his "visibility" of the position of the stars, which he simply states is "a great sovereign crisis," it is implied here that Jien, through his performance of the Yakushi Rite (regardless of his visibility of the stars), was able to have a sharper perceptions into the dealings of "unseen" actors. His insight into the workings of Tadazane's vengeful spirit as the cause of this crisis suggests that Jien was able to grasp a deeper understanding of the crisis at hand. His final remarks suggesting that the situation would have been easier to handle, had there been a few more officials who shared the knowledge of the Principle of Vengeful Spirits, can be read as Jien's advice on how a sovereign might be able to handle a similar situation in the future.

Jien's attempt to promote himself as a trustworthy advisor is also blatantly seen in the following section that focuses on his correspondence with the previous Retired

[152] Brown and Ishida, pp. 167-8; Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 289-290.

Emperor Go-Toba regarding the vengeful spirit of previous Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa. As Jien explains, there was an incident around the year 1206 in which rumors were spread that the previous Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa's vengeful spirit attached itself to the wife of priest Nakakuni, a man who had previously served the deceased Go-Shirakawa. In response to these rumors, Jien tells the story of how he, as someone "truly trusted by the Retired Emperor," wrote a letter to the Prime Minister Yorizane to clarify the situation.

> Why do we do such a thing [as decide to build a shrine] because we hear reports [that a woman has been possessed by Go-Shirakawa's spirit]? Certainly there have been many cases [of shrines being build to pacify a vengeful spirit]. But has Go-Shirakawa's spirit become vengeful because of something done by Retired Emperor Go-Toba? And should the deceased Go-Shirakawa's spirit be considered a manifestation of the Great Hachiman Bodhisattva and honored as an ancestral Kami of the Imperial House? Have there been signs of miraculous power? Have not such things occurred because people have believed what persons—possessed only by foxes (*yakan*) and demons (*tengu*)—have said? Due to such beliefs, the idea of building a shrine has already been heard by everyone in the capital, and a proposal to build it near the Imperial Palace has been reported. In reflecting about these developments, I have the feeling that I see crazy people—shamans (*miko*), mediums (*kōnagi*), dancers (*mai*), and comic dancers (*sarugō*), as well as coppersmiths and the like, all low-ranking people who served near the deceased Retired Emperor—exerting their influence over this woman [for their own selfish purposes]. The state is now going to ruin! Nevertheless, if it is still felt that such a shrine should be built, we should first ascertain the truth by having Imperial prayers sincerely offered." When Retired Emerpor Go-Toba heard these views, he immediately said: "I too think that way! Jien has made a fine statement!" His Majesty quickly held a serious discussion [with Jien] about the matter. Then when Go-Toba asks Jien for his advice regarding whether Nakakuni and his wife should be exiled, Jien says, "If Nakakuni and his wife have said what was in their own hearts without being at all possessed by foxes and badgers, they should of course be punished, even with exile. But we should not conclude that they have done this simply because they are strange. At an earlier time, the wife of a man named Kanenaka said strange things [but was judged to be insane]. Because there have always been foxes and demons that will take

possession of crazy people, some persons have come to think that, because the state is disturbed, they can realize their heart-felt desire to have themselves worshipped. We have heard stories, in past as well as at present, of efforts to comfort such crazy persons. And there are cases of actual possession. That is, some have developed the sickness of possession. But since punishment should not be meted out from above simply because a person is ill, we should place Nakakuni and his wife in isolation and pay no attention to what they say. Then the fox or badger will soon remove without a sound. Therefore you should simply wait and see what happens." Retired Emperor Go-Toba said that High Priest Jien had spoken well, and the matter was dealt with as Jien recommended.

コハイカニ候事哉。先如此ノ事ハ怨霊トサダメラレタル人ニトリテコソサル例ヲホク候へ。故院ノ怨霊ニ君ノタメナラセ給フニナリ候ナンズルハ。又八幡大菩薩躰ニ宗廟神ノ儀ニ候ベキニヤ。アラタナル瑞相候ニヤ。タダ野干天狗トテ。人ニツキ候物ノ申事ヲ信ジテ。カカルコト出キ候ベシヤハ。ソレハサル事ニテ。スデニ京中ノ諸人コレヲ承テ。近所ニタチテ候趣。コレヲ聞候ニ。故院ハ下臈近ク候テ。世ノ中ノ狂ヒ者ト申テ。ミコカウナギ舞猿楽ノトモガラ。又アカ金ザイク何カト申候トモガラノ。コレヲトリナシマイラセ候ハンズルヤウ見ルココチコソシ候へ。タダ今世ハウセ候ナンズ。猶サ候ベクバ誠シク御祈請候テ。真実ノ冥感ヲキコシメスベク候ト云ヨシヲ申タリケルヲ。ヤガテ院キコシメシテ。我モサ思フ。メデタク申タル物カナトテ。ヤガテヒシトコノ事ヲ仰合テ。仲國ガ夫妻流刑ニヲコナフベキカト仰合セラレタリケレバ。僧正又申ケルヤウハ。コノ事ハツヤトキツネ。タヌキモツキ候ハデ。我心ヨリ申イデタルニテ候ハバ。尤尤流刑ニモヲコナハレ候ベシ。ソレガ人不思議ノ者ニ候ト申ナガラ。ソレハヨモサハ候ハジ。先ニ兼仲ト申候シ者ノ妻モカカル事申イデ候ケリ。ソレモ物グルハシキウツハ物ノ候ニ。必狐天狗ナド申物ハ又候コトナレバ。サヤウノ物ハ世ノ誠シカラズ成テ。我ヲ祭リナドスルヲ一段本意ニ思ヒテ。カク人ヲタブラカシ候事ハ昔今ノ物語ニモ候。又サ候ベキ事ニテモ候也。ソレガツキテサル病ヲシ出シテ候ニテコソ候へ。病ヒストテ上ヨリ罪ニ行ハルベキニテモ候ハネバ。タダ聞シメシ入ラレ候ハデ。片角ナンドニヲイコメテ置レテ候ハバ。サル狐。狸ハサヤウニ成候へバ頓テ引入リテヲトモシ候ハヌニ候。サテタダ事ガラヲヤ御覧候ベク候ラント申サレタリケレバ。イミジク申タリトテ。ソノ定ニ御サタ有テ。ヲイコメラレタリケレバ。[153]

These passages are very important as it showcases how Jien presents himself as the "wise" and "capable" advisor to the sovereign that he stresses is necessary to restore order in the world. The key point that Jien makes here is that he had the ability to

[153] Brown and Ishida, pp. 169-170. Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 292-293.

correctly perceive the matters of the “unseen realm.” According to Jien, Nakakuni and his wife claimed that his wife was possessed by the spirit of Go-Shirakawa and used this legitimization to build a new shrine. Jien warns that before trusting these claims, that the Prime Minister should be aware that could very well be possessed, not by the great spirit of Go-Shirakawa, but by a deceptive and much lower ranking spirits of “foxes and badgers.” In the framing his own position as the “correct” and reliable voice of reason, he juxtaposes this with other groups he warns should be viewed as “evil” influences, referring to certain professions as “crazy people,” including shamans (*miko*), mediums (*kōnagi*), dancers (*mai*), and comic dancers (*sarugō*). In other words, by highlighting the existence of other “evil” teachings in the world, he elevates the legitimacy of his own ritual practices. Furthermore, according to Jien, his own advice on how to deal with the situation receives great praise by Retired Emperor Go-Toba, and even goes on to suggest that that the outcome could have been disastrous had he not stepped in to correctly distinguish between the acts of a noble vengeful spirits such as that of Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa, and the lower, evil spirits of foxes and badgers.

> Reflecting on the affair, I conclude that the current Retired Emperor is a fine sovereign. In his own mind and heart he seems to have considered the proposal only in terms of what was correct and right. But since bad people in government were speaking to him, His Majesty may have thought that what he was being told was true. It is really appalling to realize that if, in that situation, such an understanding man [as Jien] had not been on hand, scandalous things would have occurred and, in a single day, this country would have been placed at the mercy of evil demons. The persons posessed by demons at the time were later pardoned and are still living.
>
> コレヲ思フニ。コノ院ノ御事ハヤムゴトナクヲハシマス君也。ワガ御心ニハ是ヲ正義トノミ思召ケルナルベシ。ソレガアサマシキ人々ノミ世ニアリテ口々ニ申ニナレバ。又サモヤト思召ナルベシ。サレバアヤウキ事ニテ。

> モシカカルサカシキ人モナクバ。サハフシギモトゲラレテ。一旦ノ己國ハ邪魔ニセラレナンズルハトアサマシクコソ。コノ天狗ヅキ共ハ赦免セラレテイマダ生テ侍也。[154]

It is clear in these passages that part of Jien's objective here in establishing himself as the trustworthy and "orthodox" teaching includes efforts to label certain groups as the opposing "heterodox" teachings that cause disruption in the world and must be avoided at all costs. In fact, this self-image of Jien as the trusted advisor to the emperor is also juxtaposed with the "evil" teachings of Hōnen's Pure Land movement, that Jien warns will cause further disruption in the world. In introducing Hōnen in the *Gukanshō*, Jien suggests that there are two types of "evil demons":

> There are two types of evil: evil that makes people comply and evil that makes people antagonistic. It is saddening that the evil that makes people comply is now spreading its teachings. When the time comes for "the one teaching of Amitābha" to increase divine grace, people will certainly have their sins and troubles removed and enter paradise [through this method]. But until then, and while the teachings of mantra and of "cessessation and observation" are still destined to prosper, no one will be able to achieve salvation by following the teachings propagated by an evil that makes people comply. This is truly a sad matter!

> 魔ニハ順魔逆魔ト云。コノ順魔ノカナシウカヤウノ事ドモヲシフル也。弥陀一教利物偏増ノマコトナラン世ニハ。罪障マコトニ消テ極楽ヘマイル人モ有ベシ。マダシキニ真言止観サカリニモアリヌベキ時。順魔ノ教ニシタガイテ得脱スル人ハヨモアラジ。悲シキ事ドモナリ。[155]

Just as there is a battle between "good" and "evil" spirits, Jien also to suggest that there is also a battle between those who preserve the correct dharma and those who will do harm to it. The *Gukanshō* makes clear where Jien stands in this battle. The Shingon and Tendai institutions, represented here as the teachings of mantra and of

[154] Brown and Ishida, p. 171; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 293-294.
[155] Original Translation. See Brown and Ishida, p. 173; Okami and Akamatsu, p. 295.

cessessation and observation (*shingon / shikan* 真言・止観), are destined to preserve the Buddhist dharma are presented as the "correct" teachings and it is suggested that the new movements lead by Hōnen are not only deceptive and lead people away from the goal of enlightenment, but will also have various negative effects on court life. Jien suggests that after his elder brother Kujō Kanezane started to follow Honen's teachings, awful things started to happen, including the "wretched affair of Nakakuni's wife," "Honen's banishment" and Kanezane's suffering a long illness before his death. In other words, following these deceptive teachings of these "demons" can have various adverse effects, including loosing one's chance to have a peaceful death.

In the final sections of the *Gukanshō*, Jien lists a number of concrete words of advice to the sovereign on how, in an age marked with no principles and the growing influence of vengeful spirits, things can be improved. He begins his discussion on stating his remorse that part of the problem is that the current age is marked with the fact that both priests and laymen have the propensity to act resentful and hostile toward each other:

> Therefore, when I say there are no men, I mean that there really are many of poor ability. Alas! Alas! It is precisely because of this that people make critical comments such as this: "He has things that are nothing, and a reputation that is false." So priests and laymen are all resentful and hostile toward each other; and we are in the last and final stage of deterioration: the "stage of conflict." Noblemen and commoners alike have no ability, and there is no way to say [how serious] this is.
>
> サレバ人無シトハ、イカニモシカルベキ人ノ多サコソトゾ言フベキ。アワレアワレ有若亡、有名無実ナドイフ言葉ヲ人ノ口ニツケテ云フハ、タダコノレウニコソ。カカレバイヨイヨ縁素ミナ怨敵ニシテ、闘諍誠ニ堅固ナリ。貴賤同ジク人無クシテ、言語スデニ道断侍リヌルニナム。[156]

[156] Brown and Ishida, pp. 238-9; Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 356.

Considering Jien's previous discussion of vengeful spirits as the causes of feelings of resentment between the members of the imperial family and the regents, it is significant that the concept of vengeful resentment (*onteki* 怨敵) appears at this important juncture in the text. For Jien, in a world in which the influence of vengeful and malevolent spirits are taking control of the hearts of men, it was necessary more than ever to rely upon a capable person who is able to correctly direct people to correct conduct without falling under the influence of these destructive spirits. After elevating the sense of eminent demise and emphasizing the lack of capable men to deal with the situation, Jien ends the *Gukanshō* with a short question and answer format, in which he re-assures that even in this disastrous situation, there is still room for improvement, offering surprisingly simple solution to the problem:

> Question: How can some improvements be made?
> Answer: Even though able persons have disappeared, the sovereign [Go-Toba] and his Regent should be of one mind. And even though there are bad people among those who are alive, priests and laymen should be sifted and resifted. The number of promising men who held office during [the reigns of] Shirakawa and Toba [from 1072-86 and 1107-23] should be called in and employed. And other should be completely rejected. If useless persons are really rejected and ignored, there will be some improvement. This is what I mean when I say "some improvement." Since there are no persons like those who lived in ancient times, the situation can not be restored to what it was then. But it it is an age when, even though the situation is bad, improvement can be made if proper selections are made...
> Question: That is right and excellent! But who will be the proper persons to make the selections?
> Answer: This is very important! Certainly there will be four or five upright individuals who can be called on to choose the most able men. They should meet together, make their selections, and submit their recommendations to the Retired Emperor. And if those selected are really used, without even the Retired Emperor acting high-handedly [to alter the selections], the state will be improved easily.

問、その直らんずるやう如何。
答、人ハ失セタレド、君ト摂籙臣ト御心一ツニテ、コノアル人ノ中ニ悪ロケレドモ、サリトテハ、僧俗ヲ掻イエリ選リシテ、良カラン人ヲ、タダ鳥羽・白河ノ頃ノ官ノ数ニ召シ使ヒテ、ソノホカヲバフツト捨テラルベキナリ。不中用ノ者ヲマコトシク捨テ果テテ目ヲダニ見セラレズハ、目出度メデタトシテ直ランズル也。随分ニ直ルト云フハコレナリ。昔ノ如クニハ人ノ無ケレバ、<ソレモ中々>叶フマジ。選リ正シタランズル寸法ノ世コソハ悪ロナガラ、ヨク直リタルコノ世ニテアランズレ。。。

問、此義なりて侍り。いみじいみじ。但し誰かその人をば選りとらんずるぞ。
答、コレコレ大事ナレ。但シコレ選リテ参ラスル人四五人ハ一定アリヌベシ。ソノ四五人寄リ合ヒテ、選リ取リテ参ラセタランヲ、君ダニモ強々（ツヨツヨ）ト働（ハタラ＝変更）カサデ、ヒシト用ヰサセ給ハバ、易々トコノ世ハ直ランズルナリ。。[157]

In other words, Jien suggests that the total destruction of the state can be prevented by employing capable Buddhist officials and keep four to five of the most trusted men as the personal advisors of the Retired Emperor. One way of interpreting this is that Jien is concerned that the Retired Emperor, when left on his own, will not be capable of making the right decisions, perhaps also contributing to the interpretation by previous scholars that Jien wrote the *Gukanshō* to convince Retired Emperor Go-Toba to not get into conflict with the Kamakura Bakufu. However, the emphasis here is not the prevention of an unforeseeable conflict, but rather, is simply the suggestion that the Retired Emperor should employ and surround himself with the and “capable” men, and it is clear who Jien is promoting for the task. When we consider how Jien projected his own self-image as the priest who was the most capable in perceiving both matters of the “visible” and “invisible” realms that are causing disorder in the world, it is clear that Jien is implying that he should be included within the small group of close advisors to the Retired

[157] Brown and Ishida, pp. 239-40; Okami and Amamatsu, pp. 357-358.

Emperor.[158] In final conclusion, we can see that the *Gukanshō* was written for the purpose of convincing the audience, whether it was the current Retired Emperor Go-Toba or future sovereigns, that they needed to rely on "capable men" who shared Jien's worldview and vision that ritual means are necessity to deal with the impending threat of vengeful spirits. In fact, this point is made even more clear when we step outside of the text and look at how Jien's establishment of his major ritual project in the proximity of the capital.

Jien's Grand Ritual Project: Pacifying Vengeful Spirits to Protect the Heian Capital

What lies at the foundation of both Jien's motivations for writing the *Gukanshō* and his attempts to construct a new ritual space in the proximity of the capital is precisely this issue of social disorder and its relation to the "problem" of vengeful spirits.[159] An assessment of the "vows" that Jien states for the establishment of this ritual center indicate that the issue of vengeful spirits was a topic where we see in which we can see the intersections between Jien's historical project of the *Gukanshō* and his ritual projects. It was in the years ranging from 1202-1222 that Jien worked toward

[158] Yamamoto Hajime has also suggested that Jien's use of the question and answer format at the end of the *Gukanshō* and his strong suggestion to reconsider the people he surrounds himself as advisors is a direct criticism of the rise of the Konoe family as the new regent family that replaced Kujō Kanezane when he fell out of favor. See *Insei ki bunka ronshū 1 Kenryoku to bunka*, pp. 229-231.

[159] After establishing his ritual program at Sanjō Shirakawa, Jien also wrote a number of treatises that were meant to imbue the ritual practices with new theoretical meaning, based on Tendai exo-esoteric thought. These include short works like the *Honzon engi* 本尊縁起, but also full treatises like the the *Birushanabutsu betsugyō kyō shiki* 毘盧遮那佛別行經私記, a commentary on the *Qingjing fashen piluzhena xindi famen chengjiu yiqie tuoluo ni sanzhong xidi* 清浄法身毘盧遮那心地法門成就一切陀羅尼三種悉地 (T 18, # 0899). The consideration of these doctrinal issues, however, will be reserved for a separate study.

establishing a new ritual center in a region just to the east of the capital.[160] In the year 1202, Jien first obtained permission to build two structures as official prayer centers for the Imperial family at the location of Sanjō Shirakawa. In 1206, Jien's plans for the construction of his ritual site at Sanjō Shirakawa was delayed when he was given orders from Retired Emperor Go-Toba to move his ritual center to the location of Jien's residence in Yoshimizu. This part of a larger effort lead by Retired Emperor Go-Toba to build his own Buddhist center, the Temple of the Four Most Excellent Heavenly Kings (*Saishōshitennōin* 最勝四天王院), at Sanjō Shirakawa for the "protection of the state," and was related to his desire to overthrow the military government in the eastern regions.[161] After Retired Emperor Go-Toba's efforts to overthrow the Kamakura Shogunate ended in failure, Jien's ritual structures were rebuilt in its originally planned location of Sanjō Shirakawa in 1222. Despite these minor changes in location in the early years of its construction, Jien's ritual structures and activities during this time all took place in close proximity, and were focused in the region just to the east of the Heian capital. The structures built at these locations were collectively called the "Temple for the Rites of Great Repentance" (*Daisangehōin* 大懺悔法院).[162] It was at this location

[160] It was in the year 1202 that Jien first obtained permission to build two structures as official prayer centers for the Imperial family at the location of Sanjō Shirakawa. In 1206, the plans for the establishment of the center was moved to the location of Jien's residence in Yoshimizu 吉水, but in 1222 these structures were rebuilt in its originally planned location of Sanjō Shirakawa. Despite these minor changes in location, they were all in close proximity, just to the East of the Heian capital.

[161] For more on the role of poetry and painting at Saishōshitennōin, see Edward Kamens "The Saishōshitennōin Poems and Paintings" in *Utamakura, Allusion, and Intertextuality in Traditional Japanese Poetry*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997, p. 168-221.

[162] The two structures when completed were initially called the Great Accomplishment Temple (*daijōjuin* 大成就院). This name most likely refers to the Chapter of the Diamond Auspicious Great Accomplishment 金剛吉祥大成就品, ninth chapter of the Yuigikyō (Ch. *Jingangfeng louge yiqie yuqie yuqi jing* 金剛峯樓閣一切瑜伽瑜祇經). The notion of the Buddha-Eye 仏眼 (Jp. *butsugen*, Sk. *buddha-locanā*) that appears in this chapter plays an important role in Jien's conceptualization of the role of the rituals performed here.

that many Buddhist rituals that were already performed at Enryakuji on Mt. Hiei, the headquarters of the Tendai school to which Jien served as the abbot, were re-established to be performed in the proximity of the capital.

It is perhaps important to note that Jien's newly established ritual center in the urban space of the capital was also not technically within the "official" boundaries of the Heian capital. By the turn of the 13th century, the powerful aristocratic families had established their living quarters primarily in the "Left-side of the Capital" (*sakyō* 左京) from perspective of the Imperial Palace, which effectively shifted the center of aristocratic activity to the Eastern side of the capital.[163] As Matthew Stavros argued in his book, *Kyoto: An Urban History of Japan's Premodern Capital*, the area just east of the official capital borders became one of the prime locations where the court elite would travel to participate in Buddhist ceremonies, and this was precisely the area where Jien was given permission to establish his new ritual program. This geographic space allowed Jien and his network of court elites to construct a ritual space that effectively incorporated Buddhist rituals and various forms of performance arts that would please aristocrats members of Heian society, but would also appease the dead. In other words, it became a physical space where the religious practice of Buddhist rites were intertwined with the cultural activities of court elites, and Jien became a key figure

[163] In addition, to changes in the residential space, the Imperial laws also prevented the establishment of religious institutions within the official boundaries of the capital. For a detailed analysis of the shifting discourses regarding the space of the "capital" see Stavros, Matthew. *Kyoto: An Urban History of Japan's Premodern Capital*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2016. For example, Starvos says of the establishment of the temple structures just out side of the capital, "...it is difficult to find cases where members of the Kyoto elite flagrantly and without either justification or reproach gave material form to their often substantial private wealth or influence within the context of their official capital residences. To give form to their wealth, they turned to a place free of public pretensions and sumptuary restrictions: the capital's immediate surroundings." (p. 96)

in solidifying the intersections between Buddhist institutions and court culture. In addition to the establishment of these ritual structures in the physical proximity of court life, Jien also actively incorporated a discourse of "vengeful spirits" to legitimize the practice of his exoteric-esoteric Buddhist ritual program.

When Jien started the construction of these structures in 1206, he composed a document titled *Articles Regarding the Establishment of Daisangehōin* (大懺悔法院条々起請事), which included a stated vow explaining what rituals would be practiced there and how they would contribute to the larger goal of providing protection to the state. Here we see an effort to exalt the efficacy of the rituals Jien wished to establish at his new center, as well as a call for a close alliance between the imperial family and Buddhist institutions, a theme that also runs through much of his literary works. Furthermore, the purpose of these rituals are framed as being particularly effective in responding to the issue of social disorder, and specifically in addressing the "problem" of vengeful spirits, which was, according to Jien, exacerbated by certain decisions made by the court in the recent past. Jien explains:

> Ever since the Hōgen Rebellion [of 1156] until this day, it has been chaotic times. *The vengeful spirits have permeated the Heaven, and the dead soldiers occupy the four seas.* I have yet to hear of a virtuous form of governance that can help to liberate [those from their suffering], there is also no sign of a revival of court ceremonies. In spring dreams, crimson tears flow down to my sleeves and in autumn slumber, my bare heart enflames my chest. *The only thing that can liberate these vengeful spirits and bolster the Court is the Power of the Buddha Dharma...* (emphasis added)

> 然保之以後亂世之今。怨霊満一天。亡卒在四海。雖然未聞拔濟之徳政。亦無中興之朝議歟。春夢中紅涙流袖。秋眠之間丹心燒胸。濟度彼怨霊扶助此朝家。唯在佛法之法力。專歸對治之治術。[164]

In addition to the more general terms used for the dead (*bōsotsu* 亡卒) seen in this vow, it is also worth noting that Jien specified two historical figures, Emperor Sutoku and Fujiwara no Tadazane, who was Jien's grandfather, as two "noble spirits" (*seiryō* 聖霊) he intended to assist toward liberation through the ritual practices held at the *Daisangehōin*. In fact, both figures he specified here passed away at the location of their exile in the aftermath of the Hōgen Rebellion, a historical event that was also emphasized in his vow. This is significant for two reasons. First, it illustrated that his rituals were envisioned not only to deal with a generic sense of "malevolent spirits," but that his rituals could be used to assist specific historical figures, both who had direct connections to his familial lineage, whose lives were cut short due to political defeat, hence the use of the term "vengeful spirits" in the vow.[165] Secondly, is also notable that the raison d'etre of the ritual program is connected to a specific historical event, that of the Hōgen Rebellion.[166] According to Jien, the Hōgen Rebellion was significant because it was from this moment onward that vengeful spirits came to permeate the world. In other words, he implies quite clearly in the vow that the "chaotic times" that the court elite in the Heian capital were experiencing in the present could be traced back to a particular historical moment in the past.

---

[164] Taga Munehaya, ed. *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集, Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin.1945, p. 841.
[165]「就中崇徳院聖霊知足院（藤原忠実）怨霊。浮濟度之舟於追福之流。祈發願之志於三寶之誓。定叶宗廟社稷之神慮。方為三寶利物之本懐者歟。」(*Jien zenshū*, p. 841)
[166] For a discussion of the Hōgen Rebellion and how this historical event was memorialized in war tales, see Wilson, William R. *Hōgen monogatari: Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen – Translated with Annotations and Essay*. Monumenta Nipponica monographs: Tokyo, Sophia University: 1971.

It is clear that Jien viewed the Hōgen Rebellion as a turning point in Japanese history, but why was the Hōgen Rebellion viewed as the beginning of the "chaotic world"? According to Jien's own words, he seems to have felt a personal connection to the Hōgen Rebellion, as the events leading up to the rebellion in 1156 occurred around the same time that he was born into the world. The fact that he was only two years of age at the time the Hōgen Rebellion occurred allowed Jien to map the passage of time from this historical event to the present onto his own personal life experience, stating in his vow that the world had been in chaos "ever since he was conscious of his surroundings." However, perhaps more important is the larger implications the Hōgen Rebellion had in Japanese history. It was at this particular moment in 1156 that created the right conditions for the eventual establishment of the military class, which gradually became a contending authoritative power that rivaled the imperial and aristocratic families of the Heian court.[167] As already mentioned above, at the time Jien was constructing the ritual structures at the *Daisangehōin*, Retired Emperor Go-Toba viewed the military government as a political adversary and eventually lead an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow them, known by historians as the Jōkyū Disturbance of 1221.[168] It is important, however, that Jien's votive text not only pointed to these historical events of the past as the cause of shifts in disrupting social order, but also emphasized that it was due to the growing presence of "unseen forces" (*myōshū* 冥衆). In other words, as

[167] For more about the historical implications of the Hōgen Rebellion and the early stages in the rise of military powers, see Karl Friday "They Were Soldiers Once: The Early Samurai and the Imperial Court" in Ferejohn, John A. and Frances McCall Rosenbluth ed. *War and State Building in Medieval Japan*. Stanford University Press: 2010, pp. 21-52.

[168] For a discussion of the events leading up to the Jōkyū Disturbance and its aftermath, see Mass, Jeffery P. *The Development of Kamakura Rule, 1180-1250: A History with Documents*. Stanford University Press: 1979.

already seen in the discussion of the *Gukanshō* in the previous chapter, Jien is making the same claim here that the proliferation of vengeful spirits and the war dead, which were the result of years of internal warfare, was directly responsible for perpetuating chaos in the social and political realm. Jien's emphasis of the influence of "unseen forces" as the cause of disorder in his vows, and repeated again in his historical work, could have been an attempt to provide an explanation of the deterioration of the "sacred authority" of imperial order without placing the blame directly on the members of the imperial family. As already discussed in the previous chapter, this careful crafting of history that effectively places the cause and blame of social disorder onto vengeful spirits, rather than viewing it as the direct consequence of political decisions made by members of the imperial family, can also be seen in his historical work, the *Gukanshō*. As already suggested above, Jien also explains in the *Gukanshō* that the "period of the military class" (Jp. *musha no yo* 武者の世) began with the advent of the Hōgen Rebellion, pointing to this historical event as a turning point in which we start to see violence and disorder occurring in the immediate proximity of the Heian capital. Regarding the significance of the Hōgen Rebellion compared to other political conflicts preceding it, Jien says:

> As Retired Emperor Shirakawa's successor, Retired Emperor Toba administered the affairs of state from 1129 to 1156. And when he died on the 2nd day of the 7th month of 1156, the rebellions of the country of Japan broke out and the country's Military Age began. Having thought about the Principles of these developments and concentrated on what is important thereto, I write the following. Many rebellions and battles were fought outside the capital before 1156. For example, rebellions erupted in the days of Emperor Ankō and Prince Ōmoto, but nothing appears in diaries about these upheavels. Rebellions also occured after the Taihō era (710-704) and the subsequent to the removal of the capital to Heian in 794. But

> the Taira Masakado uprising in the Tengyō era (938-947) of the Suzaku reign, the 12-year war which boke out in 1151 (when Minamoto Yoriyoshi attacked Abe Sadato), as well as Governor General Takaie's subjugation of Tōi invaders in 1019 were all fought in the Kantō region or on the island of Kyushu. *Absolutely none was fought within the capital, requiring the direct attention of Emperors and their ministers, until after the Retired Emperor Toba's administration came to an end in 1156. Rebellions since then have been disgraceful.* (emphasis added)
>
> サテ大治ノ後久壽マデハ。又鳥羽院。白川院ノ御アトニ世ヲシロシメシテ。保元々年七月二日鳥羽院ウセサセ給ヒテ後。日本國ノ乱逆ト云コトハヲコリテ後。ムサノ世ニナリニケル也ケリ。コノ次第ノコトハリヲコレハセンニ思テ書置侍ルナリ。城外ノ乱逆合戦ハヲホカリ。日本國ハ大友王子。安康天王ナンドノ世ノ事ハ。日記モナニモ人サタセズ。大寶以後トイヒテ其後ノ事又コノ平ノ京ニナリテノ後ヲコソサタスル事ニテアルニ。天慶ニ朱雀院ノ将門ガ合戦モ。頼義ガ貞任ヲセムル十二年ノタタカイナドイフモ。又隆家ノ帥ノトウイ國ウチシタガフルモ。関東。鎮西ニコソキコユレ。マサシク王臣都ノ内ニテカカル乱ハ鳥羽院ノ御時迄ハナシ。カタジケナクアハレナル事也。[169]

As seen here, Jien views the Hōgen Rebellion as an important historical moment that marked a change in the course of history and it was the *proximity of violence and death* that was one characteristic that distinguished it from earlier conflicts. He points out that while there were rebellions recorded prior to this event, this marked the first time that the rebellion occurred in the immediate proximity of the central court. This point is crucial for Jien, as this is another way of saying that this was a clear sign of the decline and effectiveness of imperial authority. It is also significant that it was from this time onward that the political upheavals had direct impact on the lives of the imperial and aristocratic elite, marking the beginning of the chaotic intrusion that disrupted the elite court life of the capital. The emphasis here that social unrest *within* the capital started with the advent of the Hōgen Rebellion and continued to the present also can be seen

[169] Brown and Ishida, p. 90; Okami and Akamatsu, pp. 206-207.

as serving as a justification for Jien to build a new ritual center in the proximity of the capital, as a ritual structure that would provide reliable safety for the capital from the influence of malevolent spirits at a time when the effectiveness of imperial authority was waning. Although this connection made between the rise of the malevolent spirits and the sense that social order was deteriorating may not be immediately apparent in the *Gukanshō*, this is made very explicitly in Jien's vow commemorating the establishment of the *Daisangehōin*, as seen in the passage above when he stated, "the only thing that can liberate these vengeful spirits and bolster the Court is the Power of the Buddha Dharma."

Jien composed another text in 1222 re-stating his vows, just a year after the Jōkyū Disturbance of 1221. Here, he reiterated many of the points seen above, emphasizing that "strange apparitions have revealed their hidden forms" and that both exoteric and esoteric rituals needed be performed to provide protection in chaotic times.

> Today, the disruptions in the heaven are the same as they were in the past. *Strange apparitions reveal their hidden forms. Is this not due to the lack of prayer? How is this not a sign of envy?* How much more do we need the efficacious activity of the Radiant Light [Ritual]? In order to provide protection in these times of the Latter Dharma, we must remove the evils of the world through the merits of the *Wondrous Lotus Sutra*. (emphasis added)
>
> 今又天変如古、怪異示冥、豈不祈哉、寧不羨哉、何況熾盛光之功用、護持我末法、能除世間悪妙蓮華之利益、後五百歳濁悪世中 薬師本願観音利生、倩思之[170]

Jien also laid out in more detail the content of his ritual program,[171] referring to the two structures as the "Exoteric Teaching Hall" (*kengyō dō* 顕教堂) built for the practice of

[170] *Jien zenshū*, p. 862.

Repentance rituals (*Hokke senpō* 法花懺法) and the "Mantra Hall" (*shingon dō* 真言堂) for esoteric rites such as the Great Radiant Light Ritual (*Daishijōkō hō* 大熾盛光法) and *goma* fire rituals. Listed in the table below are the various rituals specified in Jien's ritual program at the *Daisangehōin*:

Table 2: Ritual Structures at Daisangehōin

Architectural Structure	"Exoteric Teaching Hall" (*kengyō dō* 顕教堂)	"Mantra Hall" (*shingon dō* 真言堂)
Rituals	▪ Daily practice of non-reverting concentration of the Lotus 法華 and Amida 弥陀 ▪ Daily veneration of the 15 worthies 十五尊 ▪ Daily "eye-opening" 開眼 ceremonies ▪ Successive days of doctrinal expositions of sutras 開題	▪ Successive days of the six kinds of rites (*Kinrin* 金輪, *Butsugen* 仏眼, *Yakushi* 薬師, *Fudō* 不動, *Shijōkō* 熾盛光, *Hokke* 法華) ▪ Successive days of the two *goma* rites: a) Fudō subjugation rites 不動降伏護摩, b) Four forms of *goma*: (*Kinrin, Yakushi, Butsugen, Fudō*) ▪ Annual Rites: a) Blazing Light Rite *Shijōkō* 熾盛光, b) Lotus Rite *Hokke*
Purpose of ritual practice	Alleviate the suffering of the vengeful spirits (怨霊) and hungry ghosts (餓鬼)	Dispel the "spirits of the Buddha Law and Kingly Law" (仏法王法之霊)

Although Jien based many of the rituals to be performed here on those already in practice at his main institution on Mt. Hiei,[172] he specifically reformulated the rituals so

[171]「一者大懺悔之道場、毎日不退法華弥陀之三昧、日々供養秘密瑜伽之行法、図絵十五尊、一月二幅、模写大乗経年中数部、毎日開眼長日開題、亦加以一座開眼行法、以此修善一向貸怨霊雅器（餓鬼カ）之援苦、到国土安穏之祈請、二者熾盛光之壇場、長日行法六座、金輪・仏眼・薬師・不動・熾盛光・法華是也、長日護摩二壇、一者不動降伏護摩、二者四尊四種護摩、毎月四七日金輪・薬師・仏眼・不動・息災・増益・敬愛・降伏如次、毎年修法二壇、熾盛光・法華也、以月朔有七十天供、四種護摩之智火、焼自他罪障之薪、三部三密之梵風、払仏法王法之霊」(*Jien zenshū*, p. 862)

[172] For a discussion of Zhiyi's repentance rituals, see Stevenson, Daniel B. "The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism" in Peter N. Gregory edited *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. University of Hawaii Press, 1986. For a discussion of how repentance rituals were practiced on Mt. Hiei, see "懺悔法. For a discussion of the Radiant Light Ritual, see article by Dolce, Lucia. "Taimitsu Rituals in Medieval Japan: Sectarian Competition and the Dynamics of Tantric Performance." For an excellent study of Jien's innovations in the architectural structure of the Shijōkōdō, see Fujii Keisuke 藤井恵介,

that they would be conceptualized as effective means to pacify the dead: the exoteric rituals helped to alleviate the suffering of the vengeful spirits (*onryō* 怨霊) and hungry ghosts (*gaki* 餓鬼) and esoteric rituals assisted in dispelling the "spirits of the Buddha Law and Imperial Law" (*ōbo buppō no rei* 仏法王法之霊).

Legitimizing Lineages through Relic Worship and Poems for the Dead

In addition to explaining the benefits associated with his extensive exoteric and esoteric ritual program, Jien also introduced the *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* (*Shari hōon e* 舎利報恩会) as another important ritual event to be held at the *Daizengehōin*.[173] This particular dharma assembly (*hōe* 法会), involved both reverence for the relic of the Buddha and the commemoration of previous patriarchs of the religious institution. Furthermore, it developed through Jien's direct interactions with Kujō Kanezane, who was also an avid supporter of ceremonies for the worship of relics. Before Jien's establishment of the *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* at the *Daizengahōin*, a similar form of relic worship ceremonies (*Shari kō* 舎利講), were actively held by Kujō Kanezane from as early as 1174, on the 19th or 20th of every

---

"*Sanjōshirakawa bō no shijōkōdō*" in *Mikkyō kenchiku kūkanron* 『密教建築空間論』, Tokyo: Chūōkōronbijutsu shuppan, 1998.

[173] Although Jien designed this particular ritual program, the worship of relics was a pervasive form of practice. For the development of relic worship in medieval Japan, see Brian D. Ruppert *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early Medieval Japan*. Harvard East Asian Monographs, no. 188. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000. For Japanese scholarship on relic worship and performance and its relationship to political power and kingship, see the following: Kawagishi Kōkyō 川岸宏教. "*Sharie to gakubu*" 「舎利会と楽舞」, *Shitennōji jyoshi daigaku kiyō* 『四天王寺女子大学紀要』, Vol. 7, Dec. 1974; Kawagishi Kōkyō. "*Shinkō to gakubu—shitennōji shi ni okeru ichi ni no mondai* 「信仰と楽舞—四天王寺史における一二の問題」, *Bukkyōshigaku* 『仏教史学』, Vol. 12/4, June 1966; Tsuchiya Megumi 土谷恵. *Chūsei jiin no shakai to geinō* 『中世寺院の社会と芸能』, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2001; Nakao Takashi 中尾堯. *Chūsei no kanjin hijiri to shari shinkō* 『中世の勧進聖と舎利信仰』, Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2001.

month. The 19th was the date of the death of his father, Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164), and it is clear that Kanezane viewed the relic worship ceremony as an event that served the important purpose of commemorating his own heritage.[174] According to Kujō Kanezane's diary, the *Gyokuyō*, the relic that was the object of veneration at the relic worship ceremony initially belonged to his father Tadamichi, and the miraculous powers believed to come from the relic was one way of legitimizing the authority of his lineage. An important element of the relic worship ceremony was the composition and recitation of *waka* poetry as a means to pay tribute to their ancestors. In fact, the recitation of *waka* poetry at events associated with relic veneration can be traced back to Tadamichi's time.[175] In this sense, Kanezane's devoted practice of the composition of *waka* poetry for the remembrance of one's ancestors could be viewed as an effort to preserve a family tradition that involved the participation of many cultured elite, and many who represented the powerful aristocratic lineage of the Fujiwara family. Examples of figures who composed *waka* poetry at the relic worship ceremonies he held include Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241), Fujiwara no Yoshitsune 藤原良経 (1169-1206), Nijōin no Sanuki 二条院讃岐 (1141-1217), and Fujiwara no Ariie 藤原有家 (1155-1216). Importantly, Jien was also present at many of these events and along with his counterparts, composed *waka* poetry specifically for this occasion. An example of *waka* poems that Jien composed at the relic worship ceremony include a set of ten

[174] See Tani Tomoko, "Kujōke no sharikō to waka"「九条家の舎利講と和歌」in *Chūsei waka to sono jidai* 『中世和歌とその時代』, p. 92.
[175] Indications that *waka* poetry were recited at relic worship ceremonies can be found in early imperial anthologies of *waka* such as the *Shika Wakashū*『詞花和歌集』, compiled in between 1144 and 1155, and the *Akisuke shū* 『顕輔集』, said to be compiled circa 1155.

poems written on the theme of the "ten expressions of thusness" (*jūnyoze* 十如是), a set of doctrinal concepts as taught in the Tendai school to which he belonged.[176]

In Jien's own establishment of a relic worship Buddhist assembly at *Daisangehōin*, we can see that there was an important precedence of the practice of relic worship that came directly from the ceremonial practices associated with his elder brother, Kujō Kanezane. It is not difficult to imagine that much of Jien's inspiration to establish a relic worship ceremony at *Daisangehōin* came from his experience attending those held by Kanezane before him. Importantly, Jien's decision to hold an annual Buddhist assembly in the likes of the relic worship ceremony held by Kanezane is also indicative of how ritual practices associated with Jien's familial ties were also actively incorporated into the ritual program of his exoteric-esoteric Buddhist ritual center. In fact, although music and dance were commonplace in Buddhist assemblies at major institutions, Jien's *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* was the first time that the recitation of *waka* poetry was officially included into a Buddhist ritual program.[177]

However, the *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* went beyond just a commemorative event for ancestors, but it was also framed as a ceremony that was to be held for the benefit of the emperor and for the protection of the entire realm.

---

[176] Numbers 4358-4368 in Jien's anthology of *waka* poetry, the *Shūgyokushū* 拾玉集. See Taga Munehaya, *Kōhon Shūgyokushū*『校本　拾玉集』, p. 449-450. For a discussion of Jien's poems on religious themes of the Lotus Sutra and Tendai thought, see Robert, Jean-Noël. *La Centurie du Lotus: Poèmes de Jien (1155-1225) sur le Sûtra du Lotus*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Japonaises, 2008.

[177] For more on Jien's conceptualization of the role of waka poetry in the ritual program, see Tani Tomoko, "*Daisangehōin no sharihōone to waka*" 「大懺悔法院の舎利報恩会と和歌」 in *Chūsei waka to sono jidai* 中世和歌とその時代. Kasama Shoin, 2004.

In his vow, Jien explains that the merit generated at *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* would be directed toward realizing the emperor's fundamental vow to maintain peace in the land. According to Jien's vision, it was through the act of venerating the relic through these artistic acts that would generate the power to maintain peace in the land. In addition to the recitation of *waka* poetry, the Buddhist assembly as designed by Jien also incorporated "miscellaneous arts" (*zōgei* 雑芸) that included performances of musical instruments (*kangen* 管絃) and ritual dance (*bugaku* 舞楽).

This large-scale Buddhist celebration of the relic using the performance of music and dance was based on precedents set at other major Buddhist institutions such as Shitennōji 四天王寺, Kōfukuji 興福寺, and Ninnaji 仁和寺, all major Buddhist centers associated with imperial and state power. In this sense, Jien was also keen on establishing his ritual center in a manner that would carve out a space in the proximity of the capital in which Jien and his Tendai Sanmon lineage of Enryakuji on Mt. Hiei would also be able to more effectively emulate and surpass other rival Buddhist centers that were garnering imperial support. It was in the combination of two set precedents, Kujō Kanezane's relic worship ceremonies on the one hand and the extravagant Buddhist assemblies at other Buddhist institutions on the other, that Jien attempted to structure a new ritual space at the *Daisangehōin*. Compared to the exoteric and esoteric Buddhist rites discussed above, the *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* involved the participation of a diverse community and expansive ritual space that was not restricted within specific Buddhist architectural structures. To see how this ritual space was constructed and perceived by the court elite, I will now turn to a record written by

Sugawara no Tamenaga 菅原為長 (1158-1246), in which he describes the scenery and ritual efficacy of the *Daisangehōin*, titled *A Record of the Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* (*Shari hōon e ki* 舎利報恩会記).[178] Although it is a short document consisting just over 600 Chinese characters, this record not only illustrates the close relationship between Jien and the court elite, but also shows that members of the court were directly involved in the act of conceptualizing a specific ritual space that defined the culture activities of *Daisangehōin*.

Reorienting the Center in the *Record of the Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness*

In 1212, Sugawara no Tamenaga wrote a short piece titled *Record of the Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness*, in which he expressed his observations of the ritual space of the assembly. Tamenaga was a Confucian scholar from the early Kamakura period and his close connection with the Kujō family suggests that he must have also had a close alliance with Jien, who was also of the Kujō lineage. In 1204, Tamenaga was recognized as an official scholar of Chinese literature and history and in the same year, became a tutor for Emperor Tsuchimikado, as well as serving as the personal tutor of the next five emperors. In 1211, he was conferred Junior Third Rank and achieved the status of a court noble. It was the first time since the infamous Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845-903) that someone from the Sugawara

[178] Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, p. 860-2.

family received this rank.[179] Working with the Kujō family as they gained political power, he eventually reached the rank of Senior Second Rank and was revered as a great statesman of the court. As a respectable court noble and personal tutor of the emperor, one could assume that Tamenaga's public praise of Jien's ritual site through this document held a certain amount of social capital. The fact that someone of Tamenaga's stature would compose a work like this also illustrates that there was a cooperative relationship between Jien and the court elite in their attempt to elevate the *Daisangehōin* as an important site not only for the efficacy of its Buddhist ritual program, but as we will see, for the beauty of the space it provided for the composition of poetry. The text opens by presenting *Daisangehōin* as an exemplary site within the "scenery of the capital":

> When speaking of the scenery of the capital, the most splendid woodlands and waterways are in the South-east area. The most splendid within the south-east area is Yoshimizu, and the most splendid within Yoshimizu are the Buddhist structures in the North-west corner.
>
> 都城風土。水木之勝在東南偏。東南之勝在吉水。吉水之勝在西北辺之禅房。即延暦寺座主前大僧正退老之居。[180]

Tamenaga continues to explain the surrounding of this "splendid scenery," by saying:

> To the East one sees the grandeur of the mountain peaks; to the South, Chōrakuji Temple associated with Kannon's saving grace; to the West, Kanjinin Temple, the protective shrine for the One Hundred Lords, and to the North the temples established by Sagacious rulers starting with Dharma Emperor Shirakawa.
>
> 東有山岳之神秀。仁者之楽,於是乎生矣。南有長楽寺。豈非観音利生之仏地。好士来遊之名区哉。西有感神院。列百王鎮護之宗稷。納一切衆生之懇棘。北有白河法皇以来代々賢君明王（主）草創之寺。[181]

[179] For more on Sugawara no Michizane, see Borgen, Robert. *Sugawara no Michizane and the Early Heian Court*. University of Hawaii Press: 1994.
[180] *Jien zenshū*, p. 860.

In other words, in the opening lines of the text, Tamenaga offers a conceptual re-orienting of space, suggesting that the Buddhist institutions that lie to the East of the official boundaries of the capital are effectively the nexus of religious activity, with Jien's *Daisangehōin* at its cultural center.

Tamenaga also exalts the specific benefits associated with each of the ritual structures, which resonates with the description of the purpose of these rituals as described by Jien in his stated vows as introduced above. According to Tamenaga, the Great Repentance Hall is described as a space to "offer prayers for the lives of men, present and future," and the Radiant Light Hall as one in which prayers are made "for the longevity and prosperity of the Retired Emperor." Tamenaga also goes on to proclaim the virtues associated with the aesthetic environment of the gardens that surround these structures. He says:

> The sounds of bells and chimes and the intersecting voices accompany great merit. Truly, this is the [space] that entertains the people. The Heaven and the Master, the harmony between man and ground, is it not present here in this place? …The Buddha's Garden is the Pure and Marvelous Land of Men. The sutra storehouse and shrines of Sakyamuni are the depositories of the fortunes of heaven. It is for this reason that the form [of the landscape] is most splendid.
>
> 鐘磬交声功徳有隣。寔知地待其人。天與其主。人地相応豈不在茲乎。高閣低廊隨地勢兮連属十数間矣。名樹異草備庭, 実兮, 列栽千万種矣。何唯梁孝王之菟薗有曲観有平臺有猿巖有雁池。劉義慶之鷄籠有妙経有清唄有法僧有文士而已哉。仏庭則人間之浄妙国土也。経蔵亦釈宮之天祿石渠也。因此形勝謂其肝要。[182]

[181] *Jien zenshū*, p. 860.
[182] *Jien zenshū*, p. 860-861.

For Tamenaga, the aesthetically pleasing scenery of the garden and the temple structures were not the only thing worthy of praise, but he also described the elaborate soundscape of the ritual space, in which he sees the practice of esoteric rituals, doctrinal expositions on exoteric teachings, and the various sounds of musical instruments as all part of the "collective wondrous sounds of praise, pervasive and infinite."[183] As already mentioned above, this Buddhist Assembly as designed by Jien was the first time *waka* poetry was officially incorporated into a Buddhist ritual program. As if responding to this specific characteristic of Jien's ritual program, Tamenaga explained in his record that the *waka* poems composed at this site were none other than expressions of the preaching of bodhisattvas and that the activity of "worldly letters and words" (*kyōgen kigo* 狂言綺語) that served as the conditions for spreading the Buddhist teachings:

> Although the poems [recited] follow the form of Bai Juyi 白居易, they are the preaching of the Bodhisattva of Diamond Benefit (*kongōri* 金剛利, Sk. Vajratīkṣṇa). Although the songs imitate the ancient poems of Akahito (Yamabe no Akahito 山部赤人), they emanate the feelings of Majursri's ancient essays. It is for this reason that the activity of the worldly letters and words of this present life go beyond [just] wild words and frivolous speech. On the contrary, they become the cause of the praising the Buddha Vehicle in the future and the condition for the turning of the dharma wheel.

[183] The larger context of this passage is the following: "The gifts of the Buddhist teachings are in the hundreds and the performing arts lavish in number. The practices of the Three Mysteries, poured from the stream of the Qinglongsi Temple. The doctrinal expositions on the Four Teachings, establishes the wisdom of Shariputra. The sound of bamboo flutes and stringed instruments, the songs of the *biwa*, cymbals, and iron bowls. Just as one may encounter someone in the grasslands, they will be reborn in the Western Lands. Even the song and chant of a single minute sound is non-empty. The collective wondrous sound of praise, pervasive and infinite."「法施有百。伎芸有数。三密修行 酌青龍寺之流。四教論談 樹秋鷺子(鵞鷺子) 之智。簫笛琴箜篌之音。琵琶鐃銅鈸之曲。宛然于遇草野。孰與于往西土。一小音之歌頌尚不空。衆妙音之讃詠弥無量。」 *Jien zenshū*, p. 861.

> 詩則雖慣白居易之様。可謂金剛利之説。歌亦模赤人之古什。感文殊之曩篇。以此今生世俗文字之業。狂言綺語之過。翻為当来世々讃仏乗之因。転法輪之縁。[184]

What we see here is not a simple record of what Tamenaga observed of the aesthetic landscape of the *Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness*, but it offers an explanation of how the ritual space was conducive for the production and recitation of *waka* poetry and an effective environment to commemorate the dead. Finally, in the concluding lines of the text, Tamenaga suggests that all of these activities are performed for the sake of transferring the merit to the "spirits of the past and for those to come."[185] In other words, it is clear in this statement that the court elite shared the view that the recitation of poetry, musical performances, exoteric and esoteric Buddhist practices were all activities that contributed to the soteriological goal of assisting spirits to attain liberation. According to Tamenaga, the recitation of poems are not only complimentary to the Buddhist rites performed for the worship of the dead, but they are the very conditions needed to effectively praise and spread the Buddhist teachings. This understanding of the function of poetry follows Jien's own view of the role of poetry very closely and it is clear that they were in collaborative terms in composing this piece.[186] This is also a testament that Jien's vision of the role of his ritual program was not only implemented and viewed as a shared goal among the court elites who attended the ritual ceremonies at the *Daisangehōin*, but that the court elite, as represented by

---

[184] *Jien zenshū*, p. 860-861.

[185]「元来雖為太上皇之勤。今日始備大法会之儀。月卿從事,風儀増美。一会之繁昌, 二世之張本而已。以貢仏神之法楽。以祈我君之御願増益。内證外用之徳。誓護千齢万壽之算。知恩報恩之廻向。先霊後霊之菩提。答此願力無不圓滿。」 *Jien zenshū*, p. 860-861.

[186] For more on Jien's theory of *waka* poetry: Yamamoto Hajime 山本一. *Jien no waka to shisō* 慈円の和歌と思想. Waizumi Shoin: 1999; Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien waka ronkō* 慈円和歌論考. Kasama Shoin: 1998.

Tamenaga in his record, also played an crucial role in the process of conceptualizing a specific ritual space that incorporated the symbiotic relationship between more traditional Buddhist means of offering salvation as expressed through the extensive exoteric and esoteric Buddhist ritual program and the power of poetry and the arts to effectively pacify and alleviate the suffering of the dead.

Conclusion

As discussed in the earlier chapters of this thesis, the *Gukanshō* was structured in a way that directs the reader to conclude that Jien and his network of "wise" and "capable" men hold the key to maintain world order, not only through political means, but importantly also through the practice of Buddhist rites that offer religious methods to pacify and rein in the destructive influence of vengeful spirits. While it is undeniable that the *Gukanshō* was written in response to speciific political circumstances as suggested by previous studies, we should also recognize the full implications of this work when we recognize the important role that vengeful spirits played in Jien's historical narrative.

Jien's grand story of the decline of the Japanese state was one that was carefully constructed to lead the reader to conclude that the cause of disorder in the world could be traced back to the gradual rise of vengeful spirits, whose sole purpose was to disrupt peace by bringing misfortune and destruction to the families they perceived as the source of their grudge. Furthermore, in addition to this "problem" of vengeful spirits, Jien also suggests that was an essential element to its "solution." Throughout the historical narrative and in the final volume of the *Gukanshō,* Jien depicts himself as the most

capable Buddhist ritual practitioner, endowed with the capability to effectively resolve the threat of malevolent spirits through his ability to correctly perceive the presence of these "invisible" spirits, as well as perform the rites to counter their influence. While Jien's discussion of the "invisible" realm, particularly the presence of the "evil" spirits of vengeful spirits in the narrative of the *Gukanshō* has been largely ignored in previous studies, I have attepted to show how these vengeful spirits are crucial in understanding not only the worldview that Jien presented to his readers, but also that this recongizition of the importance of vengeful spirits has implications on how we can understand the motivations that drove Jien to compose such a text. In other words, the *Gukanshō* can also be read as a work that not only called for the indispensability of Buddhist ritual in the effort to maintain order, but also as an attempt, quite specifically, to convince the present and future sovereigns that they needed to rely on Jien as a trustworthy advisor.

In other words, Jien's emphasis both in the *Gukanshō* and his written vows on the connection between the "proliferation of vengeful spirits" and social disorder around the capital could also be seen as responding to growing anxieties regarding the rise of military power and years of unrest caused by the conflicts between the imperial family, the different lineages of the Fujiwara family, and military families. Jien offered an explanation of the growing disorder felt in the capital by attributing it to the influence of vengeful spirits, which he proposed was the result of specific historical developments in Japan's recent memory. After formulating an explanation for the cause of social disorder, Jien was able to put forth a specific "solution" to deal with the "problem" of vengeful spirits that he promoted. The exoteric and esoteric rituals established in the proximity of

the capital were conceptualized as effective means to liberate vengeful spirits, with the implication that the only way to restore social order was to rely on the merit generated through the ritual practices performed at the *Daisangehōin*. Importantly, it was also designed to be a space for the appreciation of the aesthetics of the garden, suitable for the composition of poetry, which not only created a ritual landscape specific to the sensibilities of the court elite, but also a space in which poetry was, in addition to the performance of Buddhist rites, conceptualized as an effective means to pacify the dead. It is also worth pointing out that this was not a project undertaken by Jien alone, but as Tamenaga's *Record of the Assembly for Relic Worship and Repaying Kindness* shows, it was a collaboration of like-minded aristocratic men who shared the common goal of realizing peace in the realm through ritual and poetry. In this sense, Jien's establishment of the ritual space at the *Daisangehōin* can be viewed as an attempt to assimilate elite court culture into a specific Tendai exoteric-esoteric ritual program, as both viable methods in the underlying goal of pacifying vengeful spirits.

The *Gukanshō*, when interpreted as foremost a work that is fundamentally concerned with the "problem" of vengeful spirits and it's influence on the world, should be viewed as a text that goes well beyond the confines of "historical writing" that is simply concerned with pragmatic or philosophical concerns. Rather, particularly when situated within Jien's larger ritual project at the *Daisangehōin* that reflected a collaborative effort to create a space that consisted of an interplay of court aesthetics and Buddhist ritual to appease the dead, it can be seen as a treatise that reflects a dominantly religious discourse. The religious worldview and the ritual solutions that are

weaved into Jien's historical narrative emphasized the necessity of Buddhist ritual as a means to maintain order in the world. Importantly, it also served to promote himself as the most capable among Buddhist practitioners who was endowed with the ability to correctly perceive the Principles, both "good" and "evil" that influenced historical change, presenting himself as the most qualified person to act as the trusted advisor of the sovereign for the safety and future of the Heian court and its land.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Abe Mika 阿部美香. “Shiryō shōkai: Jien senjutsu ‘Honzonshaku mondō’” 史料紹介：慈円先述「本尊釈問答」. *Tokyō Daigaku Shiryō Hensanjō Kenkyū Kiyō.* Vol. 29 (March 2019): pp. 119-132.

Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. “Shitennōji shōryōin sanrō (Jien jihitsu)” 四天王寺聖霊院参籠（慈円自筆）. In *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957, pp. 283-287.

Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. “Karoku gannen shichigatsu nijyūku nichi (Jien jihitsu” 嘉録元年七月廿九日 （慈円自筆）. In *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957, pp. 283-287.

Ichishima Kenichi 市島謙吉, ed. *Gyokyuyō*. Kokusho kankōkai sōsho Vol. 48-50. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1907-1907.

Nakajima Etsuji 中島悦次. *Gukanshō zen chūkai* 愚管抄前註解. Tokyo: Yōseidō Shuppan, 1969.

Okami Masao 岡見正雄 and Toshihide Akamatsu 赤松俊秀, eds., *Gukanshō, Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, Vol. 86, Iwanami shoten, 1997.

Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英, ed. “Saihō zange hō (Kyōto Shōrenin zō)” 西方懺悔法（京都青蓮院門蔵）. In *Eizan jōdo kyō no kenkyū* 叡山浄土教の研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1979, pp. 27-68.

Shintō Taikei Hensankai, ed. “Kenryaku gyogi: daijō e shinsen hikki“ 建暦御記：大嘗会神饌秘記. In *Shintō taikei: chōgi saishi hen Vol. 5.* 神道大系　朝儀祭祀編五. Tokyo: Shintō Taikei Hensankai, 1985, pp. 97-101.

Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, ed. “Jichin kashō den (nenji ki)” 慈鎮和尚伝（年次記）. In *Zoku Tendai shū zensho: Shiden 2—Nihon Tendai sō denrui I* 続天台全書 史伝２　日本天台僧伝類 I, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 395-402.

Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, ed. “Jichin kashō den (Chōgyō ki)” 慈鎮和尚伝（長行記）. In *Zoku Tendai shū zensho: Shiden 2—Nihon Tendai sō denrui I* 続天台全書 史伝２　日本天台僧伝類 I, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 395-402.

Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, ed. “Hikyōshō” 秘経鈔. In *Zoku Tendai shū zensho: Mikkyō 3—Kyōten chūshaku rui II* 続天台全書 密教３　経典注釈類 II, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 1-31.

Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, ed. “Hisōshōshū” 秘相承集. In *Zoku Tendai shū zensho: Mikkyō 3—Kyōten chūshaku rui II* 続天台全書 密教３　経典注釈類 II, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 32-45.

Tendai Shūten Hensanjo, ed. “Betsugyōkyō shō” 別行経抄. In *Zoku Tendai shū zensho: Mikkyō 3—Kyōten chūshaku rui II* 続天台全書 密教３　経典注釈類 II, Shiga: Tendai shūten hensanjo, 1990, pp. 46-89.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “Rokka shū Shūgyokushū” 六家集拾玉集. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 1-514.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “Kenkyū gonen Jien keihaku bun” 建久五年慈円敬白文. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 817-818.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “[Monyōki] Tendai kangaku kō engi” ［門葉記］天台勧学講縁起. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 818-825.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “[Monyōki] Daisenpōin jōjō kishō no koto” ［門葉記］大懺法院條々起請事. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 826-842.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “[Monyōki] Sonshō darani kuyō hyōbyaku” ［門葉記］尊勝陀羅尼供養表白. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 857-860.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “[Monyōki] Shari hōonki Sugawara no Tamenaga saku” ［門葉記］舎利報恩記　菅原為長作. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 860-862.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. “Kasuga hyōbyaku” 春日表白. In *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945, pp. 890-892.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, ed. “Monyōki” 門葉記. In *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō zuzō vol. 12* 大正新修大蔵経図像 12 巻. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan kai, 1934.

Secondary Sources:

Abe Ryuichi 阿部龍一. “Nara ki no mikkyō no sai kentō” 奈良期の密教の再検討. In *Nara bukkyō to zaichi shakai* 奈良仏教と在地社会, edited by Nemoto Seiji, Samuel C. Morse 根本誠二・サムエル C.モース [編]. Tokyo: Iwata shoin, 2004.

Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎. “Maō tono keiyaku—dairoku tenmaō shinwa no bunmyaku”魔王との契約—第六天魔王神話の文脈. In *Chūsei gunki no tenbō* 中世軍記の展望台, edited by Takehisa Tsuyoshi 武久堅. Osaka: Izumi shoin, 2006.

Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Kamakura bukkyō no kenkyū* 鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1957.

Akamatsu Toshihide 赤松俊秀. *Zoku Kamakura Bukkyō no kenkyū* 続鎌倉仏教の研究. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1966.

Aoki Akira 青木晃. “Tengu, oni, soshite onryō, chūsei shinwa no kōchiku—‘taiheiki’ no fushigi sekai ittan” 天狗・鬼そして怨霊、中世神話の構築—『太平記』の“不思議”世界一端. In *Taiheiki to sono shūhen* 太平記とその周辺, edited by Hasegawa Tadashi 長谷川端. Tokyo: Shintensha, 1994.

Brown, Delmer M. and Ichirō Ishida. *The Future and the Past: A translation and study of the Gukanshō, an interpretative history of Japan written in 1219*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Brownlee, John S. *Political Thought in Japanese Historical Writing: From Kojiki (712) to Tokushi Yoron (1712).* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.

Chikamoto Kensuke 近本謙介. “Jien kara Keisei he” 慈円から慶政へ *Chūsei bungaku kenkyū wa Nihon bunka o kaimei dekiru ka: “Chūsei Bungakkai sōsetsu 50-shūnen kinen shipojūmu”* Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2006.

Chishō Daishi Kenkyū Henshū Iinkai 智証大師研究編集委員会, ed. *Chishō daishi kenkyū* 智証大師研究. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1989.

Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. *Gukanshō no uso to makoto: rekishi katari no jikogenkyūsei wo koedete* 『愚管抄』の〈ウソ〉と〈マコト〉—歴史語りの自己言及性を超え出て. Tokyo: Shinwasha, 2006.

Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. “Jien: Gukanshō” 慈円『愚管抄』. In *Iwanami kōza nihon no shisō dai rokkan chitsujo to kihan—kokka no naritachi* 岩波講座　日本の思想　第六巻　秩序と規範—「国家」のなりたち, edited by Karube Tadashi, Kurozumi Makoto, Satō

Hiroō, Sueki Fumihiko 苅部直・黒住真・佐藤弘夫・末木文美士［編］, 284-295. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2013.

Fujii Keisuke 藤井恵介. *Mikkyō kenchiku kūkan ron* 密教建築空間論. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1998.

Gomi Fumihiko 五味文彦. *Inseiki shakai no kenkyū* 院政期社会の研究. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1984.

Hambrick, Charles Hilton. "The 'Gukanshō': A Religious View of Japanese History," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* Vol. 5, No. 1 (March, 1978), pp. 37-58.

Hambrick, Charles Hilton. *Gukanshō*: A Religious View of Japanese History. PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1971.

Hashimoto Yoshihiko 橋本義彦. *Heian kizoku shakai no kenkyū* 平安貴族社会の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1976.

Higuchi Kentarō 樋口健太郎. *Chūsei ōken no keisei to sekkanke* 中世王権の形成と摂関家. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan, 2018.

Higuchi Kentarō 樋口健太郎. *Chūsei sekkanke no ie to kenryoku* 中世摂関家の家と権力. Tokyo: Azekura shobō, 2011.

Hongō Keiko 本郷恵子. *Ayashii monotachi no chūsei* 怪しいものたちの中世. Tokyo: Kadokawa, 2015.

Hurst III, G. Cameron. *Insei: Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan, 1086-1185.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Imai Shōnosuke 今井正之助. "Go-daigo onryō dan no kikō" 後醍醐怨霊譚の機構. In *Kokugo kokubungaku hō* Vol. 50 国語国文学報 50. (March 1992): 29-40.

Inaba Nobumichi 稲葉伸道. "Shōrenin monzeki no seiritsu to tenkai" 青蓮院門跡の成立と展開. In *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会, edited by Kawane Yoshiyasu and Fukuda Eijirō 河音能平・福田栄次郎, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2004.

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. *Onryō shiseki kō* 怨霊史跡考. Tokyo: Keibundō, 2001.

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. "Onryō shisō to shikei teishi" 怨霊思想と死刑停止. In *Waseda daigaku daigakuin hōken ronshū* Vol. 26 早稲田大学大学院法研論集　26 (1982): 1-27.

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. “Onryō to bukkyō tōsei” 怨霊と仏教統制. In *Meiji daigaku daigakuin kiyō 1 hōgaku hen* Vol. 23 明治大学大学院紀要 1 法学篇 23 (1980):

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. “Onryō shisō no genryū” 怨霊思想の源流. In *Tokoha gakuen fuji tanki daigaku kenkyū kiyō* Vol. 1 常葉学園富士短期大学研究紀要 1 (1991)

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. “Onryō shisō no denrai” 怨霊思想の伝来. In *Tokoha gakuen fuji tanki daigaku kenkyū kiyō* Vol. 4 常葉学園富士短期大学研究紀要 4 (1994)

Inaoka Akira 稲岡彰. “Heian jidai shotō no onryō shisō” 平安時代初頭の怨霊思想. In *Tokoha gakuen fuji tanki daigaku kenkyū kiyō* Vol. 5 常葉学園富士短期大学研究紀要 5 (1995)

Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien hōraku waka ronkō* 慈円法楽和歌論考. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2015.

Ishikawa Hajime 石川一. *Jien waka ronkō* 慈円和歌論考. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin 笠間書院, 1998.

Ishida Ichirō 石田一良. *Gukanshō no kenkyū: sono seiritsu to shisō* 愚管抄の研究—その成立と思想. Tokyo: Perikansha, 2000.

Itō Hiroyuki 伊藤博之, Imanari Genshō 今成元昭, Yamada Shōzen 山田昭全, eds. *Bukkyō bungaku kōza dai yonkan: waka renga haikai* 仏教文学講座　第四巻　和歌・連歌・俳徊. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 1995.

Kabutogi Shōkō 兜木正亨. *Hokke shakyō no kenkyū* 法華写経の研究. Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1983.

Kanō Shigefumi 加納重文. *Kujyō Kanezane—shashoku no kokorozashi, ten’i shinryo ni kotaeru mono ka* 九条兼実—社稷の志、天意神慮に答える者か—. Kyoto: Mineruva Shobō, 2016.

Katsukura Toshikazu 勝倉壽一. “Ōkagami asahira goryō no seiritsu” 『大鏡』朝成怨霊譚の成立. In *Genbun* vol. 48 言文 48 (2001): 27-36.

Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平. *Tenjin shinkō no seiritsu: nihon ni okeru kodai kara chūsei e no ikō* 天神信仰の成立：日本における古代から中世への移行. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2003.

Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平. *Kawane Yoshiyasu chosakushū dai 2 kan: Tenjin shinkō to chūsei shoki no bunka shisō* 河音能平著作集　第二巻：天神信仰と中世初期の文化・思想. Kyoto: Bunrikaku, 2010.

Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平. "Goryō shinkō no tenkai" 御霊信仰の展開. In *Chūsei hōken shakai no shuto to nōson* 中世封建社会と首都と農村. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1984.

Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平 and Fukuda Eijirō 福田榮次郎 ed. *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2004.

Kikuchi Hiroki 菊地大樹. *Kamakura Bukkyō heno michi: jissen to shūgaku, shinjin no keifu* 鎌倉仏教への道―実践と修学・信心の系譜. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2011.

Kobayashi Shigefumi 小林茂文. "Sawara shinnō onryō gensetsu no hatsumei" 早良親王怨霊言説の発明. In *Shigaku* vol. 79-3 (July 2010): 211-244.

Kubota Jun 久保田淳. *Chūsei waka shi no kenkyū* 中世和歌史の研究. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1993.

Kutoba Osamu 久保田収. *Yasaka jinja no kenkyū* 八坂神社の研究. Kyoto: Shinōshi Gakkai, 1974.

Makabe Toshinobu 真壁俊信. *Tenjin shinkō shi no kenkyū* 天神信仰史の研究. Tokyo: Zoku Gunshoruijū Kanseikai, 1994.

Manaka Fujiko 間中富士子. *Jichin kashō no kenkyū* 慈鎮和尚の研究. Tokyo: Morikita Shoten, 1943.

Manaka Fujiko 間中富士子. *Jichin kashō oyobi shūgyokushū no kenkyū* 慈鎮和尚及び拾玉集の研究. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1974.

Marra, Michele. "The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (December, 1985), pp. 319-341.

Matsuoka Kumiko 松岡久美子. "Shōtoku taishi no mononobe no moriya tōbatsu dan to sanmon no shitennō hō―shitennōji yō shitennō no jyuyō wo megutte" 聖徳太子の物部守屋討伐譚と山門の四天王法―四天王寺様四天王の受容をめぐって. In *Hōhō to shiteno bukkyō bunka shi: hito mono image no rekishi gaku* 方法としての仏教文化史：ヒト・モノ・イメージの歴史学, edited by Nakano Genzō 中野玄三, Kasuya Makoto 加須屋誠, Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫, 325-363. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010.

Matsumoto Ikuyo 松本郁代. “Onjōjibon ‘Hōhiki’ kuden to kujō sekkan ke: tendai jimon ha ni okeru hanryū no keisei” 園城寺本『宝秘記』口伝と九条摂関家―天台寺門派における範流の形成. In *Hōhō to shiteno bukkyō bunka shi: hito mono image no rekishi gaku* 方法としての仏教文化史：ヒト・モノ・イメージの歴史学, edited by Nakano Genzō 中野玄三, Kasuya Makoto 加須屋誠, Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫, 291-324. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010.

Matsumoto Haruhisa 松本治久. “Ōkagami ga kataru ‘onryō’” 『大鏡』が語る「怨霊」. In *Chūko bungaku* Vol. 44 (January 1990): 48-57.

Matsumoto Haruhisa 松本治久. “Ōkagami ga kataru kaii reii” 大鏡が語る怪異・霊異. In *Ōkagami no kenkyū* 大鏡の研究. Tokyo: Ōfu, 1993.

Matsubayashi Yasuaki 松林靖明. *Chūsei no senran to bungaku* 中世の戦乱と文学. Osaka: Izumi Shoin, 2018.

Matsubayashi Yasuaki 松林靖明. “Jyōkyū ki to Go-Tobain no onryō” 『承久記』と後鳥羽院の怨霊. In *Nihon bungaku* Vol. 34-5 (May 1985): 1-9.

Matsuzono Hitoshi 松薗斉. *Nikki no ie—chūsei kokka no kiroku soshiki* 日記の家―中世国家の記録組織. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997.

Mieda Akiko 三枝暁子. *Hieizan to muromachi bakufu: jisha to buke no kyōto shihai* 比叡山と室町幕府：寺社と武家の京都支配. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 2011.

Misaki Ryoshu 三崎良周. “Jichin kashō no butsugen shinkō” 慈鎮和尚の仏眼信仰. *Mikkyō bunka* 69-70 (1964): 61-76.

Mitsuhashi Tadashi 三橋正. *Heian jidai no shinkō to shūkyō girei* 平安時代の信仰と宗教儀礼. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 2000.

Mitsuhashi Tadashi 三橋正. *Nihon kodai jingi seido no keisei to tenkai* 日本古代神祇制度の形成と展開. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 2010.

Miura Hiroyuki 三浦周行. *Nihon shi no kenkyū* 日本史の研究. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1922.

Miyata Kenzō 宮田敬三. “Kakuzenshō ‘kongō yasha hō’ to genpei gassen”『覚禅鈔』「金剛夜叉法」と源平合戦. In *Hōhō to shiteno bukkyō bunka shi: hito mono image no rekishi gaku* 方法としての仏教文化史：ヒト・モノ・イメージの歴史学, edited by Nakano Genzō 中野玄三, Kasuya Makoto 加須屋誠, Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫, 260-290. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010.

Mizukami Fumiyoshi 水上文義. *Taimitsu shisō keisei no kenkyū* 台密思想形成の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2008.

Mori Shigeaki 森茂暁. “Go-daigo tennō—sono onryō to chinkon, bungaku heno eikyō” 後醍醐天皇—その怨霊と鎮魂、文学への影響. In *Kyūshū shigaku* Vol. 126 (August 2000): 55-68.

Mori Shinnosuke 森新之介. “Jien ‘Gukanshō’ yōgakushosetsu: sono sōtei dokusha ni chakumoku shite” 慈円『愚管抄』幼学書説–その想定読者に着目して. *Nihon shisō shigaku* 47 (September 2015): 56-71.

Momo Hiroyuki 桃裕行. *Momo Hiroyuki chosaku shū dai ikkan: Jyōdai gakusei no kenkyū*. 桃裕行著作集第一巻　上代学制の研究. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1994.

Momo Hiroyuki 桃裕行. *Momo Hiroyuki chosaku shū dai nikan: Jyōdai gakusei ronkō*. 桃裕行著作集第二巻　上代学制論攷. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1993.

Murata Masashi 村田正志. “Gakusō to jiin” 学僧と寺院. In *Murata Masashi chosaku shū dai go kan: Kokushi gaku ronsetsu* 村田正志著作集　第五巻 国史学論説. pp. 90-198. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan 思文閣出版, 1985.

Murata Masashi 村田正志. “Shōrenin yoshimizu zō ni okeru jien shiryō” 青蓮院吉水蔵における慈円史料. *Rekishi Chiri* 歴史地理. Vol. 84, pp. 35-57.

Murayama Shūichi 村山修一. *Tenjin goryō shinkō* 天神御霊信仰. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1996.

Murayama Shūichi 村山修一. *Hieizan shi: tatakai to inori no seiiki* 比叡山史：闘いと祈りの聖域. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994.

Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二 (Ed.), trans. by Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄, Nagahara Keiji 永原慶二, Kasamatsu Hiroshi 笠松宏. *Nihon no meicho 9: Jien Gukanshō, Kitabatake Chikafusa Jinnō shōtōki* 日本の名著９：慈円『愚管抄』、北畠親房『神皇正統記』. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1971.

Nagafuji Yasushi 永藤靖. “Kodai toshi to goryō—onryō kara goryō shinkō he” 古代都市と御霊—怨霊から御霊信仰へ. In *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kanshō* Vol. 63-3 (March 1998): 96-102.

Nagamura Makoto 永村眞. *Chūsei no monzeki to kōbu kenryoku* 中世の門跡と公武権力. 戎光祥出版. 2017.

Nagasaki Hiroshi 長崎浩. *Ranse no seiji ron: Gukanshō o yomu* 乱世の政治論—愚管抄を読む. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2016.

Nanri Michiko 南里みち子. *Onryō to shugen no setsuwa* 怨霊と修験の説話. Tokyo: Perikan sha, 1996.

Nara Hiromoto 奈良弘元. “Reiji sahō to saihō zange” 例時作法と西方懺悔. In *Shoki eizan jōdo kyō no kenkyu* 初期叡山浄土教の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1978.

Nishimoto Masahiro 西本昌弘. “Sawara shinnō kōkyo no shūhen” 早良親王薨去の周辺. In *Nihon Rekishi* Vol. 629 (October 2000): 69-74.

Nishimoto Masahiro 西本昌弘. “Fujiwara no tanetsugu jiken no saikentō” 藤原種継事件の再検討—早良親王春宮坊と長岡宮の造営. In *Rekishi kagaku* Vol. 165 (August 2001): 1-14.

Nishimoto Masahiro 西本昌弘. “Goryō shinkō ron” 御霊信仰論. In *Iwanami kōza nihon tsūshi 5* 岩波講座日本通史５. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995.

Nomura Ikuyo 野村育世. *Kazokushi to shite no nyoin ron* 家族史としての女院論. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2006.

Nunoya Yōko. 布谷陽子. “Jyōkyū no ran go no ōke to Go-Toba tsuizen butsuji” 承久の乱後の王家と後鳥羽追善仏事. In *Chūsei no chiiki to shūkyō* 中世の地域と宗教, edited by Haga Norihiko 羽下徳彦, pp. 229-264. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2005
ヌノヤ, ヨウコ

Obara Hitoshi 小原仁 [Ed.] *Gyokuyō o yomu: Kujō Kanezane to sono jidai* 玉葉を読む—九条兼実とその時代. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2013.

Okada Shōji 岡田荘司. *Heian jidai no kokka to saishi*. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1994.

Ogami Kanchu 尾上寛仲. “Jichin kashō no kagakukō” 慈鎮和尚の勧学講. *Tendai gakuhō* Vol. 14, 1972, pp. 67-79.

Ogami Kanchu 尾上寛仲. “Jichin kashō no kangakukō to kuritakō oyobi yusugikō” 慈鎮和尚の勧学講と栗田講及び湯次講. *Tendai gakuhō* Vol. 15, 1973, pp. 43-51.

Ōae Akira 大饗亮. *Gyokuyō jikō sakuin* 玉葉事項索引. Tokyo: Kazama Shobō 風間書房, 1991.

Ōe Atsushi 大江篤. *Nihon kodai no kami to rei* 日本古代の神と霊. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 2007.

Ōe Atsushi 大江篤. “Kawaradera to onryō—Iyo shinnō no rei wo megutte” 川原寺と怨霊—伊予親王の霊をめぐって. In *Kaii gaku no gihō* 怪異学の技法, edited by Higashi ajia kaii gakkai. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 2003.

Ōmori Akihisa 大森亮尚. *Nihon no onryō* 日本の怨霊. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2007.

Ōmori Keiko 大森恵子. *Nenbutsu geinō to goryō shinkō* 念仏芸能と御霊信仰. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1992.

Ōtsu Yūichi 大津雄一. “Onryō ha osoroshiki koto nareba—onryō no kinō to gunki monogatari no shihatsu” 怨霊は恐ろしき事なれば—怨霊の機能と軍記物語の始発. In *Gunki bungaku no keifu to tenkai* 軍記文学の系譜と展開, edited by Kajihara Masaaki 梶原正昭. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1998.

Obara Hitoshi 小原仁. *Chūsei kizoku shakai to bukkyō* 中世貴族社会と仏教. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007.

Ōno Jyunko 大野順子. “Kenkyū ki kujō ke kadan ni okeru waka hyōgen ni tsuite—jyusshu zōtōka gun wo chūshin ni” 建久期九条家歌壇における和歌表現について—十首贈答歌群を中心に. In *Kodai chūsei bungaku ronkō dai 28 shū*, 221-246. Tokyo: Shintensha, 2013.

Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄. *Saigyō, Jien to nihon no bukkyō: tonsei shisō to chūsei bunka* 西行・慈円と日本の仏教—遁世思想と中世文化. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2016.

Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄, Nishiguchi Junko 西口順子, eds. *Series josei to bukkyō: shinjin to kuyō* シリーズ　女性と仏教　信心と供養. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1989.

Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄. *Gukanshō o yomu: chūsei nihon no rekishikan* 愚管抄を読む—中世日本の歴史観. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1986.

Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō no gengo kūkan* 愚管抄の言語空間. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2014.

Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō no sōsei to hōhō* 愚管抄の創成と方法. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 2004.

Ozaki Isamu 尾崎勇. *Gukanshō to sono zengo* 愚管抄とその前後. Osaka : Izumi Shoin 和泉書院, 1993.

Sakurai Tokutarō 櫻井徳太郎. “Onryō kara goryō he—chūsei teki shiryōkan no tenkai” 怨霊から御霊へ—中世的死霊観の展開. In *Kaii no minzoku gaku 6: yūrei* 怪異の民族学６　幽霊, edited by Komatsu Kazuhiko, pp. 16-26. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 2001.

Saeki Tomohiro 佐伯智宏. *Chūsei zenki no seiji kōzō to ōke* 中世前期の政治構造と王家. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2015.

Saigō Nobutsuna 西郷信綱. *Kodaijin to yume* 古代人と夢. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1972.

Sakai Kimi 酒井紀美. *Yumegatari, yume toki no chūsei* 夢語り・夢解きの中世. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2001.

Sakurai Yoshirō 桜井好郎. “Chūsei ni okeru shinwa to rekishi jyojutsu—Jien no jiseki wo megutte” 中世における神話と歴史叙述—慈円の事績をめぐって. In *Chūsei nihon no ōken shūkyō geinō* 中世日本の王権・宗教・芸能. Jinbun Shoin 人文書院. 1988, pp. 150-168.

Sakurai Yoshirō 桜井好郎. *Reikonkan no keifu: reikishi minzokugaku no shiten* 霊魂観の系譜：歴史民俗学の視点. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1989.

Satō Tetsuei 佐藤哲英. *Eizan jōdo kyō no kenkyū* 叡山浄土教の研究. Kyoto: Hyakkaen, 1979.

Selinger, Vyjayanthi R. “The Sword Trope and the Birth of the Shogunate: Historical Metaphors in Muromachi Japan,” *Japanese Language and Literature*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (April 2009), pp. 55-81.

Shibata Kenryū 柴田賢龍. *Yakuchū usuzōshi kuketsu* 訳注薄草子口訣. Kyoto: Bunseidō, 2002.

Shibata Minoru 柴田實, ed. *Goryō shinkō* 御霊信仰. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1984.

See Shimizu Masayuki 清水正之. *Gukanshō ni okeru rihō to rekishi—dōri no gainen wo chūshin ni*『愚管抄』における理法と歴史—道理の概念を中心に. *Rinrigaku nenpō* Vol. 25, 1976, pp. 159-172.

Shimizu Shinchō 清水真澄. “Jien no kiseki—Kujō ke ni okeru buppō kōryū wo megutte” 慈円の軌跡—九条家における仏法興隆をめぐって. Shōtoku Daigaku Gengo Bungaku Kenkyūjo Ronsō, Vol. 14, 2006, pp. 195-232.

Shimosaka Mamoru 下坂守. *Miyako o shihaisuru yamabōshitachi: chūsei enryakuji no tomi to chikara* 京を支配する山法師たち: 中世延暦寺の富と力. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2011.

Shimosaka Mamoru 下坂守. *Chūsei jiin shakai to minshū: shuto to bashaku jinin kawaramono* 中世寺院社会と民衆：衆徒と馬借・神人・河原者. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2014.

Shimosaka Mamoru 下坂守. *Chūsei jiin shakai no kenkyū* 中世寺院社会の研究. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001.

Shintani Takanori 新谷尚紀. "Goryō to tatari" 御霊と祟り. In *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kanshō* vol. 63-3 (March 1998): 88-95.

Suda Haruko 須田春子. "Sawara shinnō goryō to akishinodera" 早良親王御霊と秋篠寺. In *Kodai bungakushi ronkō* vol. 2 (June 1981): 1-12.
Suzuki Masamichi 鈴木正道. *Jien kenkyū jyosetsu* 慈円研究序説. Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1993.

Suzuki Satoshi 鈴木哲. *Tōjō to chinkon no chūsei* 闘諍と鎮魂の中世. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha, 2010.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Jien no kenkyū* 慈円の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1980.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Gyokuyō sakuin: Fujiwara Kanezane no kenkyū* 玉葉索引：藤原兼実の研究. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼, ed. *Kōhon Shūgyokushū* 校本拾玉集. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1971.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗隼. *Jien* 慈円. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1959.

Taga Munehaya 多賀宗早, ed. *Jien zenshū* 慈円全集. Tokyo: Nanajō Shoin, 1945.

Takei Akio 竹居明男. *Tenjin shinkō hen nen shiryō shūsei: heian jidai kamakura jidai zenki hen* 天神信仰編年史料集成: 平安時代・鎌倉時代前期篇. Tokyo: Kakusho Kankōkai, 2003.

Takei Akio 竹居明男. “Tenjin shinkō no rekishi—onryō kara ‘tenman daijizai tenjin’ he” 天神信仰の歴史—怨霊から「天満大自在天神」へ. In *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* Vol. 67-4 (April 2002): 6-22.

Takei Akio 竹居明男. “Onryō no genei—godaidō to sekkan ke fujiwara shi” 怨霊の幻影—五大堂と摂関家藤原氏. In *Nihon shisō shigaku* Vol. 19. (1987)

Taira Masayuki 平雅行. *Kamakura bukkyō to senshū nenbutsu* 鎌倉仏教と専修念仏. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2017.

Taira Masayuki 平雅行. “Shōrenin no monzeki sōron to kamakura bakufu” 青蓮院の門跡相論と鎌倉幕府. In *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会, edited by Kawane Yoshiyasu and Fukuda Eijirō 河音能平・福田栄次郎, Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2004.

Tanahashi Mitsuo 棚橋光男. *Chūsei seiritsu ki no hō to kokka* 中世成立期の法と国家. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1983.

Tanaka Takako 田中貴子. “Gyokujyo no seiritsu to genkai: ‘jichin kashō musō ki’ kara ‘shinran yume no ki’ made”〈玉女〉の成立と限界『慈鎮和尚夢想記』から『親鸞夢記』まで. In *Series josei to bukkyō: shinjin to kuyō* シリーズ 女性と仏教　信心と供養, edited by Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄 and Nishiguchi Junko 西口順子, 91-126. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1989.

Tochigi Yoshitada 栃木孝惟. “Gunki monogatari he no michi” 軍記物語への道. In *Gunki monogatari keisei shi jyosetsu* 軍記物語形成史序説, pp. 9-64. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2002. “

Tsukudo Reikan 筑土鈴寛. *Jien: kokka to rekishi oyobi bungaku* 慈円：国家と歴史及び文学. Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1942.

Ueda Masaaki 上田正昭, ed. *Tenman tenjin: goryō kara gakumongami e* 天満天神：御霊から学問神へ. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1988.

Ueno Katsuaki 上野勝之. *Yume to mononoke no seishinshi : Heian kizoku no shinkō sekai* 夢とモノノケの精神史：平安貴族の信仰世界. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppankai, 2013.

Ueno Makoto 上野誠. “Higyō no shisha no katari to ōken—tatari to saishi no enkan teki kōzō” 非業の死者の語りと王権—祟りと祭祀の円環的構造. In *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* vol. 63-3 国文学解釈と鑑賞 63-3 (March 1998): 72-79.

Uwayokote Masataka 上横手雅敬, Motoki Yasuo 元木康雄, Katsuyama Seiji 勝山清次, eds. *Nihon no chūsei: Insei to Heishi, Kamakura Seiken* 日本の中世　院政と平氏、鎌倉政権. Tokyo: Chūōkōron shinsha, 2002.

Wada Junko 和田淳子. “Fujiwara no asahira to asahira onryō dan” 藤原朝成と朝成怨霊譚. In *Heian bungaku kenkyū* Vol. 4 (June 1986): 27-35.

Wakita Haruko 脇田晴子. *Nihon chūsei jyosei shi no kenkyū—seibetsu yakuwari buntan to bosei kasei seiai* 日本中世女性史の研究—性別役割分担と母性・家政・性愛. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1992.

Watanabe Shujun 渡辺守順, ed. *Hieizan* 比叡山. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1987.

Yabu Motoaki 藪元晶. *Amagoi girei no seiritsu to tenkai* 雨乞儀礼の成立と展開. Tokyo: Iwata shoin, 2002.

Yamada Akiko 山田彩起子. *Chūsei zenki jyosei ingū no kenkyū* 中世前期女性院宮の研究. Kyoto: Shinbunkaku Shuppan, 2010.

Yamada Shōzen 山田昭全. *Saigyō no waka to bukkyō* 西行の和歌と仏教. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1987.

Yamada Yūji 山田雄司. *Sutoku-in onryō no kenkyū* 崇徳院怨霊の研究. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001.

Yamada Yūji 山田雄司. *Bakko suru onryō: tatari to chinkon no nihon shi* 跋扈する怨霊：祟りと鎮魂の日本史. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2007.

Yamamoto Hajime 山本一. “Jien no gensetsu katsudō” 慈円の言説活動. In *Chusei bungaku to jiin shiryō/shōgyō* 中世文学と寺院資料・聖教. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2010.

Yamamoto Hajime 山本一. *Jien no waka to shisō* 慈円の和歌と思想. Tokyo: Taiyōsha, 1999.

Yamamoto Akihiro 山本章博. *Chūsei shakyōka no kenkyū—jyakunen saigyō jien* 中世釈教歌の研究—寂然・西行・慈円. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 2016.

Yamamoto Nobuyoshi 山本信吉. “Shōrenin monzeki yoshimizu zō shōgyō ni tsuite” 青蓮院門跡吉水蔵聖経について. In *Shōrenin monzeki yoshimizu zō shōgyō mokuroku* 青蓮院門跡吉水蔵聖経目録. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1999.

Yamazaki Toshio 山崎敏夫. *Chūsei waka to sono shūhen* 中世和歌とその周辺. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1980.

Zen Hiroaki 善裕昭. “Jien no daizanhōin to onryō metsuzai” 慈円の大懺法院と怨霊滅罪. In *Myōkenron: nihonjin no seishinshi* 冥顕論―日本人の精神史, edited by Ikemi Chōryū 池見澄隆. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2012.

Zen Hiroaki 善裕昭. “Chūsei sanmon shiryō to zendō” 中世山門史料と善導. In *Nihon bukkyō no keisei to tenkai* 日本仏教の形成と展開, edited by Itō Yuishin 伊藤唯真. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2002.

Zen Hiroaki 善裕昭. “Agui chōken no zendō juyō wo megutte―‘hokkekyō narabini amidakyō shaku’ wo chūshinni” 安居院澄憲の善導受容をめぐって―『法華経幷阿弥陀経釈』を中心に―. In *Takahashi kōji sensei koki kinen ronshū: jōdogaku bukkyōgaku ronsō* 高橋弘次古稀記念: 浄土学仏教学論叢, edited by Asaji Kōhei 浅地康平. Tokyo: Sanbō Busshrin, 2004.