

The Kōfukuji Nan'endō and Its Buddhist Icons: Emplacing Family
Memory and History of the Northern Fujiwara Clan, 800-1200

By
© 2018
Yen-Yi Chan

Submitted to the graduate degree program in The Kress Foundation Department of Art History
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chair: Sherry Fowler

Amy McNair

Maya Stiller

Maki Kaneko

William Lindsey

Date Defended: 9 November 2018

The dissertation committee for Yen-Yi Chan certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:

**The Kōfukuji Nan'endō and Its Buddhist Icons: Emplacing Family
Memory and History of the Northern Fujiwara Clan, 800-1200**

Chair: Sherry Fowler

Date Approved: 9 November 2018

Abstract

This dissertation investigates how the memorial function of the Nan'endō (Southern Round Hall) at Kōfukuji in Nara began, continued, and transformed within the history of the Northern Fujiwara clan from the ninth through the twelfth centuries. Departing from the previous scholarship on the Nan'endō, this study considers that ancestral commemoration is as important as religious devotion in considering the visual forms of the sanctuary and its relationship with the Northern Fujiwara clan. With a *longue durée* approach to the Nan'endō along with analyses of its visual program and an array of texts such as courtier diaries, *setsuwa* tales, travel journals, and temple records, I demonstrate that the architecture of the building and its Buddhist images functioned as a locus of memory and an engine of remembering for the maintenance of family institution, its tradition, value, and ways of thinking. Spatial and visual components of the Nan'endō were like “building bricks” employed to construct an image of the Northern Fujiwara as a familial group, present their preoccupation with lineage and kinship, and make their existence and experiences *visible*. This dissertation therefore uses a novel approach to illuminate the interactions between place, memory, and family in Japanese Buddhist studies and unravel the role of religious sites as a visual means through which the faithful developed ideas about themselves and attitudes toward their lives.

Chapter One outlines the history of Kōfukuji, the tutelary temple of the Fujiwara clan, from the eighth to twelfth century. This delineation sets up a religious and familial context, in which the Nan'endō was situated and its history unfolded. Chapter Two examines the creation of the Nan'endō as a memorial in 813, exploring how the practices of religious devotion and ancestral commemoration coalesced and manifested in the architectural features of the hall and its iconographic program. Chapter Three deals with the transformation of the Nan'endō as a

miraculous site beginning in the mid-eleventh century. I explore the factors that contributed to this transformation and analyze Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales and replications of the building that testified to the sanctification of the site.

Chapter Four delves into the devotion history of Fukūkenjaku Kannon (Skt. Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara) in the Northern Fujiwara family from the eighth to the twelfth century. I analyze the process in which the icon of this deity in the Nan'endō became identified as the protector of the Northern Fujiwara clan in the late eleventh century. In doing so, I examine images of the deity, accounts of the family's devotion to it, and copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Chapter Five investigates the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its images during 1181-1189 with a focus on the patronage of Fujiwara (Kujō) no Kanezane (1149-1207), showing how his role as the chieftain of the family, his Pure Land devotion, and contemporary belief in living Buddhas (*shōjin butsu*) informed the restoration of the hall.

To my parents, Chao-Hsin Chan and Yu-Hui Ni

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have come to completion without the support and assistance of many people. I would like to thank first and foremost my adviser, Sherry Fowler, for her guidance, support, and encouragement all these years. She read through draft after draft, providing invaluable comments and editing suggestions that greatly improved this work. I have received valuable training and career advice from her. I feel very fortunate to have her as my adviser. I also want to express my gratitude to the abbot of Kōfukuji, Tagawa Shun'ei, who graciously permitted me access to the Nan'endō and other buildings outside the regular time and allowed me to view closely the *tendoku* performance held in the hall. I am also indebted to the staff members of Kōfukuji and Gyoei Saile, who arranged my multiple visits to the temple. Gyoei also kindly shared his knowledge of Kōfukuji with me, offered his time to answer my questions, and provided his feedback on this work. I am grateful to his assistance, input, and generosity.

I would like to thank my committee members, Amy McNair, Maki Kaneko, Maya Stiller, and William Lindsey, who offered constructive comments on this dissertation and suggestions on translations of important texts. Courses I took from them provided sources of ideas critical to this work. I also want to specially thank Daniel Stevenson, who taught me Buddhism, helped me with interpretations of important texts, and was generous with his time to discuss my research.

Much of research and writing of this work took place in Japan during the years of 2015-2017. My time spent there was crucial for the completion of this dissertation. I thank Patricia Fister for letting me study under her at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken). Her support throughout the whole period made my stay in Kyoto fruitful. My gratitude also goes to Professor Inaga Shigemi of the Nichibunken for informing me of research

sources and introducing me to other scholars there. I also want to thank the staffs and librarians at the Nichibunken for assisting me in various ways.

This research was also made possible by several grants and fellowships which I acknowledge gratefully. My education at University of Kansas was supported by a fellowship from the Ministry of Education, Taiwan, a Marilyn Stokstad Award and a Scholarship for Academic Excellence in Asian Art History from the department of Art History. I also received grants for conducting research and writing in Japan: a Judith Harris Murphy Fellowship, two Graduate Student Summer Fellowships, and an Art History Travel Fund from the University of Kansas, and a Yu Ying-Shih Humanities Research Award from the Tang Prize Foundation. A Student Research Award from the Spencer Museum of Art, a Graduate Student Travel Grant from the Japan Art History Forum, an Art History Travel Fund and a Graduate Scholarly Presentation Travel Fund from the University of Kansas funded presentations on my research at conferences.

I presented my research at a number of venues and wanted to thank attendees and respondents for valuable comments. Special thanks go to Sarai Mai, whose comments helped me rethink and improve my argument on several parts of the dissertation and to Stanley Abe for spending time discussing the issue of copying to me. My participation in the eleventh International Workshop on Japanese Art History for Graduate Students (JAWS) also yielded valuable feedback on my research and allowed me to meet outstanding colleagues in the field. I would like to thank all of the organizers, sponsors, and participants of the workshop.

Many friends and colleagues supported me in various ways. Special thanks go to Janet Chen, Sobe Ky, Patrick Terry, Tzu-Hsien Yang, Ling Li, and Saka Chihiro for their various help. I also want to thank my classmates and students from the department of Art History at University

of Kansas, especially Pinyan Zhu, Weitian Yan, YeGee Kwon, and Takaaki Kumagai for commeting on my research and acquiring research materials for me. I also want to thank Pei-Jung Wu, Jane Ju, and Michael Jamentz for their encouragement.

Finally, I owe my greatest debt to my parents Chao-Hsin Chan and Yu-Hui Ni for their unfailing support all these years. I also want to thank my sisters Yen-Chun and Cheng-Yu for their encouragement and taking care of my parents.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Place, Memory, and Family History	1
Introduction to Topic	1
Visual Technology over the <i>Longue Durée</i>	4
Place, Memory, and Commemoration	7
Primary Sources	12
Literature Review.....	15
Dissertation Structure.....	21
Chapter One	24
Site of Commemoration, Site of Power:	24
A Brief History of Kōfukuji from the Eighth to Twelfth Century	24
Introduction.....	24
The Creation of Kōfukuji and the Fujiwara Clan	25
Kōfukuji in the Heian Period (794-1185)	41
Conclusion	63
Chapter Two	67
Making Memories:	67
The Creation of the Nan’endō and Its Buddhist Icons in the Ninth Century	67
Introduction.....	67
Issues of the Nan’endō’s Creation	69
Revisiting the Issues: A New Proposition	77
Architecture of the Nan’endō.....	96

The Interior of the Nan'endō	117
Ritualizing Piety, Death, and Memory	131
Conclusion	136
Chapter Three	139
Transforming Memories:	139
The Emergence of the Nan'endō as a Miraculous Site in the Mid-Eleventh Century	139
Introduction.....	139
The Nan'endō after the Early Ninth Century.....	141
Construction of <i>Ujidera</i> and Culture of Commemoration.....	143
Materiality and Memory	155
A New Character.....	157
Conclusion	170
Chapter Four	172
The Protector of the Northern Fujiwara Clan:.....	172
Images, Iconography, and Worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon.....	172
Introduction.....	172
Scriptures and Iconography of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara.....	174
Worship and Images of Bukongjuansuo Guanyin in China.....	179
Worship and Images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in Eighth-Century Japan	187
Worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Heian Period.....	199
Replications of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon	208
A Paradigm of Family Worship.....	230
Conclusion	235
Chapter Five	237
Restoring Family Heritage:.....	237

The Reconstruction of the Nan’endō and Its Buddhist Icons during 1181-1189	237
Introduction.....	237
Kōfukuji in the Aftermath of the 1181 Fire	239
Patron and Artist	242
Reconstruction Process	253
Recreated Images	257
Constructing the Sacred Body in the ‘Flesh’	270
Fostering a Nexus for Rebirth in the Pure Land	293
Conclusion	298
Conclusion	300
The Cult of Remembrance	300
Bibliography	304

Introduction

Place, Memory, and Family History

Each group cuts up space in order to compose, either definitively or in accordance with set methods, a fixed framework within which to enclose and retrieve its remembrances.¹

—Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*

In its oldest and most original sense a monument is a work of man erected for the specific purpose of keeping particular human deeds or destinies (or a complex accumulation thereof) alive and present in the consciousness of future generations.²

—Alois Riegl, “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin”

Introduction to Topic

In the summer of 1103, courtier Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162) visited the Buddhist temple Kōfukuji 興福寺 in Nara to attend the consecration ceremony of the Chūkondō 中金堂 (Central Golden Hall) that was destroyed by fire in 1096.³ Upon entering the temple from the South Gate, he bowed to the Chūkondō, which was situated some steps away from where he stood. After doing this, Tadazane then turned his body to face the west, where another building—the Nan’endō 南円堂 (Southern Round Hall)—stood, and bowed to it.⁴ At the time this devotional act took place, nearly three hundred years had passed since the hall was dedicated

¹ Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), 156-157.

² Alois Riegl, “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin,” in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, ed. Nicholas Stanley Price, Mansfield Kirby Talley, and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro (Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 1996), 69.

³ Fujiwara no Tadazane, *Denryaku*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-1970). Hereafter, the bibliographic information for entries includes journal title, reign year, month, and day, which are then followed by a bracket that shows volume and page number. *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.7.25 (1: 224-225).

⁴ After this, Tadazane bowed to the two buildings again and entered the Chūkondō. He did not visit other halls at Kōfukuji.

in 813 to commemorate ancestors of the Northern Fujiwara clan, from which Tadazane and his lineage *sekkanke* 摂関家 (House of Regents) hailed. His act of devotion seems to indicate the Nan'endō's long-standing presence in the memories of the family, living up to what Riegl describes about the function of a monument—it “kept particular human deeds or destinies (or a complex accumulation thereof) alive and present in the consciousness of future generations.”⁵ Indeed, the Northern Fujiwara clan continued to utilize the building for the purpose of ancestral commemoration in the following centuries after 813, and it gradually evolved into what Royall Tyler describes as a “*sanctum sanctorum* (holy of holies)” of the family.⁶

The Nan'endō is an octagonal structure situated in the southwest corner of Kōfukuji. The building was first constructed by Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu 藤原冬嗣 (775-826), but later burned down four times in 1046, 1181, 1327, and 1717. The current hall, reconstructed in 1797, enshrines sculptures of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon 不空縑索觀音 (Skt. Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara or Avalokiteśvara with the Unfailing Rope) and Four Guardian Kings as well as eight paintings of the patriarchs from the Tendai, Shingon, and Hossō Buddhist schools. Also forming as part of the visual program are the statues of six Hossō monks and a gilt bronze lantern, which is now held at the National Treasure Hall at Kōfukuji. Except for the bronze lantern, these images were recreated earlier in 1189. Previously standing in front of the Nan'endō, the bronze lantern, made in 816, is the only surviving object from the original hall.

This dissertation examines the architecture of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist images from the ninth through the twelfth centuries. It investigates the process and the ways in which the commemorative function of the hall began, continued, and transformed within the family history

⁵ Riegl, “The Modern Cult,” 69.

⁶ Royall Tyler, *The Miracles of the Kasuga Deity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990), 84.

of the Northern Fujiwara clan. By analyzing the entire visual program of the Nan'endō and contextualizing it within the family's performance of ancestral commemoration, their worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, and their interactions with the socio-political environment, this study demonstrates how the building functioned as a locus of memory and an engine of remembering for the maintenance of family institution, its tradition, value, and ways of thinking. The sanctuary was pivotal for the formulation of familial ties and communal identity. Therefore, this dissertation is not only about the construction of a place, but also the emplacement of a family: how its various aspects, such as kinship relationship, religious aspirations, familial history, and political authority became intertwined with a specific space.

The house of the Northern Fujiwara was one of the four lineages of the Fujiwara clan, whose history began in the seventh century. The Northern Fujiwara clan dominated society and politics in the first half of the Heian period (794-1185) by marrying their daughters into the imperial family and serving as regents to the emperors. As the family's tutelary temple, Kōfukuji also prospered during this time, accumulating large landholdings and expanding its political power. Furthermore, in the twelfth century Kōfukuji subjugated Kasuga Shrine under its jurisdiction and transformed itself into the *de facto* ruling body of Yamato Province. Located to the east of Kōfukuji, Kasuga Shrine was the tutelary shrine of the Fujiwara clan founded in the eighth century. In parallel to this institutional change, the main icon of the Nan'endō—Fukūkenjaku Kannon—became identified as the protector of the family and as the “original” form of Kasuga Daimyōjin, which was the name for the clan's tutelary *kami* (local divinities) at Kasuga Shrine.

Situated at the intersection between the Northern Fujiwara and the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex, the Nan'endō provides a window onto the interactions between religious institutions

and powerful family in premodern times. The Nan'endō has yet another importance: it is the repository of the sculptures that are considered to herald the birth of the new Kamakura-period (1185-1333) sculptural style. These sculptures, which are in excellent condition, are featured in almost every survey book of Japanese art.⁷

Visual Technology over the *Longue Durée*

Research on the Nan'endō is fruitful and is conducted by scholars from the fields of history, literature, art history, and religious studies. Nevertheless, these studies tend to limit their inquiries into specific aspects of the hall one at a time, such as artistic expressions of its Buddhist icons, literary sources of Nan'endō *setsuwa* 説話 (anecdotal tales), and worship activities of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. As a result, it is unclear whether and how these various aspects of the Nan'endō are related to one another. Our understanding of the hall also lacks a diachronic perspective. My critiques do not intend to devalue these studies and their approach. But it is clear that time has come for an integrated study of the Nan'endō and *longue durée* research of its religious function and social meaning.

The term “*longue durée*” designates an approach to historical studies that is put forth and espoused by the French *Annales* School.⁸ This approach gives precedence to the long-term historical structure over individual events. For *Annales* historians, to study history over the

⁷ For example, Penelope Mason's *History of Japanese Art*, commonly utilized as an art history textbook in the United States, includes sculptures of the Nan'endō. Penelope Mason, *History of Japanese Art* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005), 189.

⁸ For discussion of *longue durée* approach, see Fernand Braudel, “History and the Social Sciences: The *Longue Durée*,” trans. Immanuel Wallerstein, *Review* 32, no. 2 (2009): 171-203.

longue durée can afford a discovery of unseen recurring themes and slow-changing mindset.⁹ Moreover, in their views, it is this very continuum of recurring themes that constitute the main picture of history. Igor Kopytoff's proposition of "cultural biography" is akin to a *longue durée* approach in a way that both emphasize a long-term investigation of *lives* of images and objects.¹⁰ These approaches have inspired my research on the Nan'endō and its Buddhist icons.

However, this is not to say that this project is simply a detailed study of the Nan'endō's long life and a synthesis of the existing scholarship. Rather, the study intends to unravel elements that were seemingly invisible, but underlay the continuity and changes of the hall's function and meaning. By "seemingly invisible elements," I mean mindset, attitudes, and ways of thinking through which people experience, categorize, comprehend, and interact with the world in their everyday lives. Therefore, the Nan'endō in this study is not merely an artifact, but also what I call a "visual technology."

Derived from Wu Hung's study on the use of *wei* 位 (seat) or *paiwei* 牌位 (tablet) to indicate the presence of the deity Laozi before the creation of his anthropomorphic form, the word "visual technology" refers to as a means of action and a mental device that give forms to

⁹ It is often to see the use of the word "mentalities" to describe their historiography. For discussion of this, see Patrick H. Hutton, "The History of Mentalities: The New Map of Cultural History," *History and Theory* 20, no. 3 (October 1981): 237-259.

¹⁰ For the idea of "cultural biography," see Igor Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 64-91. There have been Buddhist studies employing Kopytoff's method to research religious images such as those by Richard Davis and Chari Pradel. For their works, see Chari Pradel, *Fabricating the Tenjokoku: Shūchō Mandara and Prince Shōtoku's Afterlives* (Leiden: Brill, 2016); Richard H. Davis, *Lives of Indian Images* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

those of the formless—such as faith, idea, death, memory, desire and emotion.¹¹ The term also denotes a way of presentation and representation that reveals human urges to make their experiences and existence tangible. By conceptualizing the Nan’endō as a visual technology, I hope to underscore the reciprocal relationship between material forms and cognitive activities, showing that the Northern Fujiwara family expressed their mentality toward death and life and conveyed their preoccupation with lineage and kinship—in both spatial and visual terms.

To view the Nan’endō in the *longue durée* perspective allows us to capture its multiple characters as a whole—a memorial for mourning departed family members, a miraculous site that reputedly generated the prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara clan, and a place for worship of *kami* and Buddha—which developed over the course of history. In addition, one finds that unlike other religious sites in Japan, which engaged with people from all walks of lives, the Nan’endō from the ninth through twelfth centuries was continuously bound up with a particular community consisting mainly of the Northern Fujiwara clan and their tutelary temple Kōfukuji.¹² Also, as I will show, the theme of family memory and ancestor commemoration threads through the early history of the hall.

To emphasize the Nan’endō’s mnemonic quality is not to undermine its salvific character. Indeed, the Northern Fujiwara utilized the hall to express religious piety, wish family prosperity, and envision afterlife salvation. It is also the hall’s religious function that enabled the performance of ancestral commemoration and contributed to its apotheosis in the mid-eleventh century. Nevertheless, after the ninth century, we know that the Northern Fujiwara clan were

¹¹ Hung Wu, “A Deity without Form: The Earliest Representation of Laozi and the Concept of *Wei* in Chinese Ritual Art,” *Orientalism* 33, no. 4 (2002): 40.

¹² The Nan’endō became one of the pilgrimage sites on the route of the Saigoku Thirty-Three Kannon Pilgrimage after the twelfth century.

drawn into the teachings of Tendai and Shingon Buddhist schools and became their powerful supporters. These two schools introduced new soteriological tools, formulated novel esoteric rituals, and promoted veneration of a variety of deities. Moreover, after the ninth century, generations of the *sekkanke* established many family temples such as Byōdōin, Hōjōji, Hosshōji among others, whose scale and splendor surpassed those of the Nan'endō. Why was not one of these temples or a single chapel on their grounds turned into a “holy of holies” of the Northern Fujiwara? Why did the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon not fall out of favor with the family given that there were many other efficacious deities promoted by and associated with Tendai and Shingon Buddhism? By asking these questions, one realizes that the salvific function of the Nan'endō cannot sufficiently explain its enduring influence in the history of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

Place, Memory, and Commemoration

These inquiries into the Nan'endō's longevity subsequently draw attention to its other function as a memorial to commemorate ancestors, to mark their presence, and to showcase their achievement. Commemoration has occupied a prominent position in Buddhist practices. Images created in memory of the dead or to facilitate memorial rites come in great number and a wide variety, for example, portrait sculptures dedicated to deceased Buddhist masters and mortuary architecture built for both the Buddha Shaka and departed lay Buddhists. However, as Riegl and others point out, memorial artifacts would change over time as their sociopolitical environment evolves and ideas associated with them shift.¹³

¹³ Riegl, “The Modern Cult,” 69-83; James Osborne, “Monument and Monumentality,” in *Approaching Monumentality in Archaeology*, ed. James Osborne (New York: State University of New York Press, 2014), 4.

It is the purpose of this dissertation to investigate not only the creation of the Nan'endō as a memorial, but also its sustenance as a monument, one that was made of time and action, and was embedded in a network of social relationships. To do this investigation, in addition to analyzing the Nan'endō's visual program, I examine activities associated with the hall, position them within their respective historical contexts, and inquiry into their meanings. The activities examined include: (1) the replications of the Nan'endō and its Fukūkenjaku Kannon; (2) the production of Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales and sacred texts of Fukūkenjaku Kannon; (3) religious practices that were centered on the hall and the icon; (4) the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist images during 1046-1048 and 1181-1189. Since the Northern Fujiwara clan utilized the Nan'endō for centuries, I delve into the history of the family in an effort to know how family institution engaged with and were shaped by activities related to the Nan'endō. Attention is also given to family structure, kinship relationship, and an array of memorial sites and social practices that were shared by clan members.

Through these examinations, this dissertation aims to address three research questions: What is the relationship among place, memory, and family as seen in the history of the Nan'endō? What are the factors that sustained and changed the hall's connection with the Northern Fujiwara clan? What were the roles that the Nan'endō played in the interactions between the Northern Fujiwara and the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex?

The past two decades witnessed a surge of publications on religious sites written by scholars from both religious studies and art history.¹⁴ These works employed various theoretical

¹⁴ To name a few, Heather Blair, *Real and Imagined: The Peak of Gold in Heian Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2015); D. Max Moerman, *Localizing Paradise: Kumano Pilgrimage and the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005); Mimi Hall Yiengpruksawan, *Hiraizumi: Buddhist Art and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Sherry Fowler, *Murōji: Rearranging Art and History at the*

models to explain a multiplicity of devotional practices, visual production, ritual activities, and political events that were intertwined within a specific place. Of particular relevance for this study are those that deal with Buddhist memorials and mortuary images. Research of these artefacts are plentiful and examine them from a variety of angles ranging from funeral practices, doctrinal teachings, iconic worship, ritual performances, power construction, to lineage formulation.¹⁵ However, discussion of the interplay between art, memory, and individuals/groups is scant in these studies. Also, little attention is paid to how memorial images sustained themselves in history and became “unintentional monuments,” monuments whose function and meaning have gone beyond their original designations.¹⁶ This paucity does not mean that scholars have no interest in the connection between Japanese artifacts and memory formation. Rather, there have been several works dedicated to explicating the multivalence of this connection.¹⁷ However, these studies predominantly focus on works made in modern and

Japanese Buddhist Temple (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005); Gregory Levine, *Daitokuji: The Visual Cultures of a Zen Monastery* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005); Andrew M. Watsky, *Chikubutshima: Deploying the Sacred Arts in Momoyama Japan* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005).

¹⁵ For these studies, Akiko Walley, *Constructing the Dharma King: The Hōryūji Shaka Triad and the Birth of the Prince Shōtoku Cult* (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Yukio Lippit, “Negative Verisimilitude: The Zen Portrait in Medieval Japan,” in *Asian Art History in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Vishakha N. Desai (Williamstown: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2007), 64-95; Janet Goodwin, “Shooing the Dead to Paradise,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 63-80; Karen Gerhart, *The Material Culture of Death in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009); Robert H. Sharf and T. Griffith Foulk, “On the Ritual Use of Ch’an Portraiture in Medieval China,” in *Buddhism: Critical Concepts in Buddhist Studies*, ed. Paul Williams (London: Routledge, 2005), 337-365; Mimi Hall Yiengpruksawan, “The House of Gold: Fujiwara Kiyohira's Konjikidō,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 48, no. 1 (1993): 33-52.

¹⁶ Gregory Levine’s book on Daitokuji is one of the few studies that delves into the construction, sustenance, and transformation of memorial architecture and images. See Levine, *Daitokuji*.

¹⁷ For example, Yoshiko Izumi, “The Making of a Mnemonic Space: Meiji Shrine Memorial Art Gallery, 1912-1936,” *Japan Review* 23 (2011): 143-176; Akiko Takenaka, *Yasukuni Shrine: History, Memory, and*

contemporary Japan.

Research on religious sites and commemorative artifacts have inspired my research in various ways. Nevertheless, I also look at studies on collective memories for theoretical tools such as those by Maurice Halbwachs (1877-1945) and Pierre Nora given that the Nan'endō continuously served as a memorial for the Northern Fujiwara clan and was tied to memory of departed family members.¹⁸

In his study on the collective memory of family, Maurice Halbwachs discusses the constructed and collective nature of family memories and their variegated content:

Each family has its proper mentality, its memories which it alone commemorates....but these memories as in the religious traditions of the family of antiquity, consist not only of a series of individual images of the past. They are at the same time models, examples, and elements of teaching. They express the general attitude of the group; they not only reproduce its history but also define its nature and its qualities and weakness.¹⁹

Therefore, what family memories constitute is not simply a series of past events, but also a composite image of attitudes, mentalities, and values shared by a community. They are the

Japan's Unending Postwar (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015); Alice Tseng, "Urban Parks and Imperial Memory: The Formation of Kyoto Imperial Garden and Okazaki Part as Sites of Cultural Revival," in *Kyoto Visual Culture in the Early Edo and Meiji Periods: The Arts of Reinvention*, ed. Alice Tseng and Morgan Pitelka (London: Routledge, 2016), 91-116; Yun Hui Tsu, Jan van Bremen, and Eyal Ben-Ari, eds., *Perspectives on Social Memory in Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). For research of memory and art in the field of Chinese art history, see Hung Wu, *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture* (California: Stanford University Press, 1995); Hung Wu, *A Story of Ruins: Presence and Absence in Chinese Art and Visual Culture* (London: Reaktion, 2012).

¹⁸ The relationship between memory and images has been a subject of investigation in the fields of art and archaeology of Europe. I find the following publications helpful for my research. Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin, eds., *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown, eds., *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture* (England: Ashgate, 2013); Giovanni Ciappelli and Patricia Lee Rubin, eds., *Art, Memory, and Family in Renaissance Florence* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); James F. Osborne, ed., *Approaching Monumentality in Archaeology* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2014).

¹⁹ Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 59.

product of social practice rather than individual activities. In addition, family memories are didactic in character, serving as models for teaching stories of family and explicating their vision, behavior, and ways of thinking. Accordingly, family memories are a prerequisite for the construction of collective identity and communal history. However, family memories have to take *material* forms in order to stay alive and be transmitted from one generation to another.

Halbwachs was one of the first scholars in the early twentieth century underscoring the significance of place for collective memories:

Thus, every collective memory unfolds within a spatial framework. Now space is a reality that endures: since our impressions rush by, one after another, and leave nothing behind in the mind, we can understand how we recapture the past only by understanding how it is in effect, preserved by our physical surroundings.²⁰

Hence, to remember, one has to localize memories in a space. Halbwachs calls the adherence of groups and memories to a particular place as “implacement.”²¹ Expanding Halbwachs’s studies on collective memories, Pierre Nora put forth the notion of “*lieux de mémoire*,” sites “where memory crystallizes and secretes itself.”²² By sites, Nora does not mean architecture alone, but a wide range of objects in various media such as history books, funeral eulogies, autobiography, diaries, anniversaries, cemeteries, museums, etc., which demonstrate “a will to remember.”²³ In addition, Nora explicates that “*lieux de mémoire*” or sites of memory are not a rubric that is frozen in time and shows a monolithic image of the past. Rather, these sites “only exist because of their capacity for metamorphosis, an endless recycling of their meaning,

²⁰ Halbwachs, *The Collective*, 140.

²¹ Halbwachs, *The Collective*, 134-136.

²² Nora, “Between Memory,” 7.

²³ Nora, “Between Memory,” 19.

and an unpredictable proliferation of their ramifications.”²⁴ This view of sites of memory is instrumental in considering the multiple metamorphoses of the Nan’endō after its inception and the ramifications of its commemorative function. In all, Halbwachs’s and Nora’s studies draw my attention to the social and spatial dimensions of memories, and the interplay between memory and materiality.

By conceptualizing the Nan’endō as a visual technology and exploring the *longue durée* of its commemorative function, this study manifests the role that memory played in religious culture in premodern times, and the process and ways in which family memory was constructed, reshaped, embodied, and preserved. This dissertation also serves as a point of departure for the exploration of how Buddhist artifacts served as a mnemonic device for the invention of tradition, representation of the past, and construction of history.

Primary Sources

Accounts regarding the Nan’endō are scattered among a wide range of texts including temple records, courtier diaries, travel accounts, iconographic manuals, and *setsuwa* tales. The following highlights those that are utilized extensively in this project. *Kōfukuji engi* 興福寺縁起 and *Kōfukuji ruki* 興福寺流記 are two essential historical texts for studying the history of the Nan’endō.²⁵ Compiled by Fujiwara no Yoshiyo 藤原良世 (823-900) in 900, *Kōfukuji engi* is a brief account of Kōfukuji’s history and includes valuable information on the rituals such as Hokke-e 法華会 (Assembly on the *Lotus Sutra*) and Chōkō-e 長講会 (Long Lecture Assembly)

²⁴ Nora, “Between Memory,” 19.

²⁵ *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 1-28; *Kōfukuji engi*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 320-326.

that were held regularly at the Nan'endō. Another text is *Kōfukuji ruki*, which was compiled in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.²⁶ The text is composed of three sections, each of which has an entry on the Nan'endō. The second section, *Yamashina ruki* 山階流記, contains sources dated to the eighth and ninth centuries. These sources are titled with era names such as *Hōjiki* 宝字記 (Records of Hōji), *Enryakuki* 延暦記 (Records of Enryaku), and *Kōninki* 弘仁記 (Records of Kōnin), respectively from the Hōji (757-765), Enryaku (782-806), and Kōnin (810-824) eras. Therefore, accounts of the Nan'endō in *Kōfukuji ruki* are mixed with sources dated from the Nara (710-794) and Heian periods. This feature of the text suggests that one should utilize it with caution to prevent from making anachronistic mistakes, and that it is important to consult with other historical documents.

Other primary sources that are widely employed are the courtier diaries written by generations of the Northern Fujiwara clan and those in their circle, such as *Teishinkōki* 貞信公記 (907-948), *Shōyūki* 小右記 (978-1032), *Midō kanpakuki* 御堂関白記 (998-1021), *Shunki* 春記 (1026-1054), *Chūyūki* 中右記 (1086-1138), *Denryaku* 殿暦 (1098-1118), *Taiki* 台記 (1136-1155), and *Gyokuyō* 玉葉 (1164-1203) among others. In the Heian period, courtiers kept diaries in order to remember important events and record proper conduct for the performance of ceremonies and governance of politics.²⁷ Therefore, courtier diaries served less as a vehicle for

²⁶ For an overview of literary studies on the text, see Matsuhara Satomi, “*Kōfukuji ruki*,” in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 327-348.

²⁷ Yoneda Yūsuke, *Fujiwara sekkanke no tanjō: Heian jidaishi no tobira* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 177-198; Yoshida Sanae, “Aristocratic Journals and Courtly Calendar: The Context of Fujiwara no Tadahira’s *Teishinkōki*,” in *Teishinkōki: The Year 939 in the Journal of Regent Fujiwara no Tadahira*, ed. Joan R. Piggott and Yoshida Sanae (Ithaca, New York: East Asian Program Cornell University, 2008), 8-21.

personal expression than as a reference for matters such as daily etiquette, ceremonial protocols, and annual events. Given these purposes, aristocrats in the Heian period placed great value on diaries and considered them as an important learning tool for their successors. The Northern Fujiwara clan also held the same attitude toward diaries. It is not uncommon to see that the clan's chieftains read, copied, and studied diaries of their ancestors, and kept their own to be passed down to descendants.²⁸ Therefore, diaries written by clan members are invaluable sources to tell how the family perceived the Nan'endō over time and the activities they conducted in the hall. Moreover, because diaries were "treated as a form of literary patrimony to be handed down,"²⁹ we can interpret these diaries as carriers of the family's memories of the Nan'endō and as a means of preserving such memories.

Another important text is *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho* (The Report of the Repair and Restoration of the Important Cultural Property Kōfukuji Nan'endō), which was published in 1996 after the completion of the repair and restoration of the Nan'endō in the same year.³⁰ This report is not only a description of the process in which the building underwent repair and restoration from 1991 to 1996, but also a meticulous examination of its structure, foundation, images, and decorative program. Such an examination was made possible because the preservation team was able to dismantle the building and carefully analyze its constituent components. The report was thus invaluable for this dissertation to investigate the physical features of the Nan'endō and its architectural history.

In addition to these texts, the current building of the Nan'endō, and its Buddhist icons,

²⁸ Yoneda, *Fujiwara sekkanke*, 181-186.

²⁹ Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 133.

³⁰ Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, ed., *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho*. Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, 1996.

images of Fukūenjaku Kannon are another important source. In particular, copies of the Nan'endō Fukūenjaku Kannon illuminate the circumstances of the cult of this icon within the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community. A few copies of the icon are extant with dates spanning from the late eleventh to the fourteenth century. In this study, I focus on copies made from the late eleventh to the thirteenth century. Paintings that juxtapose the Fukūenjaku Kannon along with the landscape of Kasuga Shrine are related to this project, but will be discussed only in relation to the development of the deity's cult in the twelfth century. This type of imagery, known as Kasuga-Nan'endō mandara, appeared after the mid-twelfth century and reflected the formulation of the Buddha-*kami* correspondence between Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine at the time.

Literature Review

Research on the Nan'endō has a long history and can be traced back to as early as the first half of the twentieth century. Discussion of the hall and its images remains vigorous: there have been works published in the past five years. Scholarship of the Nan'endō can be divided into three types. The first type is conducted in the field of art history, examining the architecture, sculptures, and paintings of the Nan'endō in terms of style, patronage, provenance, authorship, iconography, and function. A great number of studies are nonetheless concerned with the sculptures, and attention is particularly given to three aspects. One is the provenance and date of the original Nan'endō Fukūenjaku Kannon.³¹ No consensus has yet been reached, and three theories are proposed. The first theory put forth by Mōri Hisashi is that the icon was originally

³¹ For an overview of the scholarship on this, see Hamada Tamami, "Nan'endō Fukūenjaku Kannon zō," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun shuppan, 2011), 150-177.

enshrined in 746 in the Lecture Hall at Kōfukuji and was removed to the Nan'endō in 813.³² This theory has been modified by other scholars and widely accepted.³³ However, Matsushima Ken challenged Mōri's view, proclaiming that the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was created by the vow of Fujiwara no Uchimaro (756-812) sometime from the late eighth to early ninth century prior to his death in 812.³⁴ The third theory proposed recently by Tanimoto Akira in 2014 argues that Uchimaro vowed to create a new Fukūkenjaku Kannon to replace the one in the Lecture Hall that may have been lost and deteriorated by the ninth century.³⁵ I will provide my own understanding of this issue utilizing a different approach in Chapter Two.

Another focus of research is concerned with the sculptures that Kōkei 康慶 (act. 1152-1190s) restored in the Nan'endō in 1189, exploring to what extent they are similar to the originals in terms of form and iconography, and how they are related to the formulation of the Kei-School sculptural style.³⁶ This way of approaching the sculptures yields some significant

³² Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji garan no seiritsu to zōzō," in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 157-174.

³³ Asaki Shūhei, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō no sōken tōsho honzonzō to Kamakura saikōzō," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 160 (May 1985), 11-31; Hara Hirofumi, "Kōfukuji Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no zōritsu to Nan'endō iza—senkō senpi no tame no zōzō no sono ato," *Ontame no zōzō kenkyū, Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, ed. Nagaoka Ryūsaku (Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2006-2009), 28-46; Ono Kayo, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō to Hossō rokuso zō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2008), 57-92.

³⁴ Matsushima Ken, "Nan'endō kyū honzon to Kamakura saikōzō," in *Shinpen meihō Nihon no bijutsu 3: Kōfukuji*, ed. Ōta Hirotaro (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1990), 112-126.

³⁵ Tanimoto Akira, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no raireki," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 334 (May 2014): 56-69.

³⁶ Studies on these are numerous. The following gives some representative scholarly works. Matsushima, "Nan'endō," 137-153; Asaki, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō," 31-43; Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō shozō no saikō," in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 257-275; Nishikawa Kyōtarō, "Kōkei to Unkei," in *Nara no tera: Kōfukuji Hokuendō to Nan'endō no shozō*, ed. Nishikawa Kyōtarō and Tsujimoto Yonesaburō (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1997), 7-11; Nishikawa Shinji, "Kōkei no ichi:

findings. For instance, Fujioka Yutaka convincingly argues that the Four Guardian Kings that were once enshrined in the Karikondō 仮金堂 (Temporary Golden Hall) should have accompanied the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Nan'endō and were created by Kōkei in 1189.³⁷ This approach also leads scholars to raise issues with regard to the identities of the sculptures of the six Hossō monks, their iconography, and their positions on the altar. As temple records and scholars point out, when the Nan'endō was first built in 813, only two among the six sculptures represented actual monk figures while the rest four figures were offertory images (*kuyōzō* 供養像).³⁸ Moreover, Ono Kayo convincingly argues that the distinction between the two monk figures and four offertory images was marked by their gestures, postures, and hand-held objects.³⁹ Nevertheless, by the early twelfth century, all of the six sculptures came to represent specific monks associated with Hossō Buddhism. The identities of these six monks have been a subject of scholarly debates.⁴⁰ In the following, Kōfukuji's attributions of the monks' names are marked with brackets. Scholars reach consensus over the identities of the three monks, Zenju 善珠 (Zenju), Genpin 玄賓 (Genbō 玄昉), and Gyōga 行賀 (Jōtō 常騰). While there are different opinions on the identities of the other three monks, recent studies by Seya Takayuki and Asami

Kōfukuji Nan'endō shoson o chūshin ni," in *Nihon chōkokushi ronshū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1991), 309-320; Ono Kayo, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 93-126.

³⁷ Fujioka Yutaka, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite jō," *Kokka* 1137 (August 1990): 11-34; Fujioka Yutaka, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite ge," *Kokka* 1138 (September 1990): 7-19.

³⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; Seya Takayuki, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Hossō rokuso zō o meguru shomondai: zōmei hitei to sono sōi o chūshin ni," *Bijutsu shigaku* 22 (2001): 47-49; Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 24-28, 93-238.

³⁹ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 93-180.

⁴⁰ For an overview of scholarship on this issue, see Kobayashi Yūko, "Hossō rokuso zō," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 189-192.

Ryūsuke argue that they are Shin'ei 神叡 (Gyōga), Jōtō (Genpin), and Zensō 善操 (Shin'ei).⁴¹ Their argument has not been challenged by other research, and as Kobayashi Yūko remarks, unless one finds other supporting evidence, it is hard to develop an alternative identification.⁴² There are various propositions for the exact positions of the six Hossō monks on altar at the time when they were recreated in 1189. Mōri's and Ono's studies contend that the six sculptures should have been arranged in a way to show three kinds of postures on each side (right and left) in back of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁴³ Different from this view, Seya puts forth that they should have been placed according to their monastic ranks, and if so, each side would have shown two kinds of postures.⁴⁴

To date the most extensive study of the Nan'endō is Ono Kayo's excellent book, "*Kōfukuji Nan'endō to Hossō rokuzozō no kenkyū* (Study on the Kōfukuji Nan'endō and the Six Hossō Monk Sculptures)."⁴⁵ Prior to Ono, there have been many studies on the six Hossō monks. What sets her work apart from other scholarship is that she looks beyond the formal features and identification issues of these six sculptures, investigating their meaning, function, and relationship with architectural features of the Nan'endō and the memorial ritual Hokke-e. Ono argues that the six monk sculptures were initially dedicated to Uchimaro to pray for his afterlife salvation. This function is manifested in their postures and the incense burners held in their hands. By examining the content of the Hokke-e that was initiated in 817 by Fuyutsugu, Ono

⁴¹ Seya, "Kōfukuji," 37-61; Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Kōfukuji kokuhōten: Nan'endō Heisei daishūri rakkei kinen* (Tokyo: Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1997), 195.

⁴² Kobayashi, "Hossō rokuzozō," 192.

⁴³ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 279-297; Mōri, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō," 271-272.

⁴⁴ Seya, "Kōfukuji," 43-44.

⁴⁵ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*.

further contends that the six monk sculptures were placed in the Nan'endō to increase the efficacy of the ritual. They were in the hall to symbolically pray for Uchimaro's salvation along with monks who participated in the Hokke-e. To reinforce her argument, Ono traces the origin of octagonal halls, showing that this type of architecture was for the purpose of commemorating the dead, a function that is similar to that of the six monk sculptures.

Studies on the eight patriarch paintings are very limited. The most recent study published in 2016 by Ono Kayo points out that Fuyutsugu, who was responsible for building the Nan'endō, was possibly aware of or had actually seen the five Shingon patriarch paintings that Kūkai brought back from China in 806.⁴⁶ Inspired by these works, Ono contends that Fuyutsugu commissioned paintings of the five Shingon patriarchs and had them installed in the Nan'endō. Research on the gilt bronze lantern that stood in front of the hall focuses on the inscription that is engraved on its body, investigating its authorship and calligraphic style.⁴⁷ How this object fits into the whole visual program remains unexplored despite the fact that it was made around the same time as the Nan'endō.

The second kind of scholarship on the Nan'endō is conducted in the fields of history and religious studies. Hatta Tatsuo outlines the worship history of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and discusses the icon's connection with the Northern Fujiwara, Kasuga cult, and the Saigoku Thirty-three Kannon Pilgrimage.⁴⁸ Funata Jun'ichi meticulously analyzes a number of

⁴⁶ Ono Kayo, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō no sōkensha Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu o meguru bijutsu," in *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū: Soshikiron: Seisakushita hitobito*, ed. Tsuda Tetsuei (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2016), 48-67.

⁴⁷ Tanaka Kaidō, "Nan'endō dōtō daimei to Jingōji shōmei," in *Shodō zenshū*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Heibōnsha, 1955), 22-24; Iijima Tachio, "Nan'endō dōtō daimei wa Kūkai no sho," *Shūbi* 23, no. 86 (April, 2001): 24-41; Ōshiba Shōen, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō dōtō daimei no Kōbō Daishi gyosaku setsu," *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 49 (March 2017): 21-36

⁴⁸ Hatta Tatsuo, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon shinkō no tokusei ni tsuite—Kōfukuji Nan'endō o chūshin ni," in *Reigen jūin to shinbutsu shūgō: Kodai jūin no chūseiteki tenkai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoin, 2003), 63-95.

esoteric texts that illustrate and discuss the iconography, miraculous stories, secret teachings, oral transmissions, and ritual performances of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁴⁹

The third type of scholarship is that conducted in the field of Japanese literature. These works all deal with Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales that emerged in the late eleventh century. Conducted by Hashimoto Masatoshi, the most thorough research analyzes the content of the tales in various versions and connects their production to Shingon Buddhist priests.⁵⁰

So far only two English works by Susan Tyler and Royall Tyler have mentioned of the Nan'endō in detail, and they both treat it predominantly within the context of the Kasuga cult.⁵¹ They offer an overview of the Nan'endō's history and explain why the sanctuary was important for the Northern Fujiwara and the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex.⁵² However, because the studies are brief (no more than six pages) and place emphases on the Nan'endō's affiliation with Kasuga Shrine that evolved into a full-fledged form in the late twelfth century, the early history of the hall remains obscure in these works.

In all, this body of research manifests the multifarious aspects of the Nan'endō and provides a solid foundation, on which this dissertation is built upon. My investigation of the Nan'endō over the *longue durée* and its relationship with the Northern Fujiwara clan is made possible because of this previous scholarship.

⁴⁹ Funata Jun'ichi, "Sekkanke no Nan'endō Kannon shinkō to Kasuga kami: hisetsu seisei to mikkyō girei o megutte," in *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011), 433-484.

⁵⁰ Hashimoto Masatoshi, "Chūsei Bukkyō setsuwa no tenkai to waka, engi" (PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2004), 93-138.

⁵¹ Tyler, *The Miracles*, 84-87; Susan C. Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through its Art* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992), 137-142. Allan Grapard's work on the Kasuga cult only mentions the Nan'endō in passing. Allan Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), 127.

⁵² Tyler, *The Miracles*, 84-87; Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga*, 137-142.

Dissertation Structure

The dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter One outlines the early history of Kōfukuji from the eighth through twelfth centuries. This delineation will shed light on the religious environment in which the Nan'endō obtained various characters as a Buddhist memorial in 813, a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century, and a place for the worship of Buddha and Kasuga Daimyōjin in the twelfth century. The chapter begins with discussion of the construction of Kōfukuji and its Buddhist icons undertaken by the Fujiwara clan in the eighth century. It then examines the history of Kōfukuji in the Heian period, how the temple became the *de facto* ruling entity of Yamato Province, what relationship it had with the Northern Fujiwara clan, and how it subjugated nearby Kasuga Shrine under its supervision in the twelfth century.

Chapter Two examines the creation of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist icons in the early ninth century. The provenance of the hall's main icon Fukūenjaku Kannon has long been a subject of scholarly debate. Since temple records link the enshrinement of this icon to the construction of the Nan'endō, it is necessary to deal with this issue in the first place. I approach the issue by examining historical background, the aforementioned gilt bronze lantern, and the icon Fukūenjaku Kannon. I then focus on the architecture of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist images. The hall belongs to a type of architecture called "round halls (*endō*)," which has eight sides and an octagonal plan. I delve into the religious function of *endō* and its symbolical meaning by looking at other octagonal structures made in the seventh and eighth centuries. Through the use of temple records, travel journals, and relevant images, I reconstruct the visual program of the Nan'endō and investigate how various components of the hall correlated with the practice of ancestral commemoration and idea of *tsuizen kuyō* 追善供養 (memorial rituals). The

last part of the chapter inquiries into what the project of the Nan'endō's creation and the Hokke-e did to the living and the dead.

Chapter Three investigates the process in which the Nan'endō was transformed from a space for mourning to a miraculous site for generating success in the mid-eleventh century. The first part of the chapter explores to what extent the Nan'endō was important to the Northern Fujiwara clan and what sustained its connection to the family during the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century. To answer these questions, I examine diaries written by the family members, look at the changes in kinship organization, and explore memorial sites that the family built after 813. The second part of the chapter analyzes Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales and architectural replications of the Nan'endō. This literary and visual production began in the mid-eleventh century and testified to the increased significance of the building.

Chapter Four delves into the devotion history of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Northern Fujiwara family from the eighth to twelfth century. The first part of the chapter investigates the iconography of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, its worship in Tang China, and its transmission to Japan in the eighth century. I also analyze images of the deity that were related to the Fujiwara clan. The second part of the chapter deals with the family's worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Heian period. By examining courtier diaries, I delineate an array of religious practices, visual production, and architectural construction that were associated with the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. I also examine copies of the icon in relations to relevant Shingon texts and worship activities conducted in the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community.

Chapter Five focuses on the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist icons during the 1181-1189. Taira no Shigehira (1158-1185) set fire to Kōfukuji and Tōdaiji in 1181, both of which were reduced into ashes within one day. The first part of the chapter therefore briefly

discusses Kōfukuji in the aftermath of the 1181 fire and introduces Fujiwara no Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207), the chieftain of the *sekkanke*, who supervised the reconstruction of the Nan'endō, and Kōkei, the founder of the Kei School sculptors, who recreated the sculptures for the hall. I then proceed to delineate the process in which the Nan'endō was reconstructed and analyze the recreated sculptures. The last part of the chapter examines the objects that were deposited into the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the *kebutsu* 化仏 (manifestation Buddha) image that stands on the crown of the icon. These two aspects of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon were novel for their time and reflect contemporary religious practices. I inquiry into why Kanezane wanted to insert the deposits and why the *kebutsu* image was represented in a gesture of reverence and with the iconographical features of “*shōjin butsu* 生身仏 (living Buddhas or Buddhas in the flesh).”

Chapter One

Site of Commemoration, Site of Power:

A Brief History of Kōfukuji from the Eighth to Twelfth Century

Introduction

The history of the Nan'endō (Southern Round Hall) cannot be understood without an investigation of the religious environment where it is physically situated and institutionally connected. Standing in the southwest corner of Kōfukuji, the hall experienced several periods of construction and destruction throughout the centuries. The purpose of this chapter is to outline the early history of Kōfukuji from the eighth to twelfth century. The investigation of this history aims to shed light on the contexts in which the Nan'endō obtained various religious roles as a Buddhist memorial in 813, a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century, and a place for worship of both Buddhist deities and *kami* (local deities) in the twelfth century.

The first part of the chapter discusses the construction of Kōfukuji as well as its Buddhist icons in relation to the Fujiwara clan. It also addresses the socio-political milieu that prompted the family to found the temple in Nara in the eighth century. During this time, Kōfukuji provided memorial services for deceased Fujiwara members, performed sutra recitations for national protection, and served as a place to study Buddhist doctrines. The discussion of these functions is another focus of this part of the chapter.

The second part of the chapter illustrates the history of Kōfukuji in the Heian period (794-1185), examining how it became the *de facto* ruling entity of Yamato Province, what relation it had with the Fujiwara clan, and how it subjugated Kasuga Shrine under its supervision, forming the powerful temple-shrine complex in the twelfth century. Also included in this part of the

chapter is the discussion of the on-going construction of Kōfukuji in this period. Reflecting the dramatic increase in the temple's power and wealth, many buildings were erected in an around the main compound. Through the examination of Kōfukuji's early history, the chapter will be instructamental in considering various metamorphoses of the Nan'endō and its enduring presence in the lives of the Fujiwara clan from the ninth through twelfth centuries.

The Creation of Kōfukuji and the Fujiwara Clan

The Origin of Kōfukuji

Kōfukuji ruki 興福寺流記 (Records of Kōfukuji), compiled in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, traces the history of Kōfukuji to the lifetime of Nakatomi (Fujiwara) no Kamatari 中臣鎌足 (614-669), the first patriarch of the Fujiwara clan.¹ The record tells that Kamatari pledged to make images of a *jōroku* 丈六 (about 485 cm) Shaka, attendant Bodhisattvas, and Four Heavenly Kings during the 645 coup against Soga no Iruka 蘇我入鹿 (d. 645), and enshrined them at Shitennōji 四天王寺 in present-day Osaka. When Kamatari fell ill in 669, his wife Kagami no Ōkimi 鏡女王 (d. 683) built Yamashinadera 山階寺 in Yamashina in order to provide these images with a new home. After the capital was moved to Fujiwara 藤原 (present-day Kashihara, Nara) at the end of the seventh century, the temple was transferred to Umayasaka

¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 6-7. *Kōfukuji ruki* is a compilation of temple records that were drawn from a variety of sources dated from the eighth to the twelfth centuries. The text is composed of three sections. The second one, *Yamashina ruki* 山階流記, contains sources dated to the eighth and ninth centuries. These sources are titled with era names such as *Hōjiki* 宝字記 (Records of Hōji), *Enryakuki* 延暦記 (Records of Enryaku), and *Kōninki* 弘仁記 (Records of Kōnin) respectively from the eras of Hōji (757-765), Enryaku (782-806), and Kōnin (810-824). The accounts of the origin of Kōfukuji, discussed in this chapter, are from *Yamashina ruki*. In the following discussion, I will specify the source names if necessary. *Kōfukuji ruki* has been widely studied by literary scholars. For an overview of scholarship on this, see Matsuhara Satomi, “*Kōfukuji ruki*,” in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 327-348.

厩坂 and was renamed as Umayasakadera 厩坂寺. When Empress Genmei 元明 (661-721; r. 707-715) moved the capital in 710 from Fujiwara to Heijō 平城 (present-day Nara City), Fujiwara no Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659-720), Kamatari's son, constructed a temple in the plain of Kasuga and named it “Kōfukuji (Temple to Promote Felicity).”²

This account given in *Kōfukuji ruki* links Kōfukuji's origin to Umayasakadera and Yamashinadera, whose histories are, however, rather obscure. Where these two temples were located is unknown, nor do we know of their dedication dates.³ Nevertheless, both sites were probably no more than small chapels for private use.⁴ Their names “Yamashinadera” and “Umayasakadera” were used interchangeably with “Kōfukuji” in the Nara period (710-794).⁵ Kobayashi Yūko suggests that such use of appellation was to emphasize that Kōfukuji originated in ancient times and had a long history.⁶ Yet, to trace Kōfukuji's origin to Yamashinadera and Umayasakadera may have had another function—to indicate the character of the temple as an

² It is often to see in the survey of Kōfukuji's history that Umayasakadera was “transferred (*iten* 移転)” to Heijōkyō and took on the new name of Kōfukuji. Indeed, the transfer of temples from one place to another was not an uncommon phenomenon in the seventh and early eighth centuries. Nevertheless, the account from *Yamashina ruki* has no mention of the “*iten*” of the temple to the Plain of Kasuga. This is not to say that the idea of “transferring” Umayasakadera was wrong. It is possible that Fuhito did “move” the temple, but probably only “transferred” its status as a family temple in reality. For discussion of what transfer of temples meant and how it may have actually been conducted, see Donald McCallum, *The Four Great Temples: Buddhist Archaeology, Architecture, and Icons of Seventh-Century Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), 251-257. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 7; Ōta Hirotarō, “Kōfukuji no rekishi,” in *Nara rokudaiji taikan 7: Kōfukuji 1*, ed. Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 7; Izumiya Yasuo, *Kōfukuji* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997), 14.

³ Scholars have proposed several places for the location of Umayasakadera and Yamashinadera. However, none of the propositions is widely accepted. For a discussion of their propositions, see Kobayashi Yūko, *Kōfukuji sōkenki no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2011), 16-23.

⁴ Miyai Yoshio, *Ritsuryō kizoku Fujiwarashi no ujigami ujidera shinkō to sobyō saishi* (Tokyo: Seikō Shobō, 1978), 164; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 14-16.

⁵ Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 24-25.

⁶ Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 27-28.

ujidera 氏寺 (clan temple) of the Fujiwara clan.

The term “*ujidera*” refers to temples that were run by and belonged to families, and were to pray for their prosperity and afterlife salvation.⁷ The construction of *ujidera* appeared in the sixth and seventh centuries and continued into the following centuries. However, as Shimada Akira points out, clan temples built before the Heian period (794-1185) do not fit entirely to this definition of *ujidera*.⁸ While functioning as places to generate merit for deceased family members, many of these *ujidera* also enjoyed imperial patronage and were given responsibility to pray for the welfare of the state. In other words, before the Heian period, *ujidera* cannot be conceptualized as “private” temples exclusively for families as opposed to official temples. This is also the case with Kōfukuji in the Nara period. As the following shows, Kōfukuji was treated as both an official temple and Fujiwara’s *ujidera*, serving to pray for national protection and postmortem felicity of deceased clan members. Moreover, like other *ujidera* built before the eighth century, Kōfukuji was devoted not only to fulfill salvific needs, but also to meet political ends. To understand these functions, it is necessary to illustrate the background of the temple’s construction and discuss its founder Fuhito as well as the Fujiwara clan.

*Kōfukuji and Fuhito*⁹

On his deathbed Kamatari received the name of “Fujiwara” from Tenji Emperor¹⁰ (626-

⁷ Kyoto Daigaku Bungakubu Kokushi Kenkyūshitsu, ed., *Nihonshi jiten* (Tokyo: Sōgensha, 1960), 44.

⁸ Shimada Akira, “Ujidera kō,” *Aisen joshi tanki daigaku kiyō* 10 (1975): 24-27.

⁹ The discussion of Fuhito’s life is based on the following texts: Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650-800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009), 24, 126, 187-188; Takashima Masato, *Fujiwara no Fuhito* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997).

¹⁰ In her study on the formation of Japanese kingship, Joan Piggott calls for the use of *tennō* rather than its usual English translation “emperors” to refer to Japanese rulers from the seventh and eighth centuries. Piggott considers that the word “emperors” easily misleads one to think that kingship in Japan was identical with that in China. In reality, unlike their Chinese counterparts, Japanese rulers did not conquer

671) in 669. Nevertheless, only one of his sons, Fuhito, could inherit the name, and the rest of the family continued to use “Nakatomi” as their surname.¹¹ Thus, compared with other clans, the Fujiwara was a relatively small and recent clan without a long history. To establish themselves at court would have been the most important mission for Fuhito. Within the two decades of Kamatari’s death, Fuhito emerged in the political world during the reign of Empress Jitō 持統 (645-703; r. 686-697) and toward the end of his life, succeeded in positioning the Fujiwara as an important ally of the Yamato rulers. His four sons all assumed important posts at court, and one daughter married Emperor Monmu 文武 (683-707) and another Emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701-756; r. 724-749). Moreover, he was entrusted with the construction of Heijōkyō, the new capital in Heijō (present-day Nara). In 708, Empress Genmei 元明 decreed the move of the capital to Heijō, which took place two years later in 710. As Fuhito oversaw the moving project, the construction of Kōfukuji was probably planned along with that of Heijōkyō as part of the capital planning.¹² The establishment of Buddhist temples by prominent clans had been an important means to legitimize their authority in the seventh century. Likewise, for a young clan like the Fujiwara, the construction of Kōfukuji would have carried a similar function of legitimizing the clan’s political

the realm and were not autocratic. Their rule was based less on their military force than consensus. While recognizing the problem of using *tennō*, I use “emperors” to refer to Japanese rulers in the seventh and eighth century for the sake of consistency; the chapter also discusses history of Kōfukuji after the eighth century. For discussion on the use of *tennō*, see Joan Piggott, *The Emergence of Japanese Kingship* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 8-9.

¹¹ Initially, all of Kamatari’s sons were given the name of Fujiwara. However, in 698, the court allowed only one of his sons—Fuhito—to continue to carry the name. Other members of the Fujiwara were asked to change their name back to Nakatomi. The purpose of this was to indicate the specific tasks each family was responsible for. The Nakatomi lineage served as ritualists responsible for the worship of *kami* as well as preparing for the Daijōsai 大嘗祭 (Grand Rice-offering Ceremony). They also assumed posts in the Office of the Kami Affairs (Jingikan 神祇官). For more discussion, see: Ooms, *Imperial Politics*, 202-204.

¹² Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 78-79.

power and demonstrating their social status. It appears that from its inception, Fuhito had tried to elevate the status of Kōfukuji to that of the official temples—Yakushiji 薬師寺, Gangōji 元興寺, Daianji 大安寺, and Gufukuji 弘福寺—which were together known as the “Four Great Temples (*yondaiji* 四大寺)” founded in the seventh century.¹³

The classification of the Four Great Temples was established before 702 and was connected to the Emperor Tenmu 天武 (d. 686), Empress Jitō, and Emperor Monmu.¹⁴ The term “great temples” specifies a category of temples that were closely associated with the royal family, received their patronage, and enjoyed a high status in society. The Four Great Temples grew out of political needs and functioned as sites to perform ceremonies for ailing or deceased rulers, such as those of Temmu, Jitō, and Monmu. Serving under these three monarchs, Fuhito must have known the political and religious functions of the Four Great Temples. Through his influence at court and connection with the imperial family, Fuhito bestowed Kōfukuji with the same prestigious status as that of the Four Great Temples. This intention is reflected in the temple’s name and function.

Scholars have believed that Fuhito consciously changed the name of his clan temple from Umayasakadera to Kōfukuji in order to indicate the status of Kōfukuji as one of the “great temples.”¹⁵ It is commonly accepted that Kōfukuji replaced Gufukuji to form the Four Great

¹³ Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 80-81; Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 14-15.

¹⁴ McCallum, *The Four Great Temples*, 2-3.

¹⁵ Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 15; McCallum, *The Four Great Temples*, 189; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 229-230. Kobayashi Yūko proposes that Fuhito originally named Kōfukuji as “Fujiwaradera 藤原寺,” which clearly indicated it as the Fujiwara’s *ujidera*. However, in order to elevate its status as a “great temple,” he changed its name from Fujiwaradera to Kōfukuji.

Temples in the Heijōkyō.¹⁶ Indeed, among the Four Great Temples, Gufukuji was the only one not transferred to Heijōkyō at the beginning of the Nara period (710-794). Constructed by the vow of Emperor Tenji for his mother in the 660s, Gufukuji had its name presumably based on the temple, Hongfusi 弘福寺, which Chinese Emperor Taizong (r. 627-649) built for his mother either in 632 or 634 and was renamed as “Xingfusi 興福寺” in 705. The name of Xingfusi is the same as that of Kōfukuji, both meaning “Temple to Promote Felicity.” Given Fuhito’s role in the move of the capital, this naming of Kōfukuji was unlikely a coincidence, but revealed his intention to align Kōfukuji with the “great temples.” By doing this, Fuhito elevated the status of his *ujidera* and showed the clan’s close relationship with the royal family.

Geography, Plan, and Architecture

Kōfukuji occupied the sixteen *chō* 町¹⁷ of land (about thirty-nine acres) in the Outer Capital, which was situated in the northeast of Heijō. This scale of Kōfukuji was larger than that of Yakushiji, Daianji, and Gangōji, each of which received fifteen *chō*. Fuhito probably had reserved this land, the highest point of the capital, for the construction of Kōfukuji prior to 710.¹⁸ He may also have chosen this place in order to situate the temple next to the Kasuga Plain, where Kasuga Shrine, the tutelary shrine of the Fujiwara, was erected later in 768. Kōfukuji had an impressive plan, consisting of three golden halls placed in the center, west, and east, as well as a lecture hall, a pagoda in the front, an octagonal hall in the northwest, a middle gate, a

¹⁶ Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 15; McCallum, *The Four Great Temples*, 189; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 224, 229-230.

¹⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 1. One *chō* is about 2.45 acres. There are other records of Kōfukuji’s land size given in *Kōfukuji ruki*, saying that it occupied eighteen, fifteen, or twelfth *chō*. No matter which record is more viable, they all indicate that Kōfukuji owned a large precinct. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 4.

¹⁸ Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 78-81; Ōoka Minoru, *Nanto shichidaiji no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1966): 10.

southern gate, and extensive priests' quarters in the north.¹⁹ There were other buildings on the grounds, but these structures constituted the main core of Kōfukuji and were built over the course of the eighth century.

The construction of Kōfukuji began with the central compound—Central Golden Hall (Chūkondō 中金堂), a roofed corridor, and Middle Gate (Chūmon 中門)—in 710 or sometime from the late Wadō era (708-715) to Yōrō era (717-724).²⁰ Connected by a corridor, the Central Golden Hall and Middle Gate faced each other and were placed on the south-north axis. The Central Golden Hall had a grand scale, measuring thirty-seven meters east-west, twenty-three meters south-north, and twenty meters high. Another building on the central south-north axis was the Lecture Hall (Kōdō 講堂) standing in the back of the Central Golden Hall. No records are available to tell when the Lecture Hall was built. Some scholars suggest 746 to be the date of its construction since its main icon was dedicated this year,²¹ while others consider that the hall was built earlier than 746.²²

¹⁹ For the map and discussion of the reconstructed plan, see: Ōta, “Kōfukuji no,” 9, 18-20.

²⁰ Scholars have different opinions on the construction date of the Chūkondō. According to *Kōninki* and *Kōfukuji engi*, the Chūkondō was erected in 710, the third year of Wadō era. Fukuyama Toshio doubts the veracity of the records, proposing that the hall should be constructed sometime during the late Wadō era and Yōrō era. The recent research by Kobayashi Yūko, based on Ōoka Minoru's study, the textual and archaeological investigations, argues 710 as the beginning of the hall's construction and 714 as its dedication date. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 6-7; Fujiwara no Yoshiyo (823-900), *Kōfukuji engi*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 320; Ōoka Minoru, *Nanto shichidaiji*, 10; Fukuyama Toshio, “Kōfukuji no kenritsu,” in *Nihon kenchikushi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Bokusui Shobō, 1968), 328-331; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 66-78.

²¹ Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji garan no seiritsu to zōzō,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 164; Shibuya Wakiko, “Kōfukuji ruki” ni tsuite,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 160 (May 1985): 52-53.

²² Fukuyama Toshio, “Kasuga Taisha, Kōfukuji sōsetsu,” in *Kasuga Taisha, Kōfukuji*, ed. Kinki Nihon Tetsudō Sōritsu Gojūshūnen Kinen Shuppan Henshūsho (Osaka: Kinki Nihon Tetsudō, 1961), 24; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 92-93, n. 22, 71. Kobayashi Yūko speculates that it was built before 721 because there seemed to be religious activities taking place in the Kōdō as early as 734.

Around the time the central compound was completed,²³ Fuhito passed away in 720, and his death cast doubt on whether Kōfukuji's construction would continue. However, probably because his four sons held high positions at court, and the clan had a marital connection with the royal family, the construction seemed to proceed without pause. In the same year of Fuhito's death, Empress Genmei and Empress Genshō 元正 (680-748; r. 715-724) commissioned the Northern Round Hall (Hokuendō 北円堂)²⁴ in the northwest of Kōfukuji to commemorate Fuhito. The hall was completed in 721 on the first death anniversary of Fuhito. The erection of the Hokuendō likely caused changes in the layout of the temple's buildings that Fuhito originally designed, but marked the direct involvement of the imperial family in the Kōfukuji's construction.²⁵ Shortly after Fuhito's death, the *Zō Kōfukuji butsuden shi* 造興福寺仏殿司 (The Office for Building Buddhist Halls at Kōfukuji) was established the same year. Although scholars have different opinions on whether the office was in charge of creating Hokuendō or other buildings at Kōfukuji, the state appeared to take over the construction of the temple from

²³ Kobayashi Yūko proposes that the construction of the central compound was complete in 722. Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 78.

²⁴ Initially, the Hokuendō was referred to as the “Endō 円堂 (Round Hall),” “Endōin 円堂院 (The Round Hall Compound),” “Endōin Endō 円堂院円堂 (The Round Hall of the Round Compound), or “Sai'in Endō 西院円堂 (Round Hall of the Western Precinct)” as recorded in *Kōfukuji ruki*. As noted by Kobayashi Yūko, the appellation “Endōin” and “Endōin Endō” indicates that the hall was situated within a compound and was enclosed by a corridor since the word “in” means “enclosure walls.” The name “Hokuendō” was utilized after the construction of another round hall—the Nan'endō (Southern Round Hall)—in 813 to differentiate the former from the latter. The Nan'endō stood to the north of the Hokuendō. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 9; Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 101, 172-173.

²⁵ Kobayashi Yūko postulates that Fuhito's original plan contained three golden halls, each encircled within a compound in the center, west, and east of the temple. Also, the Western Golden Hall and Eastern Golden Hall would have been paired with a pagoda standing in front. No round halls would have been planned to be built on the temple grounds. Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 222-225.

this point on.²⁶ Kōfukuji’s vigorous expansion in the 720s and 730s would have been impossible without the continuous engagement of the *Zō Kōfukuji butsudenshi* or other equivalent forces in its construction.

Yamashina ruki records that Emperor Shōmu dedicated the Eastern Golden Hall (Tōkondō 東金堂) in 726 for his aunt Genshō.²⁷ Another account given in *Kōfukuji engi* 興福寺縁起 states that Shōmu installed the Yakushi Buddha and his attendant Bodhisattvas in 726 to pray for Genshō’s recovery from illness.²⁸ Although it is an issue to interpret these two sources, Shōmu was likely the patron of both the Tōkondō and its Buddhist icons.²⁹ One may be curious about why Shōmu chose to enshrine Buddhist images at Kōfukuji since Genshō did not come from the Fujiwara clan. Was this because she was close to Fuhito? Also worth noting is that Fujiwara no Asukabehime 藤原安宿媛 (701-760), who was Fuhito’s daughter later known as Kōmyō 光明, had not yet become Shōmu’s empress at this time. Therefore, she would hardly have had a direct impact on Shōmu’s decision to dedicate the Eastern Golden Hall. As mentioned, the government

²⁶ As the office was established right after Fuhito’s death, some scholars think that it was for the purpose of overseeing the building project of the Hokuendō. However, the word “*butsuden* {△殿 (Buddhist halls)” in the name of the office usually refers to “golden halls” and might indicate that the office was made to build the golden halls of Kōfukuji. However, the word “*butsuden*” might also have been used in a generic sense in this case to indicate various building projects conducted at Kōfukuji. Kobayashi Yūko considers that the office was established not only for constructing the Hokuendō, but also Five-Storied Pagoda, Eastern Golden Hall, and Western Golden Hall. I find her opinion reasonable. Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 104-106, 120-121, 225-227; Ōta, “Kōfukuji no,” 7-8.

²⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 10.

²⁸ *Kōfukuji engi*, 320. *Yamashina ruki* also lists this Yakushi Triad, but does not indicate who dedicated these images. Moreover, the same entry on the Tōkondō records an image that illustrates the pure land of Yakushi and was made at the request of Shōmu to pray for the recovery of Genshō. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 10.

²⁹ Because of the ambiguous accounts of the Tōkondō given in *Kōfukuji ruki* and *Kōfukuji engi*, Kobayashi Yūko considers that the building and its enshrined images were not created at the same time. By applying Ōhashi Katsuaki’s theory that a single building would take around four to five years to construct, Kobayashi puts forth that the construction of the Tōkondō began prior to 726, thereby having nothing to do with Shōmu’s vow to make the images of Yakushi and his attendants. Given that the Tōkondō was a golden hall for the purpose of worship, I think that the building and its Buddhist icons were more likely made at the same time. Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 106-109.

likely had to take over the construction of Kōfukuji since Fuhito's death in 720. If this was the case, it would have been natural for Shōmu to dedicate this building at Kōfukuji for the ailing Genshō since by 726, the temple would have been considered as an official temple, whose purpose was to pray for the welfare of the imperial family.

In the next decade, Empress Kōmyō came to lead the construction of Kōfukuji. In 730, she commissioned the Five-Storied Pagoda (Gojūtō 塔) that was situated to the south of the Eastern Golden Hall. Both the pagoda and the hall were placed within a single compound and were encircled by a roofed corridor. While *Kōfukuji ruki* includes no information about why Kōmyō built the Five-Storied Pagoda, Mōri Hisashi proposes that it was for celebrating her ascendancy as the Empress in 729.³⁰ It is also possible that Kōmyō simply followed Fuhito's plan of Kōfukuji's construction. Regardless of which reason is viable, the fact that Kōmyō became Empress ensured the temple's preeminent position at court and continuous patronage from the imperial family. When Kōmyō's mother Tachibana no Michiyo 橘三千代 died in 733, she commissioned the Western Golden Hall (Saikondō 西金堂) to stand in the southeast side of the Northern Round Hall and in the corresponding position of the Eastern Golden Hall. The Western Golden Hall was dedicated to Michiyo on her first death anniversary in 734.

Several structures were erected on the temple grounds in the following three decades. The Refectory (Jikidō 食堂) and Monks' Quarters (Sōbō 僧坊) were built to the east of and behind the Lecture Hall sometime before 744.³¹ No information is available in *Kōfukuji ruki* or other texts as to who commissioned these two structures. More building projects took place in the 760s, concentrating on the eastern precinct (Tōin 東院) of the temple. In 761, Fujiwara no Nakamaro

³⁰ Mōri, "Kōfukuji garan," 162-163.

³¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 17-18; Mōri, "Kōfukuji garan," 171; Ōta, "Kōfukuji no," 8.

藤原仲麻呂 (706-764) dedicated a building in the west with cypress-bark roofing (*hiwadabuki* 檜皮葺) (hereafter called as the Western Cypress-roofed Hall) for the spirit of Empress Kōmyō.³² Another hall located in the east with tile roofing (*kawarabuki* 瓦葺) (hereafter called as the Eastern Tile-roofed Hall) was built in 764 by Empress Shōtoku 称徳 (718-770) to store one million miniature pagodas, also known as *hyakumantō*, which she offered in order to quell the rebellion of Nakamaro.³³ Lastly, in 772 on the death anniversary of Fujiwara no Nagate 藤原永手 (714-771), his wife Ōno no Nakachi 大野仲仟 (d. 781) and his son Fujiwara no Ieyori 藤原家依 (743-785) dedicated a hall with cypress-roofing, also called as the Jizōdō 地藏堂 (Hall of Jizō), in his memory.³⁴ After this time, no major construction took place until the creation of the Nan'endō in 813. Nevertheless, by the end of the eighth century, Kōfukuji owned a precinct that one could refer to as a *shichidō garan* 七堂伽藍 (seven-hall compound), containing buildings—a pagoda, three golden halls, a lecture hall, a bell tower, a sutra repository, a refectory, and monks' dormitories—that were essential for a Buddhist monastery.

Buddhist Icons

Most of the Buddhist images created in the eighth century at Kōfukuji no longer exist.³⁵

³² *Kōfukuji ruki*, 18; Mōri, “Kōfukuji garan,” 171.

³³ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 18-19; Mōri, “Kōfukuji garan,” 171.

³⁴ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19; Mōri, “Kōfukuji garan,” 172.

³⁵ The surviving images are a group of sculptures including six of the Ten Disciples and Eight Classes of Indian Deities, which were created in 734 for the Saikondō. They were made out of dry lacquer, a new technique transmitted from China at the time. Among the four of the Ten Disciples that no longer remain at Kōfukuji, two were lost during the persecution of Buddhism in the early Meiji period, one is in a private collection, and the other is stored at Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku (Tokyo University of the Arts). While this group of sculptures has been considered a treasure of Kōfukuji, scholars have heated debates over their provenance. Some scholars consider that they did not originally belong to Kōfukuji, but were from Kakuanji 額安寺 in Nara Prefecture. For a review of the scholarship on the issue, see Muramatsu

However, the historical texts and surviving images provide fruitful information on the size, medium, and position of images enshrined at major buildings, such as the Central Golden Hall, Lecture Hall, Northern Round Hall, Western Golden Hall, Eastern Golden Hall, and Five-Storied Pagoda. As recorded in *Kōfukuji ruki*, the main icons of these building were Buddhas—Shaka, Amida, Yakushi, or Miroku—created in *jōroku* size following the standard format of Buddhist sculpture at the time. These icons were accompanied by a variety of figures in a smaller scale, such as Bodhisattvas, Four Guardian Kings, Heavenly Beings, and monks. In some buildings more than one group of Buddha assembly were installed. For example, in the Five-Storied Pagoda enshrined statues that represented the paradises of the Amida, Yakushi, Shaka, and Miroku.³⁶

The media of sculptures in the buildings ranged from bronze, silver, wood, clay, to dry lacquer. In addition, *Kōfukuji ruki* shows that the Jizōdō enshrined a *danzō* 檀像 (sandalwood image), which people believed possessed a miraculous quality.³⁷ There was also a pair of embroideries respectively depicting the Pure Lands of Amida and Kannon, which were hung in the Western Cypress-Roofed Hall of the eastern precinct.³⁸ Finally, the Five-Storied Pagoda contained relics that were stored in miniature reliquaries in the shape of a pagoda (*tō*). Made of crystal, the reliquaries stood on two-tiered bases that consisted of a gilt bronze pedestal and a

Tetsubumi, “Jūdaideshi zō to Hachibushū zō,” in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 85-101.

³⁶ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 11-12.

³⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19. There were two tabernacles made out of sandalwood in the Jizōdō. One enshrined the Yakushi and his attendants. The other enshrined a Fukūkenjaku Kannon. These *danzō* were commissioned by Ieyori and Nakachi.

³⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 18. The paintings were dedicated in 761 by Nakamaro for the spirits of Shōmu and Kōmyō.

rock-shaped silver platform.³⁹ Each floor of the pagoda, except the first, enshrined four of these reliquaries.⁴⁰

Many of these images, either painting or sculpture, were commissioned by the Fujiwara clan to pray for the salvation of departed family members. Fuhito's four sons, Fujiwara no Fusasaki 藤原房前 (681-737), Fujiwara no Muchimaro 藤原武智麻呂 (680-737), Fujiwara no Umakai 藤原宇合 (694-737), and Fujiwara no Maro 藤原麻呂 (695-737) formed the four lineages of the Fujiwara clan after his death in 720: the Hokke 北家 (Northern House), Nanke 南家 (Southern House), Shikike 式家 (Ceremonial House), and Kyōke 京家 (Capital House). Members from these four houses had dedicated Buddhist icons in various halls at Kōfukuji during the eighth century, and in some cases added images into a group of sculptures that were created earlier.⁴¹ As a result, it is not uncommon to see an incoherent group of Buddhist icons made of different mediums from different periods of time within a single building.⁴² In all, images at Kōfukuji displayed a full range of the Buddhist pantheon in a variety of media, sizes,

³⁹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 11.

⁴⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 11. The whole reliquaries may have been further encased in eight nested caskets with a lock. The last sentence of the description of the reliquaries states that “each [reliquary] was put on the eight shallow pagoda-shaped [caskets] and [the whole set] was attached with a lock 各納淺塔形八口著鎖.” As noted by Kobayashi Yūko, while relics were often placed underground, there are cases that they were placed on the floors of pagodas. For example, *Dōban Hokke seppōzū* 銅版法華說法図, which is a large bronze plaque dated to 668 from Hasedera, shows an engraved three-storied pagodas with relics on the top level. Kobayashi, *Kōfukuji sōkenki*, 175-177.

⁴¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 17, 18-19; Mōri, “Kōfukuji garan,” 171-173.

⁴² For example, Shōtoku stored one million miniature pagodas in the East Tile-Roofed Hall in 764. However, the same hall also enshrined the sculptures of Amida Buddha and his attendants made sometime between 768 and 778 at the request of Fujiwara no Momoyoshi 藤原百能 (720-782), who was from the Capital branch of the Fujiwara. Momoyoshi also dedicated all Buddhist scriptures (*issakyō* 一切經) along with the images. The dedication of the icons and scriptures was for her own salvation, her deceased father Fujiwara no Maro 藤原麻呂, and her departed husband Fujiwara no Toyonari 藤原豊成 (704-765), who was from the Southern branch of the Fujiwara. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19; Mōri, “Kōfukuji garan,” 171-172.

and icon types, and altogether constituted a splendid religious environment aptly conveying the preeminence of the temple. By looking at the patronage of these images, we know that from its beginning, Kōfukuji had served as a site to commemorate departed Fujiwara members in keeping with one of its functions as a clan temple.

Buddhist Teachings and Rituals

Kōfukuji also functioned as a monastery for Buddhist teachings, in particular, Hossō Buddhism, one of the Six Nara Buddhist Schools in Japan. Japanese Hossō doctrine has its origin in the Yogācāra School of Indian Buddhism and is centered on the teachings of the Indian priests, Asanga (J. Muchaku 無着, 310-390) and his brother Vasubandhu (J. Seshin 世親, 330-400).⁴³ The Indian monks Bodhiruci (d. 527) and Paramārtha (499–569) transmitted their teachings to China respectively in 513 and 546, and established the Dilun and Sanlun Schools there. The influence of both schools was eclipsed with the return of Xuanzang 玄奘 (J. Genjō, 602-664), who brought the newest Yogācāra teaching from India to China in 645 and founded the Chinese Yogācāra School in 659 under the name of Faxiang 法相 (the Dharma-characteristics; J. Hossō), also referred as *Weishi* 唯識 (J. *Yuishiki*; Consciousness-Only). The transmissions of the Yogācāra teachings to Japan over the period of the seventh and eighth centuries have been attributed to several pilgrim monks.

Studying under Xuanzang and his disciple Kuiji 窥基 (J. Kiki, 632-682) in China, Dōshō 道昭 (629-700) was the first monk to bring Hossō texts to Japan in 660 and after his return to the

⁴³ The discussion of the transmission of Yogācāra to China and Japan is based on the following texts: James L. Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan* (Oxford, London: Oxford University Press, 2006), 36-38; Allan Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), 64-70.

country, established Gangōji in 661, which is also referred to as “Southern Monastery (Nanji 南寺)” to indicate its lineage of the Hossō teachings. After Dōshō, other monks such as Chitsū, Chihō 智鳳 (dates unknown), Chiran 智鸞 (dates unknown), and Chiyū 智雄 (dates unknown) also transmitted Hossō texts to Japan in the late seventh and early eighth centuries. The final transmission took place in 734 when Genbō 玄昉 (d. 746) returned to Japan after spending twenty years studying under Zhizhou 智周 (668-723), the third patriarch of the Faxiang School. Upon his return to Japan, Genbō resided at Kōfukuji and turned it into another lineage of Hossō teaching, which is known as the “Northern Monastery (Hokuji 北寺)” as opposed to “Southern Monastery” of Gangōji. In addition, Genbō stored more than five thousand Buddhist texts including both exoteric and esoteric scriptures in Kōfukuji, and by doing so laid a foundation for the temple to become one of the most significant Buddhist studies centers in Nara.

In parallel to this development, Kōfukuji received some of its first landholdings in 749, 757, and 761 that constituted its economic basis.⁴⁴ The creation of the abbot position at Kōfukuji in 755 marked another step toward a full-fledged religious institution. With the support of Nakamaro, the monk Jikun 慈訓 (691-777) was appointed the first abbot (*bettō* 別当) of Kōfukuji in 757, following his performance of rituals for the ailing Emperor Shōmu in 756.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, the position seemed to be merely in name as Jikkun did not actually handle the temple’s administration. The next abbot Eigon 永嚴 (dates unknown), who was appointed in 779, also had no actual power. It was not until the appointment of the monk Gyōga 行賀 (728-803) as

⁴⁴ Nagashima Fukutarō, *Nara* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1963), 85-86.

⁴⁵ *Kōfukuji bettō shidai* 興福寺別当次第, in *Zoku zoku kunsho ruijū*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969), 709; Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 19; Mikael Adolphson, *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2000), 49.

bettō in 791 that the position bore significance to the development of Kōfukuji.⁴⁶ In other words, during the Nara period, it seems that the leadership of clergy had yet to be clearly defined, and *bettō* was nothing more than a title awarded to eminent monks.

In addition to being a center of Hossō Buddhism, Kōfukuji functioned as a site to perform rituals for national protection (*chingo kokka* 鎮護国家). As early as 735, at the request of the court the temple, though still under construction, held a recitation of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (J. *Dai Hannyakyo* 大般若經) for the purpose of eliminating calamities and protecting the nation.⁴⁷ The same ritual was also held at other three official temples including Daianji, Yakushiji, and Gangōji. This event of reciting the sutra indicates that as early as 730s Kōfukuji had taken on an official role, bearing responsibility for praying the welfare of the state. In addition, Kōfukuji served as a place to perform memorial rituals for departed Fujiwara members, and the family provided funds to pay for the services.⁴⁸ None of these rituals were, however, as famous as the Yuima-e 維摩会 (Assembly on the Vimalakīrti Sutra) in the history of Kōfukuji.

Centered on the sutra *Yuimagyō* (Skt. *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*), the Yuima-e was known as one of the *Sandai-e* 三大会 (Three Great Assemblies); the other two assemblies were Saishō-e 最勝会 held at Yakushiji and Misai-e or Gosai-e 御齋会 held at the Imperial Palace. According to *Kōfukuji engi*, the Yuima-e originated in the seventh century, and its initiation had to do with the nun Hōmyō 法明 from Silla, who chanted *Yuimagyō* for the severely ill Kamatari at his residence

⁴⁶ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 49-50.

⁴⁷ *Shoku nihonki* 続日本紀, in *Kokushi taikai 2: Shoku nihonki*, ed. Kuroita Katsumi (Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901); *Shoku nihonki*, Tenpyō 7.5.24 (198-199). The bibliographic information for each entry below includes titles, reign year, month, and day, which are then followed by a bracket that shows volume and page number. The same rule will be applied to other historical texts as well.

⁴⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 8, 13, 19; Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 179-189; Nagashima, *Nara*, 86.

in Yamashinadera.⁴⁹ Recovering from illness quickly, Kamatari asked the recitation of the same sutra again for three days in a row. After Kamatari passed away, the Yuima-e was discontinued for thirty years before it was reinstated by Fuhito and Kōmyō respectively in 705 and 733. The Yuima-e lasted for seven days, from the the tenth day of the tenth month to the sixteenth day of the same month, the death date of Kamatari. In 757, Nakamaro with the support of Kōmyō successfully petitioned to the court to continue the ritual, giving Kōfukuji 100 *chō* of land to pay for the expense.⁵⁰ In addition to honoring Kamatari, the Yuima-e was held to pray for national protection and promote monastic scholarship. The ritual may also have functioned to examine monks' Buddhist knowledge as it was known for after the Nara period.⁵¹ The ritual was a microcosm of Kōfukuji's dual character as a site for the state welfare as well as family memorialization, and this character persisted to the Heian period.

Kōfukuji in the Heian Period (794-1185)

Kōfukuji in the Ninth Century and the Northern Fujiwara Clan

In 784 Emperor Kanmu (737-806) moved the capital to Nagaoka 長岡 in the south of present-day Kyoto. The capital was, however, abandoned ten years later because several unfortunate events took place, and because the city was allegedly haunted by vengeful spirits. In 794 Kanmu relocated the capital to Kyoto, which remained the capital of Japan until 1868.

⁴⁹ *Kōfukuji engi*, 321-322. For discussion and studies of this ritual, see Paul Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 129-135; Fukuyama, "Kōfukuji no," 331-339; Mikael Bauer, "The Power of Ritual: An Integrated History of Medieval Kōfukuji" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2011).

⁵⁰ Nagashima Fukutarō questions the veracity of the Yuima-e accounts given in *Kōfukuji engi* and suggests that Nakamaro was the founder of the ritual rather than Kamatari. Nagashima Fukutarō, "Kōfukuji no rekishi," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 40 (September 1959): 6.

⁵¹ Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei*, 130.

Although many prominent temples in Nara such as Dainanji and Saidaiji gradually declined as the result of the move of the capital, Kōfukuji remained powerful throughout the Heian period. In the ninth century, Kōfukuji was one of the most prosperous religious institutions.⁵² This was due to the steady leadership of the temple and its dominance over the Office of Monastic Affairs (*sōgō* 僧綱), which exercised influence over Buddhist clergy. In 801 the court issued a decree to designate Kōfukuji as the sole place to hold the Yuima-e that was conducted in the format of combined lectures and debates. The ritual served as a way to examine monks and was prerequisite for them to enter the Office of Monastic Affairs. Participation in the Yuima-e meant chances for monks to earn recognition at court, to acquire institutional power, and to build up relationships with prominent patrons since imperial emissaries and aristocratic courtiers attended the ritual.⁵³ To give Kōfukuji the responsibility for holding such a prestigious event indicates its preeminent place in the state's religious policy and explains why the temple retained its prestige even after the establishment of the new Tendai and Shingon Buddhist schools in the ninth century. Kōfukuji's success also had much to do with its tie to the Northern Fujiwara clan, who rose to prominence by serving as regents to the emperors beginning in the mid-ninth century. The leading family of the Northern Fujiwara clan was the “*sekkanke* 摂関家 (House of Regents),” who controlled court politics during the first half of the Heian period. Through their influence at court, the family accumulated considerable wealth and donated many private estates (*shōen* 荘園) to Kōfukuji, whose property continued to expand after the ninth century.⁵⁴ By the end of the

⁵² Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 49-53.

⁵³ The most prominent instance for this is probably that of the monk Ryōgen (912-985), the eighteenth abbot of Enryakuji. Coming from a poor family, Ryōgen rose to prominence in part because of his participation in the Yuima-e at Kōfukuji. For discussion of Ryōgen's participation in the ritual, see: Groner, *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei*, 59-62.

⁵⁴ Nagashima, *Nara*, 85-88, 93-99.

Heian period, the temple had landholdings that were only secondary to the imperial family and the *sekkanke*.⁵⁵

In the Nara period, none of the four Fujiwara lineages could consistently have full control over Kōfukuji. Fuhito's four sons Fusasaki, Muchimaro, Umakai, and Maro died of smallpox epidemic one after another in the same year of 737. The fate of the Fujiwara therefore fell in the hands of Fuhito's daughter Kōmyō, who made an alliance with her nephew Nakamaro and successfully secured the family's political power. During the reign of Emperor Junnin (733-765) from 758 to 764, Nakamaro, a descendant of the Southern Fujiwara, was the most powerful figure at court and led the major development of Kōfukuji at the time. After Nakamaro's death until the end of the Nara period, the four Fujiwara lineages competed with one another, but no single household could dominate court politics.⁵⁶ This balance of power is reflected in the building projects that took place at Kōfukuji during this time; as discussed above, all of the four households had installed Buddhist icons at the temple in the second half of the eighth century.

However, this situation began to change in the ninth century particularly after the Kusuko Incident 薬子の変, which took place in 809-810 and was the power struggle between Emperor Heizei (774-824) and Emperor Saga (786-842). After this incident, the Northern Fujiwara clan emerged as the most powerful Fujiwara lineage.⁵⁷ Continuing to flourish after the early ninth century, the Northern Fujiwara clan controlled Kōfukuji in the Heian period and turned it into their ceremonial center.

⁵⁵ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 59.

⁵⁶ Nomura Tadao, *Narachō no seiji to Fujiwarashi* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1995), 85-146.

⁵⁷ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 32. Nagashima Fukutarō comments that the construction of the Nan'endō in 813 ushered in a new relationship between the Fujiwara clan and Kōfukuji and asserted the right of the Northern Fujiwara to control worship activities at Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine. Nagashima, *Nara*, 88; Nagashima, "Kōfukuji no rekishi," 4.

The rise of this Fujiwara lineage began with Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu 藤原冬嗣 (775-826), who supported Emperor Saga during the Kusuko Incident and became Saga's personal adviser.⁵⁸ Fuyutsugu had his daughter Fujiwara no Furuko 藤原古子 (dates unknown) marry Saga's son, who later became Emperor Montoku 文徳 (827-858) in 850. In an unusual situation, Saga allowed his daughter Minamoto no Kiyōhime 源潔姫 (810-856) to be the consort of Fuyutsugu's son Fujiwara no Yoshifusa 藤原良房 (804-872), who was the first regent of the Fujiwara family. Fuyutsugu's political power remained strong even after Saga resigned the throne in 823. Because of his relationship with the imperial family, Fuyutsugu was appointed as Minister of the Left (*Sadaijin* 左大臣) in 825 and seized some major positions at court for the family. As Morita Tei remarks, he was the “initiator of the Northern Fujiwara regency.”⁵⁹

After Fuyutsugu, Yoshifusa and his heir Fujiwara no Mototsune 藤原基経 (836-891) successfully eliminated their enemies in the capital and secured their power by marrying their daughters into the imperial family. As the grandfathers of emperors, the Northern Fujiwara family was able to control emperors, who often ascended the throne at a young age. During the time of Yoshifusa and Mototsune, the office of regent (*sesshō* 摂政) and chancellor (*kanpaku* 関白)⁶⁰ was established, allowing the family to assume the post of regents or chancellors and to

⁵⁸ Tei Morita contends that Fuyutsugu laid the foundation for the emergence of the Fujiwara regency. Morita Tei, “Toward Regency Leadership at Court,” in *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, ed. Joan R. Piggott (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006), 213-218. For discussion of Fuyutsugu's life, see Kurihara Hiromu, *Heian zenki no kazoku to shinzoku* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2008), 145-236; Morita, “Toward Regency,” 210-211, 217-218.

⁵⁹ Morita, “Toward Regency,” 218.

⁶⁰ The title “*sesshō*” indicates regents to underage emperors, while that of “*kampaku*” adult emperors. This distinction did not appear until the time of Fujiwara no Tadahira 藤原忠平 (880-949). William McCullough, “The Heian Court, 794-1070,” in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2, Heian Japan*, ed. Donald Shively and William McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 77.

ensure their leadership over the Council of the State (*Daijōkan* 太政官).⁶¹ The institutionalization of regency proved to be a tremendous success for the family, who controlled government for the next two hundred years.

To formalize their relationship with Kōfukuji, the Northern Fujiwara clan created the position of lay abbot (*zōku bettō* 俗別当) sometime during the Jōwa and Jōgan eras (834-877).⁶² The lay abbots were selected among members of the family and held the rank of the Senior Counselor (Dainagon 大納言) at court. During their tenures, lay abbots also served as the abbots of Kangakuin 勧学院, which was founded by Fuyutsugu in 821 to serve as the college of the clan.⁶³ Located in Kyoto, Kangakuin was also the clan's administrative headquarters, serving as a liaison between chieftains and Kōfukuji. Kangakuin was given the responsibilities to issue edicts and deal with various matters, such as managing the estates of Kōfukuji, overseeing its building projects, and handling its conflicts with other religious institutions.⁶⁴

The composition of Kōfukuji's clergy was rather complicated, but in general contained three hierarchal groups: the *sangō* 三綱 (temple leaders), *gakuryō* 学侶 (learning clerics), and *gerō* 下臈 (lowest seniority) that were also referred to as *dōshu* 堂衆 (hall assemblies) or *shuto* 衆徒 (assembly members).⁶⁵ The *gerō* at Kōfukuji were composed of the *Roppō daishu*

⁶¹ The formation of the regency and Fujiwara's domination of the post were a long and gradual process. For discussion of the Fujiwara regency, see Morita, "Toward Regency," 211-226; McCullough, "The Heian," 74-80.

⁶² Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 22-28.

⁶³ Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 23-24.

⁶⁴ Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 24-27.

⁶⁵ Nagashima, *Nara*, 133-134; Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 54-55. For studies on the composition of the Kōfukuji clergy, see John Dodson Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly in the Politics of Early Medieval Japan" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2005), 160-195.

(assemblies of the Six Directions), which was named after their residences within the monastery, and of two groups of the hall assemblies associated with the Eastern and Western Golden Halls. The *gerō* constituted the main source of Kōfukuji's military force and were in charge of labor works. The size of the Kōfukuji clergy is unclear, but may have been over two thousand in the eleventh century.⁶⁶ There were meetings of *gerō* held at the temple to decide various matters such as nominations for certain monastic positions and promotion of monks to higher ranks.

While chieftains of the Northern Fujiwara clan made the final decisions on the appointment of abbots, this does not mean that temple leaders were chosen from the family. During the heyday of the Northern Fujiwara in the tenth and eleventh centuries, most abbots at Kōfukuji did not come from the Fujiwara clan.⁶⁷ In addition, monks from lower ranks and non-aristocratic background could assume important monastic positions.⁶⁸ Hence, although Kōfukuji was the *ujidera* of the Fujiwara clan, its clergy enjoyed a degree of autonomy.

In general, Kōfukuji was governed through the endeavors made by the chieftains of the Northern Fujiwara, lay abbots of Kangakuin, and the clergy of the temple in the first half of the Heian period. Nevertheless, the relationship between the temple and the family began to change with the gradual domination of the two *monzeki* 門跡 (noble cloisters), Ichijōin 一乗院 and Daijōin 大乘院, in the leadership of Kōfukuji.

The Establishment of Monzeki and Resurgence of the Imperial Family

⁶⁶ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 55.

⁶⁷ Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 19-21; *Kōfukuji bettō shidai*, 709-719. Before 1100, only five abbots were from the Fujiwara clan.

⁶⁸ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 53; Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 47; Izumiya, *Kōfukuji*, 21.

Ichijōin and Daijōin were the most powerful noble cloisters at Kōfukuji. The former was founded by the monk Jōshō 定昭 (906-983) between 979 and 983, and the latter by Ryūzen 隆禪 (1038-1100) in 1087.⁶⁹ From the late eleventh century on, the *sekkanke* began to arrange their sons to take orders at Ichijōin and Daijōin. In 1100, Kakushin 覺信 (1065-1121), the son of Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101), became the first abbot of Kōfukuji from the *sekkanke*. This appointment marks a step toward the “aristocratization” or “privatization” of the temple and means that it became difficult for non-aristocratic monks to attain leadership roles. Ichijōin and Daijōin were governed by noble monks, whose properties and wealth were off-limits to the general clergy of Kōfukuji and were passed on to successive abbots. The noble status of monks from these two *monzeki* allowed them to develop close relationships with aristocrats in the capital. Because of their social status and ties with the *sekkanke*, monks from Ichijōin and Daijōin had a greater advantage to take over the post of abbot at Kōfukuji than those who came from non-aristocratic backgrounds. By the end of the twelfth century, Ichijōin and Daijōin had monopolized the leadership posts of Kōfukuji, dividing the temple into a “tripartite” organization, in which the two *monzeki* were placed on the top of hierarchy along with the *sekkanke*, followed by the general clergy.⁷⁰

The rise of Ichijōin and Daijōin reflected the shift in power from the Northern Fujiwara to the imperial family after the mid-eleventh century.⁷¹ The *sekkanke* reached its peak during the lifetime of Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1027), who utilized marriage politics to its fullest. By marrying his three daughters to successive emperors, Michinaga became both the

⁶⁹ Nagashima, *Nara*, 95-101; Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 106-114; Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 67-74, 104-121.

⁷⁰ Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 107.

⁷¹ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 70, 72.

father-in-law and grandfather of sovereigns. His heir Fujiwara no Yorimichi 藤原頼通 (992-1074) continued to establish marital connection with the imperial family and was the uncle of three successive emperors. Nevertheless, he witnessed the beginning of the crumbling of Fujiwara dominance when Prince Takahito 具平, whose mother was unrelated to the Northern Fujiwara, ascended the throne in 1068 as the Emperor Go-Sanjō 後三条 (1034-1073). The emperor and his successors devised a series of policies to restore the authority of the imperial family and restrict the power of the Northern Fujiwara at court.⁷² The period from the reign of the Emperor Go-Sanjō to the establishment of the *bakufu* government in 1185 is historically called “*insei* 院政,” cloister government, in which abdicated sovereigns ruled government from their own administrative offices *in-no-chō* 院の庁.⁷³

Under this political circumstance, the Northern Fujiwara family began to strengthen their ties with Kōfukuji in order to control its large landholdings and religious power.⁷⁴ Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101) sent his son, the aforementioned monk Kakushin, to take orders at the temple in 1074. Also, according to Kusaka Sakiko, the *sekkanke* began to refer to Kōfukuji as their tutelary temple (*mitera* 御寺) during the time of Morozane’s heir Fujiwara no Moromichi 藤原師通 (1062-1099).⁷⁵ The family demonstrated its close relationship with

⁷² G. Cameron Hurst, III, “Insei,” in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2: Heian Japan*, ed. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 583-632; Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 98-124.

⁷³ For discussion of the *insei* period, see Hurst, III, “Insei,” 576-632.

⁷⁴ Motoki Yasuo, “Kōfukuji in the Late Heian Period,” in *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, ed. Joan R. Piggott (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006), 301-325; Kusaka Sakiko, “Heian makki no Kōfukuji—mitera kannen no seiritsu,” *Shimado* 28, (1970): 75-104; Chapter Four of this dissertation.

⁷⁵ Kusaka, “Heian makki,” 91.

Kōfukuji through the patronage of ritual activities and erection of Buddhist structures on the temple grounds.⁷⁶ More importantly, as I argue in Chapter Four, the *sekkanke*'s worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon served as one of the most powerful ways to assert and solidify their ties with the temple, unifying them into a single entity. The *sekkanke*'s devotion to the deity came to an unprecedented height during the chieftainship of Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162).

These efforts to form the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community, however, barely turned the course of history in favor of the *sekkanke*. The untimely death of Morozane and Moromichi in 1101 and 1099 substantially weakened the power of the Northern Fujiwara, leaving the next heir Tadazane, who was only twenty-four years old, to face the ambitious retired emperors. The factionalism between Tadazane and his son Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164) further left little chances for the family to regain its political power.⁷⁷ The conflict between the father and the son culminated in the Hōgen Disturbance in 1156, in which Tadazane's second son Fujiwara no Yoronaga 藤原頼長 (1120-1156) joined Emperor Sutoku (1119-1164) to rebel against Emperor Go-Shirakawa (1127-1192). Their military attack failed, and Yoronaga died of head wound. The Hōgen Disturbance marked the victory of the imperial authority over the Tadazane-Yoronaga faction and the rise of warrior class.

By the twelfth century, Kōfukuji had owned large landholdings of Yamato and become the *de facto* ruling body of the province. Taira no Nobunori 平信範 (1112-1187) described the

⁷⁶ For example, Moromichi's son Fujiwara no Tadazane (1078-1162) initiated the Yuishiki-e 唯識会 (Lectures on the Yuishiki doctrine) in 1118 and patronized many other ritual performances at Kōfukuji during his tenure as the chieftain of the *sekkanke*. In addition, as discussed below, Tadazane commissioned the construction of the West Kasuga Pagoda to the east of Kōfukuji's main compound in 1116. Kusaka, "Heian makki," 92-94.

⁷⁷ Hurst, III, "Insei," 608-619.

temple's landholdings as so considerable that one could not find "a single scrap of the imperial domain" in Yamato.⁷⁸ Most of the temples, shrines, and lands in this area were subjugated under Kōfukuji, such as the temple Hasedera 長谷寺 and Mt. Kinpu 金峯山, both of which were renowned religious sites frequented by aristocrats in the Heian period. By controlling these temples and collecting taxes directly from them, Kōfukuji accumulated considerable wealth and personnel. The domination of Kōfukuji in Yamato was, no doubt, intolerable in the eyes of retired emperors, who intended to take control back over provinces from the *sekkanke* and their cohorts. Conflicts over estates invariably exacerbated between Kōfukuji and the state from the late eleventh century on.

To undermine Kōfukuji's influence in Yamato, the retired emperors intervened with the religious appointment of the temple and conducted land surveys in the area.⁷⁹ In reaction, armed clerics of Kōfukuji and service people (*jinnin* or *jinin* 神人) of Kasuga Shrine proceeded to the capital carrying sacred branches (*shinboku* 神木) of the *sakaki* tree from the shrine. The action, known as *gōso* 強訴 (forceful protests), became a powerful weapon to protect their interests against resurgent imperial authority.⁸⁰ The earliest recorded *gōso* conducted by Kōfukuji clerics took place in 1006, but did not involve the use of *sakaki* branches.⁸¹ This *gōso* stemmed from the dispute with Minamoto no Yorichika 源頼親 (dates unknown), the governor of Yamato, over the estates and rulership of the province. The tension between Kōfukuji and Yorichika continued

⁷⁸ Taira no Nobunori, *Heihanki*, in *Shiryō tsūran: Heihanki*, vols. 1-2 (Tokyo: Nihonshi Shiseki Hozonkai, 1918). *Heihanki*, Hōgen 3.7.17 (2: 316); Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 37.

⁷⁹ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 104-114; Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 41-76.

⁸⁰ To stage a *gōso* was not confined to Kōfukuji monks. Other religious entities such as Enryakuji also utilized it as a means of protests to the court. For studies on *gōso*, see Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 240-287.

⁸¹ Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 242; Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 42.

after 1006 and ended with Yorichika's banishment in 1049. The first documented *gōso* that involved the demonstration of *sakaki* trees occurred in 1093 and was conducted by the joint forces of Kōfukuji monks and Kasuga *jinnin*.⁸² More and more *gōso* broke out from this time on, and it became increasingly difficult for the *sekkanke* to tackle conflicts between Kōfukuji and the court. The ascendancy of Ichijōin and Daijōin emerged against this backdrop, reflecting the need from both the *sekkanke* and Kōfukuji to unify and solidify their power. Yet, it was the amalgamation of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries that gave the temple incredible strength and confirmed its impregnable position in Yamato for the following three centuries.

Amalgamation of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine

The amalgamation between Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine did not take place overnight, but grew out of long-term interactions between them and was predicated upon their mutual interests. Before discussing this institutional development, it is necessary to look at the history of the shrine and its relationship with Kōfukuji and the Northern Fujiwara clan. Kasuga Shrine is around twenty-minute walk from Kōfukuji and is situated to the east of the temple. Constructed at the foot of Mt. Mikasa 御蓋/三笠, the main compound of Kasuga Shrine contains the four shrines aligned side by side in a single enclosure. They enshrine four *kami*: Takemikazuchi no mikoto in the first shrine, Futsunushi no mikoto in the second shrine, Amenokoyane no mikoto in the third shrine, and Himegami in the fourth shrine.

Kasuga Shrine was allegedly founded in 768, although religious activities may have had

⁸² Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 242; Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 107. This incident is discussed below.

taken place there prior to this year.⁸³ This is indicated by a map dated to 756 in the Shōsōin 正倉院 collection. In the map, the plain of Kasuga is shown without buildings and is marked by a square cartouche written with two words “*jinchi* 神地 (land of *kami*).” The words suggest that while no permanent structures stood there, the place had been associated with *kami* and may have been utilized to hold activities for worship of *kami*.

Kasuga *kami* are collectively referred to as “Kasuga Daimyōjin (Great Bright Deity of Kasuga)” and were considered as the tutelary divinities of the Fujiwara clan. Amenokoyane no mikoto was the ancestral *kami* of the Nakatomi clan, from which the Fujiwara derived. This deity and his consort Himegami were from Kawachi province (present-day Osaka), where the Fujiwara clan came from. According to a legend, in response to the request of the Fujiwara clan, Takemikazuchi no mikoto, the deity of Kashima from Hitachi (present-day Ibaragi prefecture), arrived at Mt. Mikasa on a deer in 768.⁸⁴ After taking residence at Kasuga, Takemikazuchi no mikoto invited other deities—Futsunushi no mikoto from Kaori (present-day Chiba prefecture), Amenokoyane no Mikoto, and his consort Himegami from Kawachi province—to come to the mountain. These *kami* vowed to protect the imperial family, the Fujiwara clan, and Hossō Buddhism. Empress Shōtoku then had buildings erected at Kasuga in 768 to enshrine these divinities.

Although this account of the shrine’s origin cannot be taken as reality, the Fujiwara likely had worshipped Kasuga *kami* in the eighth century.⁸⁵ Also, given the clan’s prominent position at

⁸³ Susan C. Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through its Art* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992), 56; Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 25-29.

⁸⁴ *Koshaki*, in *Shinto taikai jinjahen: Kasuga*, ed. Nagashima Fukutarō, vol. 13 (Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985), 8.

⁸⁵ Tyler, *The Cult*, 56-59.

court, it is reasonable that they had established their tutelary shrine at this time.⁸⁶ Allan Grapard suggests that while the shrine was founded more than forty years later than Kōfukuji, it seems that from the beginning, the Fujiwara had planned to build them close to each other.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, in this early period Kasuga Shrine was not yet under the jurisdiction of Kōfukuji.

With the rise of the Northern Fujiwara to prominence in the ninth century, the family desired to augment and legitimize their lineage through the promotion of their tutelary *kami* at Kasuga. During the reign of Emperor Montoku (826-858), Yoshifusa elevated three *kami* at Kasuga to the first rank and one to the fourth rank, placing them close to the top of the state's divine ranking system.⁸⁸ Consequently, the Kasuga *kami* held the ranks only second to that of the imperial ancestral *kami*. In addition, Yoshifusa expanded the compound of Kasuga Shrine in 859 and held the Kasuga Grand Rite (*Kasuga taisai* 春日大祭) twice a year, one in spring and the other in autumn.⁸⁹ Yoshifusa's promotion of Kasuga made the shrine another ceremonial center of the family along with Kōfukuji. Moreover, by his patronage in Kasuga, Yoshifusa may have wanted to proclaim that the authority of the chieftain was grounded in the worship of Kasuga *kami*.⁹⁰

Yoshifusa's successors continued the policy of promoting Kasuga worship and further turned the Grand Kasuga Rite into an imperial ceremony. *Jōgan gishiki* 貞觀儀式 of 869 and

⁸⁶ Tyler, *The Cult*, 59.

⁸⁷ Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 50.

⁸⁸ Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 38-39.

⁸⁹ Nagashima, *Nara*, 91.

⁹⁰ Nagashima, *Nara*, 91. Nagashima Fukutarō connected Yoshifusa's patronage in Kasuga to the creation of the chieftainship at the time. Although it is commonly held that the position of the Fujiwara chieftain was officially established during the time of Mototsune, the chieftainship may have been functioning during Yoshifusa's tenure.

Engishiki 延喜式 compiled in 927 are two legal documents that provide information on the Grand Kasuga Rite and its codification. The record given in *Jōgan gishiki* details the proper protocol to perform the rite and indicates that the chieftain of the Fujiwara should be the central figure.⁹¹ The account in the *Engishiki* confirms that the Kasuga Grand Rite was a state-sponsored ceremony for the protection of the nation as well as the welfare of the emperor.⁹² In other words, beginning in the ninth and tenth centuries, the Kasuga Grand Rite was transformed from a private activity of the Fujiwara into an event of the state. This transformation would not have been possible without the power of the Northern Fujiwara, who controlled the court at the time. Through the codification of the Kasuga cult, the family incorporated their tutelary *kami* into the national pantheon, showing the preeminence of the Northern Fujiwara clan. Moreover, they demonstrated that their authority was built not only on court rank, but also religious prerogative over *kami* affairs. The family continued to govern Kasuga Shrine until the late eleventh century.

With the elevation of Kasuga Shrine as a national religious site, the imperial family and other court members began to make pilgrimages to the shrine.⁹³ Emperor Ichijō 一条 (980-1011) was the first sovereign to travel to Kasuga in 989. The leaders of the Northern Fujiwara were also expected to travel to Kasuga at least once during their tenures. From the tenth century on, it became a tradition for Fujiwara chieftains to visit the shrine right after taking the leadership position of the family. Therefore, paying visits to Kasuga had several meanings for the Northern Fujiwara—demonstrating their filial piety to Kasuga Daimyōjin, staging their religious authority, and asserting the chieftain leadership.

⁹¹ Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 57-60.

⁹² Felicia Bock, trans., *Engishiki: The Procedures of the Engi Era*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1972), 71-72; Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 60-61.

⁹³ Nagashima, *Nara*, 105-107; Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 94-95.

That Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine were two separate religious establishments prior to the late eleventh century was evidenced by a land dispute between them. In 962, Kōfukuji tried to build a hall in a land to the east of its precinct.⁹⁴ This project caused protest from Kasuga Shrine as the shrine considered the land its property. In addition, initially the Northern Fujiwara family prohibited Kōfukuji monks from entering the main compound of the shrine and from attending ceremonies held there because they viewed the monks as outside the family.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, such limitation was gradually relieved after the mid-tenth century. In 947, Tadahira sponsored the performance of the Hokke hakkō 法華八講 (The Eight Lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*) at Kasuga Shrine and asked Kōfukuji monks to preside over the ritual.⁹⁶ The Hokke hakkō was held twice a year, one in spring and the other in fall. In addition, the family ordered Kōfukuji monks to recite other sutras at Kasuga Shrine and even requested the temple to take responsibility for the offering of horses in the Kasuga Grand Rite.⁹⁷

Geographic proximity was another factor that gave Kōfukuji monks chances to interact with Kasuga Shrine. By the late eleventh century, the wooded plain, known as Tobinō, between the compounds of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine had become a place for Kōfukuji monks to practice *sanrō* 参籠 (ascetic seclusion), which involved in meditation, prayers, and recitation of sutras to Kasuga Daimyōjin.⁹⁸ Monks would conduct *sanrō* for a period of time in huts and pavilions erected in Tobinō before attending rituals held at Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine. They

⁹⁴ Nagashima, “Kōfukuji no rekishi,” 8; Nagashima, *Nara*, 114-115.

⁹⁵ Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 75-76.

⁹⁶ Nagashima, *Nara*, 117; Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 375-376. According to Miyai Yoshio, it is likely that prior to this time, recitation of sutras had been performed for Kasuga *kami*.

⁹⁷ Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 374-376.

⁹⁸ Miyai, *Ritsuryō kizoku*, 377-378; Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods*, 77-78.

also went there to seek divine guidance on their religious career, spiritual pursuit, or other matters, waiting on dreams and visions from Kasuga Daimyōjin. Such activities fostered the ties between Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine.

In sum, from the ninth through mid-eleventh centuries, the Northern Fujiwara family added imperial as well as Buddhist elements to the worship of their tutelary *kami* at Kasuga, and by doing so, amplified its prestige without sacrificing the status of the family as the primary promoter of the Kasuga cult. Nevertheless, beginning in the late eleventh century, Kōfukuji replaced the *sekkanke* as the main force to govern Kasuga Shrine and promote Kasuga cult.

Although it is unclear when Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine were made into one body, by 1093, the affiliation between them was undeniable.⁹⁹ In this year, with the consent of Emperor Shirakawa 白河 (1053-1129), Takashina Tame'ie 高階為家 (1038-1106), the governor of Ōmi, sent officials to collect tax at an Ichigyō estate that Kasuga Shrine considered belong to them and should be thus exempt from taxes.¹⁰⁰ However, for the governor and Emperor, no proper documentation could prove the shrine's ownership of the land, and therefore the estate should be governed by the imperial provincial system. This collection of taxes led to conflicts that involved violence and eventually an appeal to the court. Interestingly, instead of reporting the situation to the Fujiwara chieftain as required by the protocol, the shrine turned to Kōfukuji for help in the first place. At the request of the shrine, the temple made a petition and sent it to the chieftain, who then submitted it to the court. In the petition, Kōfukuji stated that "Kasuga Daimyōin protects Kōfukuji and Kōfukuji supports Kasuga Daimyōjin. Whether one speaks of the temple

⁹⁹ Nagashima, *Nara*, 120.

¹⁰⁰ Nagashima, *Nara*, 119-120; Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 101-113.

or the shrine, they are one and the same. Kasuga's worries are also Kōfukuji's worries."¹⁰¹ In response to the petition, the chieftain of the *sekkanke* Moromichi investigated the dispute and imposed a light punishment on Tame'ie. Dissatisfied with this result, Kōfukuji clerics and shrine *jinnin* staged a *gōso* in the capital, calling for the banishment of Tame'ie. The court reacted quickly to their request, banishing Tame'ie only two days later. The petition and *gōso* confirm the affiliation between Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine, and more importantly indicate that the *sekkanke* no longer had a monopoly on the governance of the shrine.¹⁰²

In spite of this, in 1116, Tadazane dedicated the Kasuga Saitō 春日西塔 (Kasuga Western Pagoda) on the grounds of the shrine to the east of Kōfukuji's main compound. The pagoda no longer exists, but its foundation is still visible within the precinct of the present-day Nara National Museum.¹⁰³ Two years later in 1118, Tadazane initiated the Yuishiki-e 唯識会 (Lectures on the *Yuishiki* Doctrine) in the pagoda and paid for the cost of the ceremony.¹⁰⁴ The *yuishiki* doctrine is the fundamental teaching of Hossō Buddhism. Hence, the sponsorship of this ritual signaled the *sekkanke*'s engagement with the unification of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine, and showed the close relationship between the family and these two religious institutions. The icons installed at the pagoda were the Buddhas of Shaka, Yakushi, Amida, and Miroku.¹⁰⁵ In his

¹⁰¹ *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965); *Fusō ryakki*, Kanji 7.8.22 (334).

¹⁰² For detailed discussion of the incident and its implications, see Ullrich, "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly," 101-113.

¹⁰³ For viewing the current site, see Nara National Museum, "Kasuga tōsai tō seki," Nara National Museum, <http://www.narahaku.go.jp/guide/08.html> (accessed May 13, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ Kusaka, "Heian makki," 92-99.

¹⁰⁵ Adachi Kō, "Kasuga Saitō to Kōfukuji tō to no kankei," in *Tōba kenchiku no kenkyū* (Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1987), 263-267; Fujiwara no Tadazane, *Denryaku*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-1970); *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.26 (4: 46). Nagashima Fukutarō considers that the year 1116 marked the establishment of the theory of the *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹 (original grand,

diary *Denryaku*, Tadazane specified that each of the Buddhas had two attendants, and the Shaka Buddha was accompanied by a Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁰⁶ Since he had no mention of what the attendants were for the other three Buddhas except for Fukūkenjaku Kannon, one may speculate that this deity must have been significant to him. Moreover, the associations of Kasuga *kami* with Buddhist deities at Kōfukuji, called “*shinbutsu shūgō* 神仏習合” in Japanese, were forming at the time. The associations were based on the theory of *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹 (original ground, local traces), according to which *kami* are local emanations of Buddhist deities. After the mid-twelfth century, the Nan’endō Fukūenjaku Kannon was identified as the Buddhist manifestation of Takeikazuchi no mikoto at Kasuga. Seen in this light, we may interpret Tadazane’s choice of Fukūkenjaku Kannon as reflecting the on-going process of forming the association between the Nan’endō Fukūenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin.

Interestingly, in 1140 Emperor Toba sponsored the construction of another pagoda, known as Kasuga Tōtō 春日東塔 (Kasuga Eastern Pagoda), to stand right in front of the Kasuga Western Pagoda. No documents tell why the pagoda was dedicated, but given its location we may speculate that it was intended to proclaim the presence of imperial power within the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex. By this time, Kasuga Shrine had become a national ceremonial site, and its unification with Kōfukuji made it a powerful religious institution that one could hardly

local traces) at the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex. According to this theory, particular *kami* at Kasuga were the local incarnations of specific Buddhist deities at Kōfukuji. Nagashima’s comment is based on his attribution of the icons at the pagoda as the four *honji* Buddhas of Kasuga, which were the Shaka, Yakushi, Jizō, and Kannon. However, in his diary *Denryaku*, Tadazane only indicated that one of the four Buddhas was Shaka. Moreover, by examining relevant records, Adachi Kō convincingly argues that the other three sculptures should have represented Yakushi, Amida, and Miroku rather than the *honji* Buddhas of Kasuga Shrine. As Adachi points out, the designation of the Shaka as one of the manifestations of the Kasuga *kami* did not appear until the Kamakura period. Also, according to *Chūyūki*, the Kasuga Western Pagoda was modelled after the Five-Storied Pagoda at Kōfukuji, which enshrined the Yakushi, Shaka, Amida, and Miroku Buddhas. Nagashima, *Nara*, 121.

¹⁰⁶ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.26 (4: 46).

ignore. Hence, Toba's dedication of the Kasuga East Pagoda was apparently an attempt to compete with the *sekkanke* over the patronage of the shrine.

Yet, neither of these two buildings were as important as the Wakamiya Shrine (若宮神社), which was constructed in 1135 under the auspices of Kōfukuji. The building was situated to the east of Kasuga's main compound and enshrined Ame-no-oshikumone, who was the offspring of Amenokoyane no mikoto and Himegami at the third and fourth shrines.¹⁰⁷ It is said that Wakamiya *kami* appeared in 1003 as a snake underneath the floor of the fourth shrine at Kasuga. In 1136, one year after the dedication of the shrine, the *Onmatsuri*, Wakamiya festival, was held for the first time.¹⁰⁸ Kōfukuji organized the festival and paid for its costs. Although Wakamiya Shrine stood on the grounds of Kasuga, it was the temple clerics that oversaw its operation.¹⁰⁹ As Nagashima Fukutarō points out, Kōfukuji asserted its full control over Kasuga Shrine and forged a sense of unity between the shrine and the temple through the creation of *Onmatsuri*.¹¹⁰

The formulation of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex also relied on the establishment of the connection between the divinities at both sites. The earliest record about the *kami*-Buddha correspondences between the two institutions is dated to 1175.¹¹¹ In the record, Takemikazuchi no Mikoto at the first shrine is identified as the local incarnation of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Futsunushi no mikoto at the second shrine as Yakushi Buddha, Amenokoyane no mikoto at the third shrine as Jizō Bosatsu, Himegami at the fourth shrine as Eleven-headed Kannon, and

¹⁰⁷ Nagashima, *Nara*, 121-122.

¹⁰⁸ Nagashima, *Nara*, 121-123.

¹⁰⁹ Nagashima, "Kōfukuji no rekishi," 10.

¹¹⁰ Nagashima, *Nara*, 123.

¹¹¹ Ō Nakatomi Tokimori *Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha*, in *Shinto taikei jinsha hen 13: Kasuga*, ed. Nagashima Fukutarō (Tokyo: Shinto Taikei Hensankai, 1985), 18.

Wakamiya *kami* as Monju Bosatsu. Nevertheless, these identifications were not fixed, and there are other versions of the correspondences between Kasuga *kami* and Buddhist deities at Kōfukuji.¹¹² Regardless of this, images that show various correspondences, whether they were painting or sculptures, appeared in great number after the twelfth century.¹¹³

The creation of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex had significant ramifications for the character of both religious institutions. By the twelfth century, worship of Kasuga Daimyōjin had developed into a national cult, which gave the shrine great religious power and attracted many believers outside the Fujiwara clan. Sharing a large number of service people from the shrine, its large landholdings, and its spiritual prestige, Kōfukuji ensured its dominance over Yamato Province until the sixteenth century. Also, because of this affiliation, Kōfukuji was able to remain invulnerable to the aggressive imperial power and warrior aristocrats, who took over the government after the Heian period. Beginning in the twelfth century, the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex became what historian Kuroda Toshio called “*kenmon* 権門 (power blocs).”¹¹⁴ According to Kuroda, three power blocs—the court nobles (*kuge* 公家), warriors (*buke* 武家), and temples and shrines (*jisha* 寺社)—shared political responsibilities as well as prestige. Each power bloc controlled extensive properties and human resources; however, no power bloc could dominate completely its rivals. This system of shared rule characterizes Japanese society from

¹¹² For this, see Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis, *Japanese Mandalas: Representations of Sacred Geography* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 146-147.

¹¹³ For studies on them, see Tyler, *The Cult*; ten Grotenhuis, *Japanese Mandalas*, 142-162; Sherry Fowler, *Murōji: Rearranging Art and History at a Japanese Buddhist Temple* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), 175-203.

¹¹⁴ For discussion of the *kenmon* theory, see James C. Dobbins, “Editor’s Introduction: Kuroda Toshio and His Scholarship,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26.3 (1996): 217-232; James C. Dobbins, ed., “The Legacy of Kuroda Toshio,” Commemorative Issue of *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26.3-4 (1996); Adolphson, *The Gates of Power*, 10-20.

the eleventh through the fifteenth centuries. It is not an exaggeration to say that while having been a powerful religious institution for centuries, Kōfukuji just began to witness its efflorescence in the twelfth century.

Expansion of Kōfukuji's Precinct

In the Heian period, the precinct of Kōfukuji continued to expand beyond its main compound. A number of *inge* 院家 (cloisters) such as Denbōin 伝法院, Kanzenin 観禅院, Kita'in 喜多院 were constructed by the ranking monks to conduct Buddhist practices and serve as their residences.¹¹⁵ In addition, Ichijōin and Daijōin were two large complexes erected on the north side of Kōfukuji, where the Nara Court and the Nara Prefectural Offices occupy today.¹¹⁶ The two *monzeki* were constructed in the *shinden* 寝殿 style, which is characterized by a U-shaped structure surrounded by a pond in front of it and was commonly employed to make mansions for aristocrats in the Heian period.¹¹⁷ Built in this manner, the complexes of Ichijōin and Daijōin provided comfortable environments for noble monks, allowing them to continue to live a luxurious lifestyle within a monastic setting. With the increased number of noble monks entering Kōfukuji from the eleventh and twelfth centuries on, more construction of *inge* were undertaken at the temple. According to *Sankaiki* 山槐記, a journal of Nakayama Tadachika 中山忠親 (1131-1195), by the end of the twelfth century, there were nearly fifty subtemples situated

¹¹⁵ Sugiyama Nobuzō, *Inge kenchiku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981), 293-309. More *inge* were erected on the grounds of Kōfukuji after the Heian period. For this, see *Kōfukuji ingeden* 興福寺院家伝, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 65 (Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 130-140.

¹¹⁶ Nagashima, *Nara*, 100-101; Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 303. After the fire in 1181, the Daijōin was moved to the Zenjōin, a subtemple of Gangōji, which was located in the present-day Nara Hotel.

¹¹⁷ Nagashima, *Nara*, 99-101; Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 303.

in and out of the compound.¹¹⁸

In addition to *inge*, there were other types of buildings erected on the temple grounds during the Heian period. They were commissioned by the Fujiwara members to express their religious piety and pray for the family's welfare. For example, Fujiwara no Morosuke 藤原師輔 (909-960) commissioned the Godai'in 五大院 to enshrine Godai Myōō (Five Great Bright Kings) in the middle of the Tenryaku era (947-956).¹¹⁹ Furthermore, in 973 Morosuke's son Fujiwara no Kane'ie 藤原兼家 (929-990) held the *hokke zanmai* 法華三昧 (Lotus Meditation) in the Godai'in to pray for the prosperity of the family and Kasuga Daimyōjin.¹²⁰ Another example is that Fujiwara no Shōshi 藤原璋子 (1101-1145) commissioned Tōendō (Eastern Round Hall) in 1124, which was situated in the northeast of the main compound on the land of today's government offices.¹²¹ Lastly, Fujiwara no Kiyoko 藤原聖子 (1122-1182) erected a three-storied pagoda in 1143 to the southwest of the Nan'endō.¹²² The pagoda burned down in 1181 and was

¹¹⁸ Nakayama Tadachika, *Sankaiki*, in *Zohō shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-3 (Tokyo: Naigai Shoseki Kabushiki Kaisha, 1935); Jishō 4.12.28 (3: 152-154).

¹¹⁹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 25. *Kōfukuji ruki* does not indicate the location of the Godai'in. However, the images of the Godai Myōō are illustrated on the top right corner of the Kōfukuji mandara painting from the Kyoto National Museum. Dated to the early thirteenth century, the painting depicts Buddhist icons in various halls in the main compound of Kōfukuji. The layout of these icons corresponds to that in reality. The Godai Myōō is shown in the top right corner above the Jikidō Thousand-armed Kannon in the painting. For the image and discussion of the Kōfukuji mandara, see Izumi Takeo, "Kōfukuji mandara no zuyō to hyōgen," in *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō Kōfukuji mandara zu*, ed. Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Kyoto: Benridō, 1995), 52-72, plate 9; Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji mandara yori mita dōji anchi butszō," in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 211-212.

¹²⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 25.

¹²¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20.

¹²² Records of the three-storied pagoda are scattered among several historical texts. Some texts indicate that the pagoda was commissioned by Shōshi. However, Adachi Kō convincingly argues that it was Kiyoko to be the commissioner of the building. *Kōfukuji ryaku nendaiki*, 興福寺略年代記, in *Zoku kunsho ruijū*, vol. 27 (ge) (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1984), 148; Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan: Kōfukuji 1*, vol. 7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969), 25-28. Adachi

rebuilt in the early thirteenth century. Except this pagoda, none of the aforementioned buildings survive today.

The precinct of today's Kōfukuji is much smaller than it was in history. A map created after 1760 offers a detailed view of the buildings in the precincts of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine.¹²³ While this map was dated to a much later period, by comparing it with the list of the buildings at Kōfukuji given in *Sankaiki*, one finds that the precinct of the temple in the twelfth century was not much different from that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹²⁴ The map shows that Kōfukuji occupied a larger area than it has today, covering the lands of the present-day Nara Prefectural Offices, the Nara Court, the National Nara Museum, the Nara Hotel, and the neighborhood of Gangōji. Moreover, the precinct was populated with cloisters and other types of buildings such as storage houses; most of these buildings were unfortunately destroyed in the Edo (1615-1868) and Meiji (1868-1911) periods. If we add the land occupied by Kasuga Shrine to that of Kōfukuji after they established their affiliation in the twelfth century, Kōfukuji was undoubtedly the largest temple in Nara.

Conclusion

The examination of Kōfukuji's early history shows that the temple was given with various

Kō, "Kōfukuji sanjūtō no shōshitsu nendai," in *Tōba kenchiku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1987), 280-298.

¹²³ For the photo of the map, see Nara Joshi Daigaku (Nara Women University), "Map of the Precinct of Kasuga Shrine and Kōfukuji (*Kasuga Kōfukuji kennai zū*)," Nara Joshi Daigaku, http://mahoroba.lib.nara-wu.ac.jp/y08/kasuga_taisha/keidai_zu/ (accessed May 13, 2015). For another map that also illustrates the precinct of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex, see Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Kōfukuji kokuhōten: Nan'endō Heisei daishūri rakkei kinen* (Tokyo: Geijutsu kenkyū shinkō zaidan, 1997), 184-185, 218.

¹²⁴ It should be noted that while many of the buildings listed in the map do not match with those recorded in *Sankaiki*, the boundaries of the temple's precinct indicated by both sources are similar. *Sankaiki*, Jishō 4.12.28 (3: 152-154).

tasks from the beginning of its history. In addition, its relationship with the Northern Fujiwara clan was by no means stable, but in a constant state of flux. Kōfukuji originated as a private Buddhist chapel for Kamatari in 669 and emerged as a prominent religious establishment in the eighth century. On the one hand, Kōfukuji was treated as the Fujiwara's *ujidera*, praying for their deceased family members and signifying their prominent status in society. On the other hand, it served as one of the official temples, whose primary function was to perform rituals for national protection. Fuhito's death in 720 ushered in the state's direct engagement in the construction of Kōfukuji. The government took responsibility for the creation of the Northern Round Hall and Eastern Golden Hall. After Kōmyō became Empress in 729, other building projects were conducted under her auspices, including those of the Five-Storied Pagoda and Western Golden Hall. Other family members such as Nakamaro from the Southern Fujiwara clan and Empress Shōtoku also dedicated Buddhist halls at Kōfukuji in the eighth century. In addition to these developments, as early as the mid-eighth century, Kōfukuji had served as a place for monks to practice Buddhism. Genbō's deposit of thousands of sutras to the temple further established it as one of the important centers for studying Buddhism in Nara. By the end of the eighth century, Kōfukuji had become a full-fledged religious institution.

Kōfukuji in the Heian period accumulated tremendous wealth and obtained great power through the support of the Northern Fujiwara, who dominated politics from the mid-ninth through mid-eleventh centuries. In 801, the temple was designated as the place to hold the state ritual Yuima-e. This designation indicates its significant position in both religious and political realms. The temple's political power continued to increase in the following centuries, and by the end of the eleventh century, it had become a *de facto* governing entity of Yamato Province.

Kōfukuji clerics enjoyed a degree of independence in the first half of the Heian period.

Most of the abbots during this time were not from the Fujiwara family. Also, monks who had no aristocratic background could assume leadership posts of the temple. This situation gradually changed with the establishment of the two *monzeki*—Ichijōin and Daijōin—in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Noble monks from Ichijōin and Daijōin occupied important administrative posts and had a monopoly over the abbot position from the twelfth century on, turning the monastic organization into a tripartite one. The domination of the two *monzeki* also changed the character of Kōfukuji, making it a religious institution governed by aristocrats from the Northern Fujiwara clan. This “aristocratization” or “privatization” process paralleled the amalgamation of Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine and was in part a reaction to the resurgence of the imperial family.

The formulation of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex was a long-term process. Initially, the Northern Fujiwara family banned Kōfukuji monks from entering the compound of Kasuga Shrine. Also, the family was the primary promoter of the shrine and governed its worship activities prior to the mid-eleventh century. However, the limitation on Kōfukuji’s participation in Kasuga-related events was gradually relaxed. At the request of the *sekkanke*, Kōfukuji monks presided over recitation of sutras at Kasuga Shrine and participated in other ritual events held there. These ritual activities encouraged frequent contact between both religious institutions and paved the way for their unification in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. The weakened *sekkanke* and the resurgent imperial family from the late eleventh century on also prompted the creation of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex. In the face of the intrusion of the state into their properties, the temple and shrine strengthened their power banding together. The *gōso* in 1093, launched by armed clerics at Kōfukuji and service people at Kasuga, confirmed the affiliation between these two religious establishments. The *sekkanke* also made efforts to cement their ties

with the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex through the construction of the Kasuga West Pagoda and sponsorship of ritual activities held there. Nevertheless, as the *sekkanke*'s power drastically declined at court, they could no longer monopolize the supervision of Kasuga Shrine and had to yield the administrative rights of the shrine to Kōfukuji. The construction of the Wakamiya Shrine and creation of the *Onmatsuri* signaled the temple's control over Kasuga Shrine. By subjugating the shrine under its jurisdiction, Kōfukuji transformed itself into a *kenmon* that remained unchallenged until the sixteenth century.

The investigation of Kōfukuji's early history shows the limitation of using the term *ujidera* to characterize the temple's relationship to the Northern Fujiwara. The term gives an impression that Kōfukuji had no independence from the family and was subordinated under their governance the entire time. As the above demonstrates, the Northern Fujiwara did not always have full control over Kōfukuji, and the temple became a powerful religious institution largely on its own in the early twelfth century. Its relationship with the Northern Fujiwara changed according to the external political circumstances and internal monastic structure. Also, unlike other family temples in the Heian period, Kōfukuji was deeply entangled in politics and society, owned large landholdings, and had its own military force. It is in this complex and transitory religious environment that gave rise to the creation of the Nan'endō in 813 and its transformation as a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century. The history of the hall unfolded along with that of Kōfukuji and lives of the Northern Fujiwara clan members, continuously engaging with these two power constellations for centuries.

Chapter Two

Making Memories:

The Creation of the Nan'endō and Its Buddhist Icons in the Ninth Century

In the act of commemoration, in the uttering of the memorized text, the practitioners of *Buddhānusmṛti* establish a communal identity that links them to other members of the Buddhist faith. But at the same time, they call forth a relationship between two persons, themselves and the Buddha, capable of being profoundly catalytic, to the extent that distinction of self and other dissolve in its luminosity and a new identity comes into existence, purified, omniscient, fearless, and awakened.¹

—Paul Harrison, “Commemoration and Identification in *Buddhānusmṛti*”

Introduction

Commemoration is defined by scholars as “practices and processes associated with honoring the memory of someone or something.”² In Buddhism, acts of commemoration are not only about reverence of the departed, but also experience of meditation and enlightenment. For instance, the practice of *Buddhānusmṛti*, translated as “recollection,” “remembrance,” “commemoration of the Buddha,” or “calling the Buddha to mind,” entails contemplation on the virtues of the Buddha, his teachings, and visualization of his bodily features.³ A mental activity as it may be, Paul Harrison contends that this mnemonic practice “establishes a communal identity that links them (practitioners) to other members of the Buddhist faith.” This chapter examines the creation of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist images in 813, a project that the Northern Fujiwara clan initiated to commemorate departed family members. In what circumstances did the family embark on this

¹ Paul Harrison, “Commemoration and Identification in *Buddhānusmṛti*,” in *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*, ed. Janet Gyatso (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 230-231.

² Brenner, Elma, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown, eds., *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture* (England: Ashgate, 2013), 2.

³ For discussion of this practice, see Harrison, “Commemoration,” 215-238.

project? In what ways did the visual program of the Nan'endō engage with the family's performances of memorialization? What is the relationship between place, images, and commemoration as seen in the project? It is the purpose of this chapter to answer these questions.

As I will show, the creation of the Nan'endō was for both the living and the dead. On the one hand, the physical space of the hall and its visual images were dedicated to the deceased family members to pray for their salvation. On the other hand, the sanctuary established a liminal realm where the Northern Fujiwara family recollected the lives of their ancestors⁴ and reaffirmed their place in the kinship relationship. This sanctuary and the Hokke-e (Assembly on the *Lotus Sutra*)—the memorial ritual held in 817 in the hall—linked ancestors, descendants, and clerics with the divine, creating a community in which the boundary between the living and the dead was obscure. Therefore, like Harrison's characterization of *Buddhānusmṛti* practice, the creation of the Nan'endō was a salvific and communal activity for both believing and remembering. Practices of ancestral commemoration and religious devotion coalesced and manifested in the material form of the hall and its Buddhist images.

I divide this chapter into three parts. The first part deals with the controversy over the origin of the Nan'endō and enshrinement of its main icon Fukūkenjaku Kannon (Skt. Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara or Avalokiteśvara with the Unfailing Rope). By examining the historical background, a gilt bronze lantern that stood in front of the hall, and the icon

⁴ In this study, I use the term “ancestors” in a loose sense to refer to both the founder of the Northern Fujiwara and his successors. Also, it should be noted that this definition is for “lineal ancestors” rather than “ancestors of origin” who are non-human beings like *kami* (local divinities) and whom the founders of households were allegedly derived from. We should also make a distinction between ancestor commemoration (*sozen-kuyō* 祖先供養), in which descendants make offerings on the behalf of ancestors, and ancestor worship (*sozen-sūhai* 祖先崇拜), in which ancestors are the subject of devotion. In this chapter, discussion of the family's practice of memorialization fits into the first category. For discussion of the terms of ancestors, see Robert Smith, *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974), 8-11, 15-16.

Fukūkenjaku Kannon, I propose that the construction of the Nan'endō resulted from an attempt to celebrate the rise of the family as the most prominent lineage of the Fujiwara clan after 810 and derived from how they perceived their success through the notion of *sekizen yokei* 積善余慶, which literally means “accumulation of goodness, excessive blessings.” Moreover, this celebration took on the form of ancestral commemoration and prompted the re-enshrinement of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the Lecture Hall at Kōfukuji.

The second part of the chapter focuses on the architecture of the Nan'endō and its visual images. I analyze physical features of the hall and explore its religious function as well as symbolic meaning. I also reconstruct the iconographic program of the Nan'endō through the uses of temple records, travel accounts, and relevant images. The last part of the chapter considers the visual program within the performance of the memorial ritual Hokke-e. I explicate how the ritual, architecture, and images coordinated with one other to establish a realm of the sacred that integrated traditional value of filial piety and Buddhist notion of salvation.

Issues of the Nan'endō's Creation

Ambiguous Accounts

The Nan'endō burned down four times over the course of history in 1046, 1181, 1327, and 1717. The most recent fire, caused by the careless use of candles in the Lecture Hall, quickly spread to other parts of Kōfukuji and destroyed the Nan'endō along with other buildings, such as the Western Golden Hall, Central Golden Hall, Middle Gate, South Gate, Sutra Repository, and Belfry.⁵ Fortunately, temple staff rescued all of the Nan'endō's sculptures and two panels of

⁵ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, ed. *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho* (The Report of the Repair and Restoration of the Important Cultural Property Kōfukuji Nan'endō) (Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1996), 8-9; *Kōfukuji garan enshō no ki* 興福寺伽藍炎焼之記, in *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji*

paintings, throwing them into two ponds—Sarusawa Pond 猿沢池 and the pond in front of Tōin 唐院—in order to save them from the fire.⁶ After they were removed from water the next day, these images were stored temporarily in the refectory and warehouses. They were reinstalled in eight decades later in 1797 after the reconstruction of the hall.⁷ Still in existence, these works, recreated earlier in 1189, include sculptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Four Guardian Kings, and six Hossō patriarchs as well as eight paintings of eminent monks from the Hossō, Tendai, and Shingon Buddhist schools. Hence, neither the Nan’endō nor its interior images survive in the original form.

To understand the creation of the hall, one invariably has to rely on *Kōfukuji ruki* (hereafter *Ruki*) and *Kōfukuji engi* (hereafter *Engi*), which are the earliest extant records.⁸ These

Nan’endō shūri kōji hōkokusho (Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1996), 98. Dated to 1717, *Kōfukuji garan enshō no ki* (The Record of Kōfukuji Catching on Fire) provides detailed accounts of the 1717 fire and aftermath of this disaster.

⁶ *Kōfukuji garan enshō no ki*, 100. Prior to the fire, there were eight panels of the paintings installed in the Nan’endō. The record makes no mention of what happened to the other six panels.

⁷ For a brief discussion of the hall’s reconstruction, see Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 9-17. It is commonly held that the Nan’endō was rebuilt in 1789 (Kansei 1). Nevertheless, an Edo-period text *Inouechō nendaiki shō* 井上町年代記抄 tells that while the hall was already reconstructed in 1789, the icons were not re-installed until 1797 because of the lack of financial support. In addition, an inscription written on a paper that is inserted into the gold metal fittings of the altar indicates that the fittings were installed in 1797. These records suggest that the construction of the Nan’endō was not entirely completed in 1789, nor did its icons return to the building. Takata Jirō, ed., *Nara Inouechō nendaiki shō* (Tokyo: Kuwana Bunseidō, 1943), 110-111. For the inscription and discussion of the hall’s completion date, see Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 14, 92-93.

⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, compiled in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, contains temple records that were drawn from a variety of sources dated from the eighth to the twelfth centuries. The text is composed of three sections, each of which has an entry on the Nan’endō. In addition, the second section, *Yamashina ruki* 山階流記, contains sources dated to the eighth and ninth centuries. These sources are titled with era names such as *Hōjiki* 宝字記 (Records of Hōji), *Enryakuki* 延暦記 (Records of Enryaku), and *Kōninki* 弘仁記 (Records of Kōnin), respectively from the eras of Hōji (757-765), Enryaku (782-806), and Kōnin (810-824). The accounts of the origin of the Nan’endō, discussed in this chapter, are from *Yamashina ruki*. In the following discussion, I will specify the source names if necessary. Another text, *Kōfukuji engi*, was compiled by Fujiwara no Yoshiyo (823-900) in 900 and is a brief account of temple’s history. *Kōfukuji ruki* has been widely studied by literary scholars. For an overview of scholarship on this, see Matsuhara

two documents present a very similar story of the Nan'endō's origin, telling that Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu 藤原冬嗣 (775-826) built the hall in 813 to house the images of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings that were made by the vow of his father Fujiwara no Uchimarō 藤原内麻呂 (756-812), who died a year before the completion of the hall.⁹

Nevertheless, the accounts do not provide the construction dates of the icons. Neither do they indicate why Uchimarō wanted to create these images. These issues are further complicated by the entries on the Kōdō (Lecture Hall) in both texts. The entry in *Ruki* states:

One building of the Kōdō.*Hōjiki* says that the Buddhist icon in the [Kōdō] was a Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which is one *jō* and six *shaku* tall. It is said that the chief administrator moved it [Fukūkenjaku Kannon] to the Nan'endō; one can inquire about this [move]. The following: Junior Second Rank Lady Fujiwara [Fujiwara no Fusasaki's daughter] and the Senior Fourth Lower Consultant of Civil Affairs [Fujiwara no Matate] constructed it [the Fukūkenjaku Kannon] on the first month of the eighteenth year of Tenpō [746] for their deceased father [Fujiwara no Fusasaki] and mother [Queen Muro]. *Enryakuki* states that a sculpture of Fukūkenjaku Bodhisattva is said to be in a hōden. 講堂一字。 寶字記云。安置佛者。不空羼索觀自在一軀。高一丈六尺。法務御房。後移南圓堂云云。尋之。右。從二位藤原夫人。參議正四位下民部卿藤原朝臣。以天平十八年歲次丙戌正月。為先考先妣所造立也云云。延曆記云。不空羼索菩薩一軀。在寶殿云云。¹⁰

Satomi, "Kōfukuji ruki," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 327-348.

⁹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 19; Fujiwara no Yoshiyo, *Kōfukuji engi*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 321. The entry to the Nan'endō in *Kōfukuji ruki* states: The following: [Nan'endō] houses the images of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings. Minister of the Right Nagaoka [Fujiwara no Uchimarō] made a great vow to create the images. Later Chancellor of Kan'in [Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu] built the Round Hall to house these images in the fourth year of Kōnin [813]. 右。安置不空羼索觀音像并四天王像也。長岡右大臣。發大願所奉造。後閑院贈太政大臣。以弘仁四年。造立圓堂。所安置尊像。

The account is almost the same as that in *Kōfukuji engi*: The following: [Nan'endō] houses the images of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings. Note: there is a word "great" below the word "four." Minister of the Right Nagaoka [Fujiwara no Uchimarō] made a great vow to create the images. Later Chancellor [Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu] of Kan'in built the Round Hall to house these images in the fourth year of Kōnin [813]. 右。安置不空羼索觀音像并四^四考^四下一本有大字天王像也。長岡右大臣殊發大願所奉造也。後閑院贈太政大臣。以弘仁四年。造立圓堂。所安置尊像也。

¹⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 16-17; *Jō* and *shaku* are the measurement for the height of traditional Buddhist sculptures. One *jō* is about 3.03 meters and one *shaku* 30.3 centimeters. One *jō* and six *shaku* or *jōroku* is 4.85 meters.

As the passage indicates, there was a sculpture of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Kōdō. Fujiwara no Matate 藤原真楯 (715-766) and his sister commissioned the sculpture for their deceased father Fujiwara no Fusasaki 藤原房前 (681-737) and mother Queen Muro 牟漏女王 in 746. However, at some point, the chief administrator moved the sculpture to the Nan'endō. The passage also says that the sculpture was in the *hōden*, which literally means “Treasure Hall” and probably refers to a *zushi* 厨子 (tabernacle).”¹¹

Another entry in *Engi* tells of a slightly different story and states:

The following: [Lecture Hall] houses the images of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings. On the first month of Tenpō 17 [745], the Senior Third Rank Empress Muro was ill and made a wish to produce the said images and copy one thousand scrolls of *dhāraṇī* sutras. However, she passed away without realizing her wishes. Her children Junior Second Rank Lady Fujiwara [Fujiwara no Fusasaki's daughter] and Senior Fourth Lower Consultant Fujiwara of Civil Affairs [Fujiwara no Matate] together fulfilled her wishes. The hall was built on the Queen's death anniversary. 右。安置絹索菩薩像并四天也。天平十七年歲次乙酉正月。正三位牟漏女王寢膳違和願造件像并寫神呪經一千卷而藏山遂遷。不果其願。孝子從二位藤原夫人正四位下民部卿藤原朝臣等並願先志堂造忌日矣。¹²

¹¹ Although Matsushima argues that the word “*hōden*” refers to the Western Golden Hall at Kōfukuji, more scholars consider it as a *zushi*. I will turn back to this issue below. Matsushima Ken, “Nan'endō kyū honzon to Kamakura saikōzō,” in *Shinpen meihō Nihon no bijutsu 3: Kōfukuji*, ed. by Ōta Hirotarō, et al. (Tokyo: Shōgakusan, 1990), 125; Asaki Shūhei, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō no sōken tōsho honzonzō to Kamakura saikōzō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 160 (May 1985): 21-24; Unno Hiroyuki, “Den e no manazashi: kodai, chūsei ni okeru butszō anchi to zushi,” in *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 5: Kinōron: tsukuru, tsukaru, tsutaeru*, ed. Nagaoka Ryūsaku (Tokyo: Chikurisha, 2014), 358-359.

¹² *Kōfukuji engi*, 321. This passage contains four inserted notes that point out differences in the uses of some words between *Engi* and other versions of the record. As they do not change the meaning of the record and may prevent one from reading the passage, I omit them here. A sentence written in a separate line next to the entry states: “The said icons were created by Minister of the Right Nagaoka [Fujiwara no Uchimarō] on the fourth year of Kōnin (813) and were placed [in the Lecture Hall] for the time being as the Nan'endō had not yet been built. 件像。以弘仁四年長岡右大臣奉造未作圓堂之假以安置也。” The compiler of *Engi*, Fujiwara no Yoshiyo (823-900) likely confused this account of the Kōdō with those of the Nan'endō. To fulfill their mother's vow, Matate and his sister should have made the images of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon rather than build the hall. Moreover, the account given in *Ruki* has no mention of the Four Guardian Kings, while that in *Engi* does. It also makes little sense that it was not Matate, but Uchimarō fulfilled Empress Maro's wishes. When the empress died in 746, it was still ten years before Uchimarō was born in 756. No evidence suggests that Matate had to delay the construction of the images. Also, the construction date—813—given here for the icons was incorrect as Uchimarō already died a year

Contrary to the previous account, this passage speaks of Empress Muro as the commissioner of the images of the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings. After falling ill, the empress vowed to make these images and copied one thousand *dhāraṇī* sutras, but without completing the vow, passed away. Her children Matate and his sister constructed the Kōdō that was completed on the Queen's death anniversary.

According to these records, the enshrinement of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon served as the reason for the construction of the Nan'endō. However, the accounts of its provenance are contradictory and can be generally divided into two opinions. One is that the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was enshrined in the Kōdō in 746 at the behest of Matate and his sister and was later moved to the Nan'endō. The other is that Uchimaro vowed to create the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings, while his son Fuyutsugu ordered the construction of the Nan'endō to enshrine the icons. How do we tackle these conflicting accounts? Which one is more reliable? Why was the Fukūkenjaku Kannon created or moved from the Kōdō to the Nan'endō? Many theories are proposed to answer these questions; however, no consensus has yet been reached. It is not my intention here to treat each theory in detail as this has been done by scholars, but I would like to focus our attention on the major arguments and their approaches.¹³

Two Theories

ago in 812. For these reasons, Uchimaro was not involved in the creation of the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

¹³ For an overview of the scholarship on this, see Hamada Tamami, "Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 151-158.

Among studies on the creation of the Nan'endō and enshrinement of its icons, two theories receive most scholarly attention. Proposed by Mōri Hisashi, one theory is that the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was removed from the Kōdō because of the competition between the Northern and Ceremonial branches of the Fujiwara clan.¹⁴ According to Mōri, during the reign of Emperor Kanmu (737-806; r. 781-806), the power of the Ceremonial branch reached its peak, and as recorded in *Ruki*, they enshrined the Amida triad in the Kōdō in 791 to commemorate Fujiwara no Otomuro 藤原乙牟漏 (760-790), who was a family member and Kanmu's consort. Furthermore, Mōri claims that the Ceremonial Fujiwara forced the replacement of the hall's main icon from Fukūkenjaku Kannon to Amida Triad. This incident prompted Uchimarō to create a new home—the Nan'endō—for the icon since it was made at the behest of his father Matate to commemorate Fasaki, the first patriarch of the Northern Fujiwara. However, before finishing this project, Uchimarō passed away in 812. His son Fuyutsugu fulfilled his wishes, constructing the Nan'endō and enshrining the Fukūkenjaku Kannon the following year.

To support his argument, Mōri looks at an inscription that is engraved on a bronze lantern, which previously stood in front of the Nan'endō and is currently stored in the National Treasure Hall at Kōfukuji.¹⁵ According to this inscription, Uchimarō's another son Fujiwara no Manatsu 藤原真夏 (774-830) and other family members constructed this bronze lantern in 816 in order to fulfill his father's wishes. As Uchimarō was the main patron of this bronze lantern, Mōri speculates that the Nan'endō was also made by his vow.

¹⁴ Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji garan no seiritsu to zōzō," in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 163-170. Fukuyama Toshio is the first scholar tackling with the dating of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and considers that it was moved from the Kōdō. This point of view is grounded predominantly on the analyses of texts regarding the icon. Fukuyama Toshio, "Kōfukuji no kenritsu," in *Nihon kenchikushi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Bokusui Shobō, 1968), 339-342.

¹⁵ For discussion of this lantern and its inscription, see below.

The other theory, put forth by Matsushima Ken, is that Uchimaro commissioned the Fukūkenjaku Kannon for the prosperity of the family.¹⁶ He also postulates that the construction took place sometime either between 798 and the end of Emperor Kanmu's reign or between 806 and 812. Unlike Mōri, Matsushima considers that the Northern Fujiwara was the most powerful branch of the Fujiwara toward the end of Kanmu's reign. By the time the new Emperor Heizei 平城 (774-824; r. 806-809) ascended the throne in 806, Uchimaro had become Minister of the Right (*udaijin* 右大臣). Given this, Matsushima claims that Uchimaro likely vowed the construction of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings in the hope of restoring the family's power sometime between 798 when he was appointed as Middle Counselor (*chūnagon* 中納言), a position relatively low compared to other clans at court, and 806 when he was promoted to Minister of the Right. It is also possible that Uchimaro dedicated the icon after 806 and before his death in 812 to show his gratitude for the fulfillment of his prayer.

In addition, by analyzing the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon that the sculptor Kōkei (act. 1152-1190s) restored in 1189, Matsushima further confirms that the original sculpture was made in the Heian period (794-1185) rather than 746.¹⁷ As the following shows, this way of approaching the issue is problematic. Lastly, unlike Mōri, Matsushima considers that the Nan'endō was dedicated by Fuyutsugu to commemorate his father Uchimaro and demonstrate the eminence of his family over the other Fujiwara lineages.¹⁸

Modified Views and Some Remarks

¹⁶ Matsushima, "Nan'endō kyū honzon," 114-126.

¹⁷ Matsushima, "Nan'endō kyū honzon," 142-144.

¹⁸ Matsushima, "Nan'endō kyū honzon," 121, 124.

After Mōri and Matsushima, other researchers have modified their theories, and two studies deserve our attention.¹⁹ One study by Hara Hirofumi contends that the relocation of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the Kōdō to the Nan'endō was not due to the conflict between the two branches of the Fujiwara clan.²⁰ Rather, it stemmed from Uchimaro's attempt to demonstrate the good deed (*sazen* 作善)—the construction of the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon—that his father Matate did in his lifetime. Also, through this project, Hara claims that Uchimaro wanted to commemorate Matate and accumulate merit for sentient beings and his own salvation.

Another study by Ono Kayo looks at the issue from the perspective of the hall's function.²¹ By tracing the origin of octagonal halls to Indian stupas, she confirms that the Nan'endō was

¹⁹ Asaki, "Kōfukuji," 11-48; Yoneda Yūsuke, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō no kenritsu to Fujiwara no Uchimaro," *Shoku nihongi kenkyū* 281 (1992): 29-36; Hara Hirofumi, "Kōfukuji Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no zōritsu to Nan'endō iza—senkō senpi no tame no zōzō no sono ato," "Ontame no zōzō" *kenkyū*, *Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, ed. Nagaoka Ryūsaku (Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2006-2009), 28-46; Ono Kayo, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō to Hossō rokuzō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2008), 57-92; Tanimoto Akira, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no raireki," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 334 (May 2014): 56-69. After Matsushima challenged Mōri's theory, Asaki Shūhei made one of the earliest attempts to evaluate both arguments. Asaki agrees with Mōri's view that the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon came from the Kōdō, but considers that the Northern Fujiwara and Kōfukuji replaced it with the Amida triad either on behalf of or under the request of Emperor Kanmu, who commissioned the triad for his deceased consort Otomuro. Different from Mōri, Matsushima, and Asaki, Yoneda argues that witnessing the downfall of his first son Manatsu in the Kusuko Incident in 809-810, Uchimaro decided to construct the Nan'endō in the hope that the family could thrive again. As the following will show, the Northern Fujiwara was far from declining in the early ninth century. By analyzing various temple records, the most recent study by Tanimoto Akira contends that the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Nan'endō and Kōdō were not the same one; the former was seated and the latter stood inside a *zushi*. Tanimoto also claims that by the early ninth century, the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon had been lost or deteriorated, and that Uchimaro vowed to restore the icon and planned to construct a building to enshrine it. Also, while realizing his father's project, Tanimoto considers that Fuyutsugu changed the function of the Nan'endō, treating it as a place to hold the memorial ritual Hokke-e for the spirit of Uchimaro. It is hard to think that a monumental *jōroku*-size Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Kōdō would have been lost. If this had happened, this should have caused attention from Kōfukuji, but no temple records mention of its loss. As the icon was created in 746, it was probably made of dry lacquer, which is an extremely durable material and was commonly used in the eighth century. Thus, by the early ninth century, the icon should not have been in a dire condition.

²⁰ Hara Hirofumi, "Kōfukuji Kōdō," 28-46.

²¹ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 57-92.

built for commemorating Uchimaro and accumulating merit for his salvation. However, she follows Mōri's position with regard to the provenance of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Through a discussion of these studies, we know that scholars have approached the issues in various ways. One way, which most of researchers have employed, is to examine historical records and political background. Another is to explore architectural features of the Nan'endō and its function. Still another is to look at visual sources for clues, such as the bronze lantern and the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Also worth noting is that research under review shows a tendency to connect the creation of the hall to the revival of the family. This tendency is, in my opinion, informed less by historical reality than legendary narratives about the origin of the hall. In these narratives, the theme—that the Nan'endō was the source of the family's prosperity—occupies a prominent position and takes on different literary forms. As Chapter Three and Four show, this idea and literary trope appeared in the mid-eleventh century after the family dominated politics for a long period of time. It is also important to remember that while the Nan'endō was built in the Heian period, the lives of the two patrons, Uchimaro and Fuyutsugu, spanned from the eighth to early ninth century. In other words, religious culture in the Nara period (710-794) and family history at the time should have had governed their way of thinking, conduct of politics, and practices of Buddhism to a large degree. Hence, it is important to pay attention to the history of the Fujiwara clan in the eighth century. It is also necessary to revisit relevant sources and analyze them without the hindsight of what people thought of the building after the ninth century.

Revisiting the Issues: A New Proposition

Historical Background

Mōri and Matsushima, as discussed above, delineate different stories of the political power of the Northern Fujiwara in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. Their delineation of the family's status is, however, inaccurate. After Uchimaro's uncle Fujiwara no Nagate 藤原永手 (714-771) died in 771, Southern and Ceremonial Fujiwara gradually rose to prominence and overtook the Northern Fujiwara in terms of political rank.²² In spite of this, historians commonly agree that Uchimaro still played an important role at court and steadily advanced to higher ranks during the reign of Emperor Kanmu.²³ In 794, Uchimaro was appointed as *sangi* 参議 (advisor) and four years later in 798, was promoted to the post of *chūnagon*. Moreover, trusted by the emperor, he was in charge of the Bureau of Imperial Documents (*chokushisho* 勅旨所), which delivered imperial letters and managed royal estates. Uchimaro's influence increased toward the end of Kanmu's reign and was entrusted by the emperor in 805 with the preparation work for the succession of the next Emperor Heizei.

Other Fujiwara members also occupied important positions at court, for example, Fujiwara no Otomo 藤原雄友 (753-811) and Fujiwara no Otsugu 藤原緒嗣 (774-843), who were respectively from the Southern and Ceremonial Fujiwara clans. Both Otomo and Otsugu attained high offices faster than Uchimaro and were Kanmu's favorites. However, their influence over the emperor was limited. As William McCullough remarks, Kanmu "may have been the most

²² Nomura Tadao, *Narachō no seiji to Fujiwarashi* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1995), 97-100, 137-141.

²³ Watari Tsunenobu, "Fujiwara no Uchimaro, Manatsu, Fuyutsugu fushi ni tsuite no ichi shiron," in *Nihon kodai no denshō to rekishi* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2008), 286-287; Morita Tei, "Toward Regency Leadership at Court," in *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, ed. Joan R. Piggott (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006), 217; Masano Jun'ichi, "Fujiwara no Uchimaro ni tsuite," *Komazawa shigaku* 33 (March 1985): 61-63; Uehara Eiko, "Fujiwara no Uchimaro no seijishiteki no kenkyū: hokke taitō no ketteiteki kikai," *Seiji keizai shigaku* 1 (February 1963): 25-26.

powerful ruler the imperial line ever produced”²⁴ and retained his domination over aristocratic clans throughout his rule. Because Kanmu had no blood tie to the Fujiwara or any other leading nobles, he could free himself from their control. Also, Kanmu tended to leave leading posts vacant or give them to those who were from the royal family.²⁵ During the last decade of his reign no single Fujiwara members held a rank above the Middle Counselor, and Kanmu’s cousin Prince Miwa (737-806) served as Minister of the Right, which was the highest position that an official could reach at the time.

While serving under Kanmu, Uchimaro sent his first son Manatsu to work as the adviser of Crown Prince Ate 安殿新王, who later became Emperor Heizei. After the enthronement of Heizei in 806, Uchimaro arranged his another son Fuyutsugu to serve as a manager in the household of Crown Prince Kamino 神野親王, who was Heizei’s brother and later became Emperor Saga (786-842). As Masano Jun’ichi comments, by doing these, Uchimaro created a political environment in favor of his own family.²⁶ Indeed, in 806, the first year of Heizei’s rule, Uchimaro became Minister of the Right, outranking his long-term competitor Otomo. His son Manatsu also quickly climbed the ladder of power.

In 807, accused of plotting rebellion against the emperor, Prince Iyo (d. 807) and his mother Fujiwara no Yoshiko (d. 807) were forced to commit suicide. This event resulted in the exile of Otomo and decline of the Southern Fujiwara clan. In the next year, because of his poor health, Emperor Heizei abdicated the throne in favor of his brother Saga. However, he recovered

²⁴ William McCullough, “The Heian Court, 794-1070,” in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2, Heian Japan*, ed. Donald Shively and William McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 25.

²⁵ McCullough, “The Heian,” 26. Kanmu left the highest post of the government, Minister of the Left, unfilled almost throughout the time of his rule.

²⁶ Masano, “Fujiwara no,” 65.

from illness the following year and prepared to regain the throne. He moved to Nara with his followers and bestowed his consort Fujiwara no Kusuko 藤原薬子 (d. 810) and her brother Fujiwara no Nakanari 藤原仲成 (764-810) with official titles. These moves no doubt challenged Saga's authority and subsequently gave rise to his military action against Heizei. Within three days after the emperor sent troops to Nara, Heizei and his cohorts surrendered, Kusuko committed suicide, and Nakanari was executed. This struggle over the throne is known as the Kusuko Incident, causing the downfall of the leading members—Kusuko and Nakanari—of the Ceremonial Fujiwara clan. More importantly, it contributed to the emergence of the Northern Fujiwara as the most powerful Fujiwara branch.²⁷

It should be noted that although Manatsu was banished after the incident, Uchimaro was unaffected by this and may even have earned more trust from Saga because of his quick action against Heizei's forces.²⁸ One should also remember that Uchimaro's other son Fuyutsugu had served under Saga prior to 810. As one of Saga's most trusted officials, Fuyutsugu quickly rose to prominence after the incident. His political power remained strong even after Saga resigned the throne in 823. As Morita Tei remarks, Fuyutsugu was the "initiator of the Northern Fujiwara regency."²⁹

This investigation sheds light on the political circumstances of the Nan'endō's

²⁷ Mikael Adolphson, *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), 32; Nagashima Fukutarō, *Nara* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1963), 88; Nagashima Fukutarō, "Kōfukuji no rekishi," *Bukkyō bijutsu* 40 (September 1959): 4. Nagashima Fukutarō comments that the construction of the Nan'endō in 813 ushered in a new relationship between the Fujiwara clan and Kōfukuji, and asserted the clan's control over worship activities at Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine. While these comments are viable, they were made in hindsight. Nagashima did not offer his reasoning and nor did he analyze the family's political power in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.

²⁸ Masano, "Fujiwara no," 69-70.

²⁹ Morita, "Toward Regency," 218.

construction. Firstly, we know that the power of the Northern Fujiwara steadily increased toward the end of Kanmu's reign and culminated after the Kusuko event. Second, while other Fujiwara members held important positions at court, their influence did not drastically differ from that of Uchimaro. A comment from *Nihon kōki* speaks of Uchimaro's relationships with the emperors in the late eighth and early ninth centuries, stating that he was an official who "served for the three sovereigns and was trusted and respected by all of them."³⁰ It is therefore quite unlikely that the Ceremonial Fujiwara or Emperor Kanmu would have forced the replacement of the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon with the Amida triad. Moreover, it appears that the Northern Fujiwara had no urgent need or a strong motive to revive the family. Instead, to demonstrate the family's rise as the most powerful Fujiwara lineage after the Kusuko Incident seemed to be the strongest motivation for the construction of the Nan'endō and enshrinement of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Bronze Lantern and Its Inscription

The bronze lantern, mentioned above, provides important clues for the circumstances of the Nan'endō's creation. Made in 816, the lantern is the only surviving object from the original hall. Nevertheless, except those who take interest in the calligraphy in this work, no scholars have analyzed its inscription beyond the first five sentences.³¹ The inscription appears on the

³⁰ *Nihon kōki* 日本後記, in *Rikkokushi: Kokushi taiki* (Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1916). *Nihon kōki*, Kōnin 3.10.6 (159). The bibliographic information for each entry below includes titles, reign year, month, and day, which are then followed by a bracket that shows volume and page number. The same rule will be applied to other historical texts.

³¹ Mōri, "Kōfukuji garan," 169; Tanaka Kaidō, "Nan'endō dōtō daimei to Jingōji shōmei," in vol. 11 of *Shodō zenshū*, ed. Shimonaka Kunihiko (Tokyo: Heibōnsha, 1955), 22-24; Ōshiba Shōen, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō dōtō daimei no Kōbō Daishi osasetsu," *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 49 (March 2017): 21-36; Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan 7: Kōfukuji 1* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 47-49. While Mōri pays attention to this inscription, he only reads the part that identifies the donor of the lantern. Studies on the inscriptions have focused on the authorship of the calligraphy and its aesthetic quality. For an overview of the scholarship on the lantern and its inscription, see Ishii Takeshi, "Bonshō

lantern's body, which is shaped as a hexagonal box and is covered with bronze panels. Currently, one side of the panel and a pair of doors are missing. The four extant panels are carved with the inscription in high relief. The text of each panel is arranged into seven lines and contains nine characters in each line. The upper parts of each panel are engraved with the lattice windows where light shined through. It is said that Kūkai (774-835), the founder of the Shingon Buddhist school in Japan, composed the inscription, and that Tachibana no Hayanari 橘逸勢 (d. 842), a noted calligrapher and courtier, brushed the original calligraphy.³² Since traces of gold are left on the panels, the inscription must have looked splendid in the past and glistened in light while the lantern was used.

The inscription begins with a description of who donated the lantern and when it was made:

In Kōnin 7 (816), the year of Keishin (Heishin),³³ Senior Fourth Fujiwara Official of Iyo [Manatsu] and others [from the Northern Fujiwara] followed and obeyed the deceased father's [Uchimaro's] will to construct a bronze lantern. Our heart does not deviate from [our father's vow or intent]. The lantern is of an artless quality as wished [by our father]. 弘仁七載。歲次景申。伊豫權守正四位下藤原朝臣公等。追遵先考之遺敬志。造銅燈臺一所。心不乖麗。器期於樸。³⁴

As this passage indicates, Uchimaro is the chief patron of this lantern and must have

to tōrō,” in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 309-326.

³² Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji*, 49; Ishii, “Bonshō to,” 317-324. There is also suggestion that Kūkai was the author of both the text and calligraphy.

³³ Because the name of the Emperor Taizong (598-649) in Tang China contained the word “*hei* 昉” that pronounces the same as “*hei* 丙,” it became customary that people avoided using the latter word to indicate the year name. Therefore, Keishin 景申 corresponds to Heishin 丙申, referring to the year of 816. Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji*, 48.

³⁴ *Nan'endō dōtō daimei*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 329. My translation of the inscription is based on the punctuation, transliteration, and annotations given in the following texts. *Nan'endō dōtō daimei*, 329-330; Yoshida Hiroko, “Nan'endō dōtō daimei,” in *Kokyō ibun chūshaku*, ed. Jōdai Bunken o yomukai (Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1989), 316-324. The calligraphy/carver probably mistook the word “*hoku* 樸,” meaning “plain, simple, pure, raw, artless, or ingenuous” for the last word of this sentence, “*hoku* 撲,” meaning “to strike” or “to beat.”

commissioned its construction prior to his death in 812. Turning back to the inscription, it then explains allegorical meanings of light and lanterns in general, addresses the benefits of offering them to Buddhas, and identifies the beneficiaries—ancestral spirits—to whom the lantern was dedicated:

This light of wisdom will be passed on and never extinguish, and the radiance of loving-kindness will shine everywhere with no exception. *Yuikyōkyō* (The Sutra of the Deathbed Injunction) states: with a lantern there is brightness. The word “brightness (*mei* 明)” means the same as the word for “life (*mei* 命).” Therefore, lanterns prolong lives. *Hiyukyō* (The Sutra of Metaphors; Sk. *Āsīvisōpama-sutta*) states that those who light lanterns for buddhas will obtain the heavenly eye (clairvoyance) in their afterlives and will not be born in the underworld. *Fukōkyō* (The Sutra of Pervasiveness and Vastness) states that lighting a lantern and offering it will illuminate the darkness of the underworld. Bathed in this light and connected with its merit, sentient beings who suffer and fall ill gain rest. This being so, [for those] going to the heavens above and the earth below, [the world] would not be illuminated without the sun. [For those] facing darkness and entering the netherworld, [the netherworld] would not be shined without the fire [of a lit lantern]. For this reason [we] offer this merit to the departed ancestral spirits. 慧景傳而不窮。慈光燭而無外。遺教經云。燈有明。明命也。燈延命。譬喻經云。為佛燃燈。後世得天眼。不生冥處。普廣經云。燃燈供養。照諸幽冥。苦病眾生。蒙此光明。緣此福德。皆得休息。然則上天下地。匪日不明。向晦入冥。匪火不照。是故以斯功德。奉翔先靈。³⁵

The inscription also addresses to offspring of the Northern Fujiwara clan. A passage on the fourth panel states: “[The construction of this lantern] exemplifies and marks the good karma that will be left to our descendants. 式標良因。貽厥來者。”³⁶ The meaning of this passage resonates with that in the biography of Jōe 貞慧 (645-686), one of the patriarchs of the Fujiwara clan: “In keeping with the idea that a family that accumulates goodness will be sure to have an excess of blessings, Kamatari (the founder of the Fujiwara clan), who had done virtuous works, left Jōe with excessive blessings. 積善余慶。貽厥哲人。”³⁷ Both passages express that doing

³⁵ *Nan'endō dōtō daimei*, 329. *Fukōkyō* 普廣經 is a lost Buddhist scripture. Yoshida, “Nan'endō,” 322.

³⁶ *Nan'endō dōtō daimei*, 329.

³⁷ *Tōshikaden*, in *Tōshikaden: Kamatari, Jōe, Muchimaro den: chūshaku to kenkyū*, by Okimori Takuya, Satō Makoto, and Yajima Izumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbankan, 1999), 96, 283.

meritorious works would bring benefits to one's descendants. As discussed below, this meaning might have had other connotations.

The inscription goes on to tell that the Buddha descended to this world in response to sentient beings and preached according to their different abilities of attaining enlightenment. It then describes that by practicing the Six Perfections (Skt. *pāramitās*; J. *ropparamitsu* 六波羅蜜)³⁸ people could reach “the other shore 成津,” liberating themselves from suffering. Also by cleansing a multitude of sins and cultivating meritorious deeds, they could ascend to the Tōri 忉利 (Sk. *Trāyastriṃśa*) heaven. The inscription ends with an account that “[this lantern] is to show veneration to parents. First, [the lantern] ‘fumigates’ and cultivates their felicity. 示以崇親。其一薰修福。”³⁹ The rest of the inscription is missing. While incomplete, this passage seems to articulate that by fulfilling Uchimaro's will, Manatsu showed reverence to his father, and that while the lantern was dedicated to their ancestors, the merit generated by its construction also went to Uchimaro.

By analyzing the inscription, we know that the lantern was constructed to commemorate ancestors as well as Uchimaro, pray for their salvation, and express the filial piety of the living. It is also clear that Uchimaro commissioned the lantern prior to his death in 812, but did not live to see its completion. Given his leading position in the family, Uchimaro would have also taken part in the creation of the Nan'endō or have been the initiator of the project. It is hard to imagine that he commissioned the lantern without knowing that there would be a hall standing behind. As the below shows, the Nan'endō, like the bronze lantern, possessed a meaning of memorialization

³⁸ The Six Perfections refers to the six practices: charity, morality, forbearance, effort, meditation, and wisdom.

³⁹ *Nan'endō dōtō daimei*, 329.

that was expressed through its architectural features. It appears that the building and the lantern were conceived together as different parts of an ensemble. We may further speculate that the family initially planned to dedicate the hall to their ancestors, but made Uchimaro as the primary beneficiary because of his untimely death. Uchimaro's health seemed to go worse abruptly and unexpectedly.⁴⁰ It was not until a month before his death that he submitted the resignation letter to the court. To sum up, no matter who (ancestors, Uchimaro, or both) was the main beneficiary, the Nan'endō was built for the purpose of commemoration. I contend that this purpose did not conflict with the attempt to celebrate the rise of the Northern Fujiwara as the most prominent lineage of the Fujiwara clan.

Sekizen Yokei

After the death of Fujiwara no Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659-720) in 720, Empress Kōmyō (701-760) and Fujiwara no Nakamaro 藤原仲麻呂 (706-764) were the leading members of the Fujiwara clan.⁴¹ A descendant of the Southern Fujiwara clan, Nakamaro was the most powerful statesman from 758 to 764 and led the major development of Kōfukuji at the time. He revived the Yuima-e 維摩会 (Assembly on the *Vimalakīrti Sutra*) to memorialize Nakatomi (Fujiwara) no Kamatari 中臣鎌足 (614-669), the founder of the Fujiwara clan. During his heyday, Nakamaro undertook a writing project, *Tōshikaden* 藤氏家伝 (The History of the Fujiwara Clan), which consists of the biographies of Kamatari, his two sons—Fuhito and Jōe—and Nakamaro's

⁴⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; Yoneda Yūsuke et al., *Shin sekkanke den*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1995), 9. *Ruki* indicates that Uchimaro died suddenly (忽遷).

⁴¹ For discussion of Nakamaro and other Fujiwara members in the eighth century, see Chapter One.

father Fujiwara no Muchiimaro 藤原武智麻呂 (680-737).⁴² By writing this history of the clan that excluded other Fujiwara households, Nakamaro demonstrated an “unbroken” lineage from Kamatari to Muchimaro, legitimizing the status of his own family.⁴³ In addition, *Tōshikaden* was intended to demonstrate the prominence of his ancestors and their accumulation of good deeds (*sekizen* 積善).⁴⁴ The expression of “*sekizen yokei* 積善余慶” appears in both the biographies of Jōe and Muchimaro in *Tōshikaden* and was utilized to praise the virtue of the Fujiwara clan.⁴⁵ This expression is taken from a phrase in *Books of Changes* 易經 (Ch. *I Ching*; J. *Eikikyō*): “A family that accumulates goodness will be sure to have an excess of blessings, but one that accumulates evil will be sure to have an excess of disasters.”⁴⁶ The phrase stresses the significance of doing good deeds for the maintenance of households and conveys a meaning that meritorious works of one generation will bring abundant blessings to another.⁴⁷

The use of this phrase in the biographies has to do with a story about Kamatari. According to *Nihon shoki*, in 669, while Kamatari was at his deathbed, Emperor Tenji (626-671) visited him, stating that “families that have accumulated goodness must have an excess of blessings. How

⁴² *Tōshikaden*, 63-113. For the English translation of *Tōshikaden*, see Mikael Bauer, “The Chronicle of Kamatari: A Short Introduction to and Translation of the First Part of the History of the Fujiwara House,” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 71, no. 2 (June 2017): 477-496; Mikael Bauer, “The Chronicle of Jōe: A Translation of the Second Part of the History of the Fujiwara House,” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 72, no. 1 (March 2018): 207-214.

⁴³ Satō Makoto, “Kaden to Fujiwara no Nakamaro,” in *Tōshikaden, Kamatari, Jōe, Muchimaro den: chūshaku to kenkyū*, by Okimori Takuya, Satō Makoto, and Yajima Izumi (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1999), 401-402.

⁴⁴ Satō, “Kaden to,” 401-403.

⁴⁵ *Tōshikaden*, 96, 113; Satō, “Kaden to,” 402.

⁴⁶ Richard John Lynn, trans., *The Classic of Changes: A New Translation of the I Ching as Interpreted by Wang Bi* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 146.

⁴⁷ *Tōshikaden*, 96, 280, 283 (note. 343); Satō, “Kaden to,” 402.

come this [blessing] has not yet been conferred [on you].”⁴⁸ In other words, Tenji complimented that Kamatari was from a virtuous household and wished that because of this, he could recover from illness soon. The idea of *sekizen yokei* also takes on the form of a seal, “積善藤家 (*sekizen tōke*), which literally means “the Fujiwara House that accumulates goodness.” The seal appears in *Tokaritsusei* 杜家立成 (A Collection of Letters Written by the Du Family), a text from the Shōsōin collection, and the calligraphy of the seal was arguably rendered by Empress Kōmyō.⁴⁹ The seal demonstrates the virtue of Kōmyō’s family and indicates that her eminent status resulted from the good works of her ancestors.⁵⁰ Apparently, the idea of *sekizen yokai* served as the shared wisdom among the Fujiwara members in the eighth century, and as Satō Makoto observes, was employed to signify their familial identity.⁵¹

In addition to writing family history, Nakamaro erected a hall at Eizanji in Nara Prefecture to commemorate Muchimaro in 763-764. Like the Nan’endō, this building was constructed with an octagonal plan. Another octagonal structure Hokuendō (Northern Round Hall) at Kōfukuji was also associated with the Fujiwara family. In 721, Empress Genmei 元明 (661-721) and Empress Genshō 元正 (680-748) dedicated the Hokuendō to memorialize Fuhito, and the building signified great honor that was conferred on him. It is very likely that by constructing an octagonal hall at Eizanji, Nakamaro asserted kinship relationship between Muchimaro and Fuhito and fashioned an admirable image of his father.

⁴⁸ *Nihon shoki*, in *Rikkokushi*, vol. 2 (Osaka: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1928-1931). *Nihon shoki*, Tenji 8.10.10. (239).

⁴⁹ Imai Shōji, et al., *Sho no nihonshi: Asuka/Nara*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1975), 146-147; Maruyama Yumiko, *Shōsōin monjo no sekai* (Tokyo: Chūōkōron Shinsha, 2010), 35.

⁵⁰ Maruyama, *Shōsōin*, 34-36.

⁵¹ Satō, “Kaden to,” 402-403.

In brief, during his heyday, Nakamaro signaled his success in politics and showed the preeminence of his lineage through commemoration of his ancestors, Kamatari, Fuhito, and his father Muchimaro. When Nakamaro governed politics in the mid-eighth century, Matate and his brother Fujiwara no Mitate 藤原御楯 (715-764) were his cohorts at court.⁵² Given this collaboration relationship, the Northern Fujiwara family should have been aware of the strategies that Nakamaro utilized to promote his lineage. Indeed, these strategies that involved literary production, architectural construction, and performance of memorial rituals are seen in the creation of the Nan'endō. Also, the content of the lantern inscription suggests that the Northern Fujiwara likely adhered to the idea of *sekizen yokei* as their forebears Nakamaro and Empress Kōmyō. The family may have attributed their current political success to virtuous deeds of their ancestors and have attempted to repay the kindness through the construction of the Nan'endō following the model that Nakamaro set up during the peak of his political power.

Why Fukūkenjaku Kannon?

Yet, questions still remain with regard to the enshrinement of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which as indicated by *Engi* and *Ruki* served as the main reason for the dedication of the hall. Why did the family enshrine the image of this deity in the Nan'endō? Had they worshipped Fukūkenjaku Kannon prior to 813? Was the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon moved from the Kōdō or constructed at the request of Uchimaro?

Fukūkenjaku Kannon is one of the manifestations of Avalokiteśvara (J. Kannon), who out of compassion, vows to save all beings from suffering. As his name “Kannon whose rope is never empty” indicates, Fukūkenjaku Kannon rescues sentient beings without fail through a lasso

⁵² Yoshikawa Toshiko, *Ritsuryō kizoku seiritsu no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2006), 215-224.

held in his hand. As Chapter Four shows, Fukūkenjaku Kannon was popular among the Fujiwara clan in the eighth century. Empress Kōmyō promoted the worship of the deity and was behind the creation of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon statue in the Hokkedō (Lotus Hall) at Tōdaiji. Uchimaro’s father Matate, grandmother Queen Muro, and two uncles—Nagate and Fujiwara no Kiyokawa 藤原清河 (d. 779)—were also the devotees of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and commissioned deity’s images.⁵³

Given this devotion history of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, we may surmise that the Northern Fujiwara clan enshrined the sculpture of the deity in the Nan’endō because they had worshipped it since the eighth century. Furthermore, the family likely relocated the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Nan’endō rather than created a brand-new image of the deity. As the above analyses indicate, there is a high likelihood that the family wanted to memorialize their ancestors and demonstrate their lineage. If this was the case, the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon would have aptly served these purposes as it was associated with the first two patriarchs (Matate and Fusasaki) of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

The Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon

It is commonly held that the appearance of the original Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon would have looked similar to the current sculpture that Kōkei restored in 1189.⁵⁴ Therefore, in this line of thinking, one might be able to surmise the date of the earlier icon by analyzing

⁵³ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 16-17, 19; Chapter Four.

⁵⁴ Matsushima, “Nan’endō kyū honzon,” 138; Nishikawa Kyōtarō, “Kōkei to Unkei,” in *Nara no tera: Kōfukuji Hokuendō to Nan’endō no shozō*, ed. by Nishikawa Kyōtarō and Tsujimoto Yonesaburō (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1994), 8; Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō shozō no saikō,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 266; *Nara rokudaiji taikan 8: Kōfukuji 2*, ed. Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 31.

Kōkei's work. Historical texts offer very limited information on the appearance of the original Fukūkenjaku Kannon, briefly describing it as a golden *jōroku*-size sculpture seated on a lotus pedestal with eight arms.⁵⁵ This description is consistent with the appearance of Kōkei's work, which is also seated in a lotus posture and has eight arms.

The current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon has three eyes with the third one placed vertically on the forehead. Two sets of its hands carry attributes while the other two perform mudras. Counting from the top, the first pair holds a lotus flower and a monk's staff. The second pair is pressed in front of the chest to form a mudra of reverence (J. *gasshōin* 合掌印; Skt. *anjali mudra*). The third pair is lowered with the palms facing upward in mudras of wish-granting (Skt. *varada*; J. *yoganin* 予願印). The fourth pair grasps a fly whisk in the right hand and a lasso in the left hand. The sculpture wears a crown with a standing image of Amida Buddha. A piece of deer skin hangs over the left shoulder and across the back.⁵⁶ While absent, a cape, made from a separate piece of wood, may have been worn by the sculpture, lying on top of the deer skin.⁵⁷ The mandorla (*kōhai* 光背) installed behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon consists of several openwork panels each shaped like swords and covered in gold. With pointed ends and arabesque patterns, these panels radiate out around the body of the Kannon, giving it a splendid ambience.

Mōri Hisashi and Nishikawa Kyōtarō pointed out that some material and technical elements of the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon are characteristics of Buddhist images

⁵⁵ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19-20; Ōe Chikamichi, *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 50.

⁵⁶ Itō Shirō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no rokuhie," in *Heian jidai chōkokushi no kenkyū* (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000), 288, 292.

⁵⁷ Itō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 292.

from the eighth and early ninth centuries.⁵⁸ All of the three eyes of the icon were made utilizing a technique called “*dōgannyū* 瞳嵌入 (pupil insertion),” which was transmitted from China in the eighth century.⁵⁹ This technique is different from that of well-known *gyokugan* (crystal eyes) in that the former uses crystals or gems only for the pupils, while the latter fills the whole eye with a piece of crystal quartz. The third eye of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was made of crystal quartz (later replacement) while the two eyes black stones.⁶⁰ Kōkei inserted the crystal and black stones from the interior of the sculpture. Because *dōgannyū* is rarely seen in sculptures from the late Heian period, scholars consider that Kōkei probably modeled the three eyes after those of the destroyed Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁶¹

The platform (*daiza* 台座), upon which the current Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is seated, is another archaic element. It is composed of a lotus pedestal, a ball-like ornament called *shikinasu* 敷茄子, and a multi-tiered base. Two tiers of this base are fashioned as downturned lotus petals while the other six tiers are crafted as circles with small indentations on the edges (*irisumi marugamachi* 入角丸框). This configuration of the platform including *shikinasu* and *irisumi marugamachi* is associated with Buddhist sculptures of the Nara period.⁶² The lotus pedestal that sits above the *shikinasu* is in a design of *gyorinbuki* 魚鱗葺, which shows rows of alternating petals like a fish scale. Moreover, the ends of each petal are attached with metal sticks

⁵⁸ Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 260-262; Nishikawa, “Kōkei,” 8-9.

⁵⁹ For discussion of this technique, see Itō Shirō, “Daigōji Enmaten zazō to dōgannyū,” *Museum* 474 (September 1990): 7-11; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 261.

⁶⁰ Suzuki Yoshihiro, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zō (Nan’endō anchi),” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 54.

⁶¹ Nishikawa, “Kōkei,” 8-9; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 261; Itō, “Daigōji,” 10.

⁶² Nishikawa, “Kōkei,” 8-9.

and are inserted into the holes of a structure called *fukijiku* 葺軸, which is part of the lotus pedestal. This way of constructing the lotus pedestal was only in frequent use until the early Heian period and is extremely rare in sculptures made after this time.⁶³ Therefore, these ways of making the platform suggest that Kōkei must have recreated it following that in the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

The platform and mandorla of the Kōkei's sculpture are strikingly similar to those of the original icon illustrated in *Besson zakki* 別尊雜記, which is an iconography manual compiled by the monk Shinkaku 心覺 (1117-1180) during the Shōan 承安 era (1171-1175).⁶⁴ Both images of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon also resemble to each other in terms of iconography. They show the deity seated with eight arms and three eyes, performing two kinds of mudras—*yoganin* and *gasshōin*—and holding the attributes of a lasso, a fly whisk, a lotus flower, and a monk staff. These features are also shared by copies of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon made in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, for example, one sculpture from Ōgenji 応現寺 in Nara City and another from Daitōji 大通寺 in Okayama Prefecture.⁶⁵

Nevertheless, there are some minor differences between the *Besson zakki* drawing and Kōkei's work. For example, while both represent the deity wearing a crown with an image of Amida Buddha, the drawing shows Amida seated rather than standing. Another difference is that the *Besson zakki* illustration has the deity's right leg placed above the left one, a position opposite to that of Kōkei's sculpture. In addition, the image from *Besson zakki* shows the third

⁶³ Nishikawa, "Kōkei," 9; Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 32.

⁶⁴ *Besson zakki* in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: zuzō*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978), 226-227.

⁶⁵ For studies on these two works, see Chapter Four.

pair of hands rather than the fourth one carrying the lasso and fly whisk attributes. Because *Besson zakki* gives no back view of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, it is unclear regarding how the deerskin is represented. Nevertheless, a piece of cloth with a tie in front of its belly might be an indication of a deer skin.

While this treatment is absent in the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, it appears in the Daitsūji and Ōgenji copies, which are respectively dated to 1099 and the first half of the twelfth century.⁶⁶ In these two works, the antelope skin hangs across both shoulders as well as the back, wraps on the waist, and knots in the front. A similar rendition of antelope skin is found in the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Hokkedō at Tōdaiji, dated to sometime between 733 and 749. Made of a separate piece of dry lacquer, the deer skin of this sculpture lies above the cape on the upper left arms.⁶⁷ Moreover, in an irregular shape with a smooth surface, the deer skin hangs on the back with two strings encircling the waist and knotted in front of the abdomen. While there are some differences in the exact positions of the deer skin, these three sculptures indicate a pattern of the way the deerskin drapes—across the shoulder(s), back, and ties in front of the abdomen. For unknown reasons, this mode of draping a deer skin is not fully executed in the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, since it only covers the back and left shoulder.⁶⁸ In Buddhist scriptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, the deer skin is described only briefly as “covering the left shoulder,”⁶⁹ “hanging over the shoulder(s),”⁷⁰ or dressed like “a scarf.”⁷¹ These concise

⁶⁶ Asai Kazuharu, “Okayama Daitsūji no Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zazō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 246 (September 1999): 75-76; Yamamoto Tsutomu, “Nara Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon zazō,” *Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan kenkyūshi* 388 (July 1983): 16.

⁶⁷ Itō, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 285. For the photo image of this icon's deer skin, see Tōdaiji Myūjiamu, ed., *Nara jidai no Tōdaiji* (Nara: Tōdaiji, 2011), 72-75.

⁶⁸ Itō, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 288, 292.

⁶⁹ *T.* 1093, 20: 0402a03.

prescriptions may give artists some freedom to render this feature and may explain why Kōkei's work lacks a tie.

Buddhist scriptures prescribe Fukūkenjaku Kannon either in a seated or standing form, with one, three, or eleven heads, and two, four, six, or more arms.⁷² Nevertheless, it is more common to see that the deity is shown with one head, three eyes, and eight arms in surviving works from the eighth century. In addition, all of the extant works from this period assume a standing posture. Hamada Takashi therefore relates the seated Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon to esoteric teachings, which Kūkai transmitted to Japan in 806.⁷³ This proposition implies that the icon was made in the early ninth century rather than 746. However, by looking at historical circumstances of the ninth century, one finds this point of view untenable.

First of all, esoteric Buddhist imagery, which Kūkai brought back from China in 806, was not yet widely known and firmly established until the erection of the Lecture Hall at Tōji in 839. Second, while Uchimaro and Fuyutsugu may have known Kūkai as early as the 810s, no evidence indicates that they had a good understanding of new esoteric doctrine. Third, as recorded in *Ruki*, Uchimaro was a devotee of the *Lotus Sutra*.⁷⁴ The family dedicated two scrolls of the sutra to the Nan'endō along with one scroll of the *Muryōgikyō* 無量義經 (Skt. *Amitartha-sūtra*) and one scroll of the *Kan Fugen Bosatsu gyōhōkyō* 觀普賢菩薩行法經 (Skt.

⁷⁰ *T.* 1092, 20: 0232b07; *T.* 1097, 20: 0422b22-23.

⁷¹ *T.* 1169, 20: 0685a07.

⁷² *T.* 1097, 20: 0428a03; *T.* 1097, 20: 0427c29-0428a01; *T.* 1092, 20: 0250a27; *T.* 1092, 20: 0265b13; *T.* 1092, 20: 0268c12-0268c13; *T.* 1092, 20: 0292b23-0292b24; *T.* 1096, 20: 0415b18-0415b19; *T.* 1092, 20: 0312a03-0312a04; *T.* 1097, 20: 0428a01; *T.* 1096, 20: 0415b18-0415b19.

⁷³ Hamada Takashi, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon josetsu: Tōdaiji Hokkedō zō o chūshin ni," in *Higashi Ajia to Nihon: Kōko bijutsu hen*, ed. Tamura Enchō (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 200.

⁷⁴ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19-20.

Samantabhadra bodhisattva dhyana-carya dharma sutra).⁷⁵ None of these scriptures are related to esoteric teachings. Lastly, although from historical records we know only one seated image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the eighth century,⁷⁶ it is not uncommon to see that historical sources make no mention of deity's posture, suggesting that there might have been more seated images of the deity produced in this period than previously thought.

Through the above investigation, we can hypothesize that the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was seated with eight arms and three eyes with a third one placed on the forehead. Two sets of the hands would have performed the reverence and wish-granting mudras, while the other two sets have grasped various attributes such as a fly whisk, a lasso, a monk staff, and a lotus flower. The sculpture would have worn a crown with an image of Amida. The deer skin may have hung on the left shoulder and the back in a mode similar to that in the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. The platform and mandorla of the original icon were probably fashioned in the manner as seen in the Kōkei's work. These iconographical depictions of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon suggest that its appearance was by no means novel for viewers of the early ninth century.

Nevertheless, one may wonder whether we can justify the date of the original icon by analyzing the formal quality of Kōkei's work. As Asaki Shūhei's research shows, the answer to this question is, however, negative.⁷⁷ Firstly, there is no way to verify whether Kōkei faithfully recreated the form of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. By form, I mean the volume of the sculpture, anatomy of its body, and carvings of its draperies. Even though Kōkai probably

⁷⁵ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20.

⁷⁶ *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1940), 207; Asai, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 30. The image was made in *jōroku*-size around 750.

⁷⁷ Asaki, "Kōfukuji," 31-40.

had access to copies of the icon, it would have been almost impossible for him to achieve absolute fidelity to the modeling of the original in terms of volume, anatomy and drapery folds. Also, the extant copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon dated prior to 1181 demonstrate formal qualities more associated with sculptures made in the late Heian period rather than those in the eighth or early ninth centuries.⁷⁸ Second, Kōkei's work exhibits a new sense of realism achieved through the recreation of various sculptural sources from the eighth and ninth centuries.⁷⁹ For these reasons, one cannot determine whether the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was created in 746 or ninth century by analyzing the form of Kōkei's sculpture.

Architecture of the Nan'endō

Description of the Building and Its Surroundings

The Nan'endō is within ten minutes' walk from the Kintetsu Railway Station and stands in the southwest corner of Kōfukuji. The building faces the five-storied pagoda in the east. The pairing of the Nan'endō with the pagoda was probably both a coincidence and a deliberate choice. By the time of the hall's creation, the temple had been founded nearly one hundred years before. The erection of the hall was not in the initial plan of Kōfukuji's construction in the eighth century. Nevertheless, the Northern Fujiwara family might have selected this site because like the pagoda, the Nan'endō was also a mortuary building; the former was for the Buddha, and the latter for lay Buddhists.

The building overlooks Sarusawa Pond located to its south, which probably has existed

⁷⁸ Asaki, "Kōfukuji," 35-36; Chapter Four.

⁷⁹ For discussion of this, see Chapter Four.

since the Heian period.⁸⁰ Legends have it that because a dragon lived there, the pond was always filled with water even during the period of drought.⁸¹ To the hall's left, waves of wisteria hang from a wooden rack, attracting visitors while in full blossom. Wisteria is the symbol of the Fujiwara clan as “*fuji* 藤 (wisteria)” constitutes the first character of the family's name. The scene of wisteria along with that of the Nan'endō had earned the site a designation of one of the “Eight Views of Nara” as early as the fifteenth century.⁸² A replica of the aforementioned bronze lantern stands in front of the building with the inscription composed by Chen Shunchen 陳舜臣 (1924-2015) in 1997, which is titled “*Heisei Kannonsan* 平成観音讚 (*Heisei Ode in Praise of Kannon*). Two small buildings are erected to the left side of the Nan'endō. One enshrines a secret icon (*hibutsu*) known as “Hitokoto Kannon 一言観音 (One-Utterance Kannon),” which is allegedly efficacious and carefully listens to the utterances of believers' wishes one at a time. The other building contains a small souvenir shop and a writing booth where visitors can purchase seals written with the name of the Nan'endō and prints illustrated with the image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Although the Nan'endō is open only once a year on the seventeenth of October, it is busy with pilgrims and tourists all year around. As one of the sites on the Saigoku Thirty-Three Kannon Pilgrimage route, it is common to see pilgrims chanting sutras and making offerings outside the building.

⁸⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 5.

⁸¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 5. There are other legends about the pond. For this, see Tagawa Shun'ei and Kaneko Hiroaki, *Kōfukuji no subete* (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2014), 52-53, 120-121.

⁸² Narashishi Henshū Shingikai, ed., *Narashishi: Tsūshi san* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988), 410-412. Kikei Shinzui, *Inryōken nichiroku*, in *Zohō shiryō taisei*, vol. 22 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1978). *Inryōken nichiroku*, Kanshō 6.9.26. (2: 48). In the fall of 1465, accompanying Shogun Ashikaga Yoshimasa (1436-1490) on a trip to Nara, the Zen monk Kikei Shinzui 季瓊真蘂 (1401–1469) listed the wisteria at the Nan'endō as one of the Eight Views of Nara in his diary *Inryōken nichiroku* 蔭涼軒日録 (*Inryōken Diary*).

The Nan'endō is a one-story eight-sided structure set on a stone podium (*kidan* 基壇) elevated from the ground.⁸³ The building has four doors with the main entrance open on the east and measures 197.86 meters square and 22.8 meters tall. The main entrance is accessed by stone steps and is covered with a pent roof that protudes from the upper wall and sits on another roof with a Chinese-style gable (*karahafu* 唐破風), which has an undulating curve. Supported by six columns painted in red, the double roofs create a sheltered space for worship (*haisho* 拝所).

Shaped like a pyramid, the roof of the Nan'endō is covered with tiles in the style of *honkawarabuki* 本瓦葺, which is characterized by semi-cylindrical tiles lying on the seams between flat concave tiles. Along the eight hips of the roof, corner ridges rise up from the surface and descend from the center of the building. Made of flat piled tiles, each of the corner ridges is composed of one long and one short ridge. The former is called “*sumikudari-mune* 隅降棟” literally meaning “corner descending ridge,” and the latter “*chigo-mune* 稚児棟 (child ridges).” The distinction is made probably because the *chigo-mune* are smaller and appear to derive from their “parent” ridges.⁸⁴ Both short and long corner ridges curve toward the end and are finished with ogre-face tiles (*onigawara* 鬼瓦). Small cylindrical tiles, carved with the *kanji* characters of the Nan'endō, are placed on top of the *onigawara*. These treatments of the roof endow it with a dynamic contour and a feeling of lightness.

⁸³ The description of the hall's physical appearance is based on the following texts. Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, ed. *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho* (The Report of the Repair and Restoration of the Important Cultural Property Kōfukuji Nan'endō) (Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1996); Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji*, 36-38.

⁸⁴ Mary Neighbour Parent, *The Roof in Japanese Buddhist Architecture* (New York; Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1983), 64.

The hips of the roof converge on the central point of the building, which is further topped by a finial made of iron and bronze.⁸⁵ Measuring 4.76 meters high, the finial has an octagonal platform (*roban* 露盤) with each face carved with cloud patterns. Jewels with flaming openwork design (*suien* 水煙) stand on the corners of the platform, enclosing an inverted bowl (*fukubachi* 伏鉢) in the center. According to its incised inscription, the inverted bowl contains relics of the Buddha that were installed in 1779.⁸⁶ The relics were found among ashes at the site of the Nan'endō after the 1717 fire.⁸⁷ Above the inverted bowl stands a bejeweled flask (*hōbyō* 宝瓶), whose body is attached to a floral plate-like ornament (*keban* 華盤) with eight bells suspended from it. Set on top of the flask, a multi-layered lotus pedestal (*ukebana* 請花) holds a sacred jewel (*hōju* 宝珠), from which a shaft rises and projects upward. A flaming openwork ornament radiates out from the jewel as if it were a torch burning in sky.

Extending over the façade, the roof spreads across a post-and-lintel system using timbers and wooden bracket complexes. The underside of the roof is concealed and is filled with a superstructure (*koyagumi* 小屋組) combining beams or purlins (*keta* 桁) and transverse beams (*hari* 梁); they provide a direct support for the roofing materials. The superstructure lies on the rafters that are supported by two concentric octagons of the pillars. Set on the foundation stones (*soseki* 礎石), these pillars are surmounted by the multi-stepped bracket complexes and are

⁸⁵ For the composition of the finial and its image, see Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 78, fig. 235.

⁸⁶ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 11, 91.

⁸⁷ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 11, 91, 113. It should be noted that although the inscription does not specify where the relics were discovered, another historical record *Kōfukuji saikō kangesho* 興福寺再興勸化疏 indicates that people found relics at the site of the Nan'endō while removing ashes after the 1717 fire.

connected to the tie beams on the ground, middle, and upper levels. The pillars that form the inner octagon are called *irikawabashira* 入側柱 (altar pillars), and those for the outer octagon *kawabashira* 側柱 (corner pillars). Together they outline the plan of the building and mark off two interior spaces: a *moya* 母屋, the core of the sanctuary, and a *hisashi* 廂, the surrounding aisle. In other words, the altar pillars are erected to encircle the *moya* inside the building, while the corner pillars surround the *hisashi* from the outside.

The Nan'endō has triple eaves composed of base rafters with hexagonal cross-sections and two layers of flying rafters with square cross-sections. They protrude from the interior and are piled up one after another in a descending manner directly above each side of the hall. As a result, the eave extension is deep, shielding the body of the building from sun, rain, and wind. The exposed hip rafters (*keshō sumigi* 化粧隅木) also contribute to a steep eave rendition, sloping downward from the core of the sanctuary. They consist of one flying hip rafter (*hien-sumigi* 飛檐隅木) and two hip base rafters (*chisumigi* 地隅木), and are inserted into the three-stepped bracket complexes resting on the corner pillars. This combination of various hip structures creates a triangular pocket, a sheltered space, under the eaves. In between the corner pillars, four-tiered horizontal tie beams (*tooshijiki* 通肘木) stretch over the upper walls and are intersected with the non-projecting bracket complexes (*hiramitsudo* 平三斗) as well as two *kentozuka* 間斗束, each of which contains a strut topped by a bearing block. These structural components as a whole are called “*nakazonae* 中備” and run parallel to the wall plane to serve as the secondary support system for the overhanging eaves, while in the meantime enrich the surface texture of the exterior.

Repair and Restoration of the Present Nan'endō

In 1991, the Agency for Cultural Affairs initiated a project of repairing and restoring the Nan'endō. The Cultural Properties Division of the Nara Prefecture Board of Education then set up an on-site office at Kōfukuji to oversee the project.⁸⁸ The funds for the repair and restoration came from nation, prefecture, city, temple itself, and miscellaneous sources.⁸⁹ The work was completed after five years in 1996.

As the previous repair occurred relatively recently in 1981, the Nan'endō underwent partial dismantling this time.⁹⁰ In the process, the preservation team assessed damage, examined the physical structure of the building, and studied its architectural history through the analyses of textual and visual sources.⁹¹ Owing to these studies, they were able to discern alternations made to the building over time, grasp the evolution of its forms, plan, and structure, and determine which parts of the building needed to be repaired, restored, and replaced. Following the traditional preservation practice, the carpenters tried to reuse as much of old materials as possible.⁹² In cases when original materials could not be used anymore, the carpenters employed traditional techniques to make replacement pieces. After removal from the building, if considered valuable, the deteriorated materials were stored in the bathhouse at Kōfukuji.

⁸⁸ Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 24.

⁸⁹ Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 27. The government paid more than half—59%—of the costs for the restoration. Among the remaining costs, Kōfukuji was responsible for 31%, the Nara Prefectural 5%, the Nara City 3.5 %, and the miscellaneous revenue 1.5%.

⁹⁰ Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 24.

⁹¹ Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 24.

⁹² Naraken Kyōiku Inkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 24. For the preservation and conservation practice of historical architecture in Japan, see Knut Einar Larsen, *Architectural Preservation in Japan* (Trondheim: ICOMOS International Committee, Tapir Publishers. Lawton, Thomas, and Linda Merrill, 1993).

Not long after the work of repair began, the preservation team realized that they had to move the Fukūkenjaku Kannon out of the building in order to repair the altar.⁹³ This move was by no means an easy task since the sculpture measures 336 centimeters and is 739 centimeters tall including the mandorla and the platform. Initially, the preservation team planned to repair the sculpture after they finished the work of the Nan'endō. However, they realized that it would be better to repair the hall and the sculpture at the same time. The repair of the sculpture began in 1992 and was completed four years later in 1996.

One of the major repairs of the Nan'endō took place on the altar, which was dismantled entirely.⁹⁴ The carpenters and other specialists repaired the metal fittings as well as the rotten pillars of the altar. In addition, except for the pictorial motifs that decorate the upper part of the pillars and the overhead tie beams, they recoated the platform, altar pillars, and bracket complexes with *urushi* lacquer. To prevent their colors from peeling, the preservation team applied glue and chemicals on the pictorial motifs and eight patriarch paintings depicted on the wood planks, which are attached to the four intermediate sides of the hall. Another repair conducted on a large scale occurred on the roof, whose surface was broken in many parts, causing water leaks and damage to the roofing materials.⁹⁵ As most of the roof tiles were in a bad condition, only a few of them from 1789 could be reused.

⁹³ For discussion of the whole process in which the Fukūkenjaku Kannon underwent repair, see Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete jō," *Kōfuku* 91 (March 1996): 3-4, 6; Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete chū," *Kōfuku* 92 (June 1996): 3, 6; Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete ge," *Kōfuku* 93 (September 1996): 3-4; Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki chū," *Kōfuku* 79 (March 1993): 5-6; Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki ge," *Kōfuku* 80 (June 1993): 5-6; Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Nan'endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki jō," *Kōfuku* 78 (December 1992): 5-6.

⁹⁴ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 24, 28, 38-40.

⁹⁵ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 45.

Since the Nan'endō had undergone repair several times since 1797, certain designs of the building were altered over the course of history.⁹⁶ After obtaining the permission from the Agency for Cultural Affairs, the preservation team removed the gold wire and latticed doors that were once added to the four entrances in the nineteenth century.⁹⁷ In addition, they recreated a small window (*kugurito* 潜り戸), which serves as an entrance and exit, at the bottom of the northeast side of the Nan'endō.⁹⁸ By doing these, the preservation team restored the form of the Nan'endō back to the state of the 1797 reconstruction.

The Original Nan'endō

Foundation

The preservation team conducted an underground investigation after they dismantled the altar and dissembled the floor tiles of the *hisashi*. They dug several holes into the Nan'endō's earth foundation. By estimating the height of the earth inside and outside of the building, they found that the ground (*jiyama* 地山), on which the hall is erected, was originally a slope tilting toward the southwest.⁹⁹ Therefore, one can imagine that a considerable amount of soil was piled up on the ground to build up an even surface. Above the ground level of the foundation, a layer of stones and tile fragments was paved, followed by the level of solidified tamped-earth (*hanchiku* 版築). A mixture of stones, earth, and sand piled up layer upon layer, the *hanchiku* serves as a base for the placement of the foundation stones, upon which pillars are erected.

⁹⁶ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 16-17.

⁹⁷ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 42-44.

⁹⁸ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 43-44.

⁹⁹ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 49.

Among the layers of *hanchiku*, the preservation team unearthed eighty-four coins, which were buried there on purpose and were utilized as ritual implements called *chindangu* 鎮壇具 to perform the earth-calming ritual.¹⁰⁰ As people believed that the spirit of the earth could disturb the construction of buildings, it is important to pacify it through the performance of this particular ceremony. The coins were issued in 708, 760, 765, and 796, and are considered to have been buried at the time when the Nan'endō was built in 813.¹⁰¹ There are other *chindangu* from the Edo period (1615-1868) including a bronze jar and eight sets of the ritual implements, each consisting of one bronze staff (*ketsu* 榑) and one wheel.¹⁰²

Scale

According to *Kōfukuji ruki*, the length between two corner pillars of the ninth-century Nan'endō was two *jō* 丈, one *shaku* 尺, and one *sun* 寸, which is equal to 6.564 meters and is slightly longer than that of the current hall (6.4 meters) by 16 centimeters.¹⁰³ The record also tells that the original Nan'endō measured two *jō*, nine *shaku*, and two *sun* in height, which was 8.67

¹⁰⁰ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 49-51, 82-84.

¹⁰¹ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 51, 84. The preservation team found a layer of the covering stones (*jibukuishi* 地覆石) placed right underneath the current *jibukuishi*. In addition, they also found other *jibukuishi* at other locations of the foundation. *Jibukuishi* are utilized to outline the bottom frame of buildings and are set on podium bases. Because the *jibushiki* discovered are made of tuff stones (*gyōkaigan* 凝灰岩), which were only used until the late Heian period at Kōfukuji, the team considers that they were made from the time of the hall's creation in 813 and during its reconstruction from 1046 to 1048. Based on this, the team thinks that the position of the Nan'endō's podium has not been changed since its inception, and that when the hall was reconstructed during 1046-1048, its new base was probably rest directly on the original one. Because the coins were unearthed below the level of the *jubukuishi*, they should have been buried while the hall was first constructed in 813. Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 48-49.

¹⁰² For more discussion on these *chindangu*, see Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 85-86, 122-124.

¹⁰³ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 88. One *jō* equals 3.03 meters, one *shaku* equals 30.3 centimeters, and one *sun* equals 3.03 centimeters.

meters and was lower than the current building (9.154 meters) by 48 centimeters.¹⁰⁴ While conducting the foundation investigation, the preservation team examined the covering stones (*jibukuishi* 地覆石) that are placed on the podium base to form a plinth course and bottom frame of the building. By calculating their positions and sizes in tandem with relevant records, the preservation team came to know that the location of the eaves' ends has not been changed since 813.¹⁰⁵ However, because the eave extension of the original Nan'endō was shallower than that of the current building, the floor size of the former would have been slightly larger than that of the latter.¹⁰⁶ Through these investigations, we know that the scale of the Nan'endō has remained nearly unchanged over the course of the history.

Finial

When courtier Ōe Chikamichi (d. 1151) visited Kōfukuji in the twelfth century, he noted in his diary, *Shichidaiji junrei shiki*, that the finial of the Nan'endō showed “flames and inverted bowl (*fukubachi*), whose beauty surpassed those at other temples.”¹⁰⁷ What Chikamichi saw was however not original to the Nan'endō as the building was destroyed by fire in 1046. The reconstruction of the hall began shortly after the fire and was completed in 1048. Given this swift completion of the work, we may assume that the recreated finial, which Chikamichi saw, would have not drastically differed from the original.

Endō: Function and Meaning

¹⁰⁴ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 89.

¹⁰⁵ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 88.

¹⁰⁶ Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, *Jūyō bunkazai*, 88.

¹⁰⁷ *Shichi daiji*, 50.

The Nan'endō belongs to a type of architecture called “*endō* 円堂 (round halls)” that appeared as early as the eighth century. *Endō* are one-storied eight-sided structures with a centralized plan and have a layout of the space organized symmetrically around a central axis.¹⁰⁸ Jun Hu categorizes *endō* as a type of domical architecture that is defined to have “a radially symmetrical space” and “a ceiling design which alludes to the impression of a circle, a circle that recedes upwards.”¹⁰⁹

The word “*endō*” is used interchangeably with “Hakkakudō 八角堂 (octagonal halls),” but the former is more commonly seen in historical texts than the latter.¹¹⁰ Therefore, even though *endō* is octagonal architecture, Japanese associated it with a circle. In addition, the character “*en* (round)” might connote “perfection” or “complete,” connected with Buddhist notions of wisdom and enlightenment, which are often described as perfect, transcendental, and non-duality.¹¹¹ Given these associations, *endō* may have possessed a meaning of enlightenment, calling to mind the Buddha and his teachings.

Because there are two *endō*—Hokuendō and Nan'endō—at Kōfukuji, one in the north and the other south, the characters of “*hoku* (north)” and “*nan* (south)” were added to the compounds “*endō*” in order to differentiate these two buildings.¹¹² There has been plentiful research on

¹⁰⁸ For discussion of central-plan buildings in Japanese architecture, see Parent, *The Roof*, 124-134.

¹⁰⁹ Jun Hu, “Embracing the Circle: Domical Buildings in East Asian Architecture CA. 200-750” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014), 19.

¹¹⁰ Sugaya Fuminori, “Hakkakudō no kenritsu o tsūjite mita kofun shūmatsu no ichi yōsō,” in *Shūmatsuki kofun: Ronshū*, ed. Mori Kōichi (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1973), 446.

¹¹¹ I thank Gyoei Saile for pointing out to me that “*en*” might have connotations of “complete” and “perfect” (Oct. 12th, 2016). Jun Hu also holds a similar view. For this, see Hu, “Embracing the Circle,” 79-80.

¹¹² The Hokuendō was referred to as the “Endōin 円堂院 (The Round Hall Compound),” “Endōin Endō 円堂院円堂 (The Round Hall of the Round Compound), or “Sai'in Endō 西院円堂 (Round Hall of the Western Precinct)” as recorded in *Kōfukuji ruki*. As noted by Kobayashi Yūko, the appellation “Endōin”

endō,¹¹³ and some of them have traced its origin to Indian stupas, a round mound made to store relics of the Buddha and symbolize his presence.¹¹⁴ In China stupas were transformed into pagodas (J. *tō* 塔), a tower-like building often created by traditional Chinese timber-frame techniques and having multiple stories as well as sides. Structurally speaking, pagodas and *endō* are similar. First of all, their interior has a central plan with altars in the center and pathways in the surrounding area. Second, both have a hip and pyramidal roof, each facet of which converges at a central point that is further topped by a short ridge and then a finial. Third, their finials contain a flask and a jewel, both of which are associated with relic of the Buddha.¹¹⁵

Despite these similarities, pagodas and *endō* are different in terms of height and finial composition. Pagodas have multiple stories and a finial that contains nine rings (*kurin* 九輪) while these features are absent in *endō*. Ono Kayo points out that as prescribed by Buddhist scriptures, the height of pagodas and the number of their rings should correspond to the spiritual status and merit of subjects, to which pagodas are dedicated.¹¹⁶ In other words, pagodas would theoretically be taller with more rings on their finials if they are built for beings at higher levels in their spiritual path to enlightenment. Based on this, Ono contends that *endō* are a variant of

and “Endōin Endō” indicates that the hall was situated within a compound and was enclosed by a corridor since the word “*in*” means “enclosure walls.” The name “Hokuendō” was utilized after the construction of the Nan’endō to differentiate one from the other. *Kōfukuji ruki*, 9; Kobayashi Yūko, *Kōfukuji sōkenki no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2011), 101, 172-173.

¹¹³ For a review of the scholarship on *endō*, see Hu, “Embracing,” 83-89; Katata Osamu, *Nihon kodai jūinshi no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1991), 176-179.

¹¹⁴ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan’endō*, 63-74; Tanaka Shigehisa, *Nihon ni iryū indokei bunbutsu no kenkyū* (Osaka: Tobundō, 1943), 285.

¹¹⁵ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan’endō*, 72-73.

¹¹⁶ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan’endō*, 67-72.

pagodas reserved for esteemed Buddhists, laity or clergy, and that like pagodas, they were for the purposes of commemoration and merit accumulation.¹¹⁷

Nevertheless, other scholars have different opinions on the origin of *endō*. Gorai Shigeru considers that *endō* were derived from *mogari* 殯, a funerary structure built for the “exposure burials (*fūsō* 風葬)” in ancient times.¹¹⁸ Unlike Gorai, Aboshi Yoshinori connects *endō* to Chinese ritual places such as Mingtang (Hall of Brightness), where emperors worshipped heaven and earth as well as their ancestors.¹¹⁹ While not denying the influence of Buddhism and Chinese worship of heaven and earth, Katata Osamu emphasizes that Japanese perception of eight as a miraculous number likewise inspired the form of *endō*.¹²⁰ It seems that *endō* has an ambiguous origin, and this may have to do with religious landscape of the Nara period, in which Buddhism, though influential, intersected with indigenous beliefs, Confucian values, and Daoist elements. Therefore, what is important is to consider what *endō* may have evoked for eighth-century viewers rather than subsume it under a specific belief system. To investigate this inquiry, we should examine octagonal structures made before the ninth century and explore why octagon was employed to make “circular” buildings.

In Daoism, an octagon is considered equivalent or approximate to a circle. According to Fukunaga Mitsuji, the altar for worship of heaven in China was fashioned in a shape that combined an octagon/eight arcs and a circle since in Daoist cosmology octagon represents the

¹¹⁷ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 74.

¹¹⁸ Gorai Shigeru, *Kōya hijiri* (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1975), 111-112.

¹¹⁹ Aboshi Yoshinori, “Hakkaku hōfun to sono igi,” *Kashihara kōkogaku kenkyūjo ronshū* 5, ed. Kashihara Kōkogaku Kenkyūjo (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979), 181-226.

¹²⁰ Katata, *Nihon kodai*, 182-184.

entire universe.¹²¹ Moreover, Fukunaga corresponds octagon/eight arcs with Eight Trigram, which symbolizes the fundamental principal and order of the universe.¹²² This cosmological symbolism finds its visual manifestation in works such as octagonal mirrors (*hakkakukyō* 八角鏡) from the Shōsōin collection. This type of mirror has rims shaped into eight arcs, which in some cases, enclose a circle or engraved eight trigrams.¹²³

Eight/octagon was also associated with sovereignty in China and was utilized as a political symbol. For example, Empress Wu Zetian (624-705; r. 690-705) invented the character “囿 (*guo*)” placing the compound of “eight directions 八方” within an enclosure.¹²⁴ The character means “country” and conveys Chinese political ideology that rulers were those who subjugated people of the eight directions. Japanese rulers also signified their prestige and sovereignty employing the symbolism of octagon. For example, *takamikura* 高御座 is the elevated seat for emperors and according to *Engishiki*, is fashioned like a pavilion with an octagonal canopy and a square base.¹²⁵ The canopy, supported by eight pillars, is embellished with images of phoenix at every corner. In addition, each side of the *takamikura* is decorated with mirrors and hung with

¹²¹ Fukunaga Mitsuji, “Hakkaku kofun to hachiryōkyō: kodai Nihon to hakkakukei no shūkyō tetsugaku,” in *Dōkyō to Nihon bunka* (Kyoto: Jinbunshoin, 1982), 65-67.

¹²² Fukunaga, “Hakkaku kofun,” 69-71.

¹²³ For examples of these octagonal mirrors, see Naruse Masakazu, “Shōsōin no hōshokukyō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 522 (November 2009): 20-25, 37-39, 74-76; fig. 19, 28, 31, 34, 39, 53.

¹²⁴ Aboshi, “Hakkaku,” 197.

¹²⁵ Fukunaga Mitsuji, “Tennō kō rokudai,” in *Dōkyō to kodai Nihon* (Kyoto: Jinbunshoin, 1987), 12-14; Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650-800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009), 44; Aboshi, “Hakkaku,” 181-226; see *Engishiki*, in *Shinto taikai kotenhen vol. 11: Engishiki jō*, ed. Torao Toshiya (Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1991), 663. *Engishiki* 延喜式 is the legal document compiled in 927.

curtains to hide emperors from view. It is unclear when *takamikura* was created, but it may have had existed in the eighth century.¹²⁶

Octagonal tumuli (*kofun*), which emerged in Japan from the late seventh to early eighth century, are another example to show the association between octagon and sovereignty. A number of octagonal tombs have been found in the Kansai area and were built for Yamato rulers to distinguish their status from other clan leaders, such as the Gobyōno 御廟野 Kofun in Kyoto for Emperor Tenji, and Noguchi Ōbo 野口王墓 Kofun in Nara for Emperor Tenmu and Empress Jitō.¹²⁷ Because these Yamato rulers were devout Buddhists, the emergence of octagonal *kofun* has been linked to structures such as *endō*, stupas, and octagonal pagodas.¹²⁸ Nevertheless, considering that from the late seventh to the early eighth century, the Yamato clan sought to establish themselves as rulers of a centralized government modelled after the Chinese system, Herman Ooms speculates that octagonal *kofun* might have been utilized to express stewardship.¹²⁹

In addition to mirrors, tombs, and *takamikura*, there were other structures shaped as octagons in eighth-century Japan. For example, “*hōden* 宝殿 (treasure halls)” are a pavilion-like structure with an octagonal plan and are categorized as a type of tabernacle (*zushi*).¹³⁰ As mentioned, *Kōfukuji ruki* records that the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was enshrined in a *hōden*.

¹²⁶ Aboshi Yoshinori proclaims that the form of the *takamikura* has its origin in political thought and protocols of Tang China. As discussed below, the shape octagon had been associated with Japanese rulers in the seventh century. We may speculate that *takamikura* might have had appeared in the eighth century. Aboshi, “Hakkaku,” 199-200.

¹²⁷ Ooms, *Imperial Politics*, 44; Imao Humiaki, “Hakkakufun no shutsugen to tenkai,” *Kodai o kankaeru shūmatsuki kofun to kodai kokka*, ed. Shirai Taiichirō (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2005), 24-53.

¹²⁸ For a review of studies on octagonal tombs, see Aboshi, “Hakkaku,” 182-190.

¹²⁹ Ooms, *Imperial Politics*, 44.

¹³⁰ Unno, “Den e no manazashi,” 347-348.

The Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon at Tōdaiji also once stood inside a *hōden*.¹³¹ Currently only the two-tiered base of this *hōden* exists, but from the holes at the eight corners on the top tier, one can imagine that the structure used to have eight columns to support a canopy.¹³² *Hōden* were utilized to house not only Fukūkenjaku Kannon, but also other types of Buddhist images, for example, the Amida assemblies, dated to 741, in the Amida Hall at Tōdaiji.¹³³ As Unno Hiroyuki points out, *hōden* were intended to simulate a heavenly setting suitable for the enshrinement of Buddhist icons,¹³⁴ and therefore, can be understood as an adornment (*shōgon* 莊嚴) for the divine. Unno also associates *hōden* with Mt. Fudaraku, the abode of Kannon in southern sea of India, as described in the sutra *Fukūkenjaku shinpen shingonkyō* 不空羼索神變真言經 (Sk. *Amoghapāśa-kalparāja*), and considers that the Nan'endō had an octagonal plan because its main icon was initially enshrined in a *hōden*.¹³⁵ In the sutra, Mt. Fudaraku is described as having nine peaks that are shaped like a lotus flower with the central peak supporting a seven-jeweled palace, where Kannon resides.¹³⁶ According to Unno, as other attendants surround the Kannon from the surrounding eight peaks, they constitute an octagon

¹³¹ Oku Takeo, “Tōdaiji Hokkedō hakkaku nijūdan shōkō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 306 (September 2009): 92-107.

¹³² The dendrochronological test of the two-tiered octagonal base suggests that it was made of wood cut around 729, which is close to the earliest proposed date 733 for the construction of the Hokkedō that some scholars have proposed. Mitsutani Takumi and Kojima Daisuke, “Tōdaiji Hokkedō (seidō) narabini hakkaku nijūdan no nenrin nendai chōsa,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 321 (March 2012): 69-87.

¹³³ *Amida keka shiryōchō*, in *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1955), 673-674; Unno, “Den e no manazashi,” 350-351. These images and its enshrined tabernacle no longer exist, but according to *Amida keka shiryōchō* 阿弥陀悔過資料帳 from the Shōsōin collection, we know that it had a two-tiered base and a canopy supported by eight pillars that were painted with the images of birds and flowers. In addition, banners, adorned with images of phoenixes, flowers, and birds, hung from the canopy.

¹³⁴ Unno, “Den e no manazashi,” 350.

¹³⁵ Unno, “Den e no manazashi,” 361.

¹³⁶ *T.* 1092, 20: 0268c07-12.

above the mountain.¹³⁷ However, a close reading of this sutra shows that the eight peaks all together do not outline the form of an octagon.¹³⁸

No Chinese *endō* are extant, but there are remains of three octagonal structures from the Tang dynasty (618-907).¹³⁹ However, it is unclear what they were for. In the Korean peninsula, we know that there were octagonal structures built in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries.¹⁴⁰ The remains of these structures often appear in the center of a Buddhist monastery and are flanked by other buildings from two, three, or four sides. Among them, a few are close to royal graves, and in some cases, the names of monasteries, where they were situated, contain the character “tombs 陵 (K. *neung*).”

Several *endō* were constructed in eighth-century Japan. The first example is the aforementioned Hokuendō originally built by Empress Genmei and Empress Genshō in 721 to commemorate Fuhito, a Fujiwara patriarch and prominent officer in the eighth century. The current hall was reconstructed in 1220. According to *Kōfukuji ruki*, the original Hokuendō enshrined a Miroku, the Buddha of the future, with Bodhisattvas and other attendants.¹⁴¹ The second example is the Yumedono (Hall of Dreams) in the eastern precinct of Hōryūji constructed under the supervision of the priest Gyōshin 行信 in 739 to memorialize Prince Shōtoku (574-

¹³⁷ Unno, “Den e no manazashi,” 357.

¹³⁸ T. 1092, 20: 0268c07-0269b17. In his studies on the sites that were identified as Mt. Fudaraku in Japan, Shimizu Ken also cites this passage of the sutra, but makes no comment on the shape of the mountain as octagon. Also, as Chapter Three and Four discuss, to portray Mt. Fudaraku as such likely has to do with the emergence of the Nan’endō as a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century. Shimizu Ken, “Suijaku suru seichi: chūsei Nihon no Fudarakusan hyōshō no shoyōtai o rei toshite,” in *Higashi Ajia Bukkyō bijutsu ni okeru seichi hyōshō no shoyōtai, Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, ed. Inamoto Yasuo (Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2013-15), 155-156; Chapters Three and Four.

¹³⁹ Nancy Steinhardt, “The Sixth Century in East Asian Architecture,” *Ars Orientalis* 41 (2011): 56.

¹⁴⁰ Steinhardt, “The Sixth Century,” 43-49.

¹⁴¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 9.

622). As indicated by temple records, the building was initially referred as a “*Hakkaku butsuden* 八角仏殿, eight-sided Buddhist hall/palace,”¹⁴² and began to be called as “Yumedono” in the thirteenth century.¹⁴³ In addition to Gyōshin, Fusasaki and Kōmyō’s daughter Princess Abe (718-770) were involved in the construction of the hall.¹⁴⁴ The main icon of the Yumedono is a standing Kannon statue made in life size in the early seventh century and was thought as the portrait of the prince beginning in the eighth century.¹⁴⁵

Tachibana no Michiyo (d. 733), who was Kōmyō’s mother, allegedly vowed to construct another octagonal hall, known as Saiendō 西円堂 (Western Round Hall), in the western precinct of Hōryūji.¹⁴⁶ No information tells of when the hall was constructed. The current Saiendō was rebuilt in 1250 and enshrines a dry-lacquer sculpture of Yakushi Buddha dated to the eighth century. This icon is, however, not original to the building and was moved from other places at Hōryūji. As a last example, Nakamaro erected the Hakkakudō at Eizanji in 763-764 for his deceased father Muchimaro, whose tomb is located on a mountain behind the temple.¹⁴⁷ It is unclear as to the iconographic program of the Eizanji Hakkakudō in the eighth century.

¹⁴² *Hōryūji engi shizaichō*, in *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1955): 517. Jun Hu speculates that the name “*hakkaku butsuden*” is a misnomer. Given the word “*den*” means “halls” or “palaces,” it may be utilized to mark the royal status of Shōtoku or to make a reference to Ikaruga palace, which was prince’s residence nearby the Yumedono. Hu, “Embracing the Circle,” 95.

¹⁴³ Lucie R. Weinstein, “The Yumedono Kannon: Problems in Seventh-Century Sculpture,” *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 28.

¹⁴⁴ *Hōryūji tōin engi*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 85 (Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidai, 1972), 127.

¹⁴⁵ *Hōryūji engi shizaichō*, 510.

¹⁴⁶ The discussion of the Saiendō is based on the following texts: *Shichi daiji*, 61; Nagaoka Ryūsaku, *Nihon no butsuzō: Asuka, Hakuhō, Tenpyō no inori to bi* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2009), 242-245.

¹⁴⁷ Fukuyama Toshio, “Eizanji no sōritsu to Hakkakudō,” in *Jiin kenchiku no kenkyū chū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1982), 244-249; Kawahara Yoshio, “Shōzō o hōshisuru jidai izen: Eizanji Hakkakudō no tsuizendō no seikaku,” *Yamato bunka* 96 (September 1996): 3-4. Muchimaro was probably reburied at Eizanji sometime between 760 and 764.

Discussion of these examples suggests that *endō* was a type of memorial structure to honor a great person and was a popular form among the Fujiwara clan to commemorate departed family members. The iconographic programs of these *endō* are varied, showing different configurations of Buddhist icons. Hu considers that *endō* made in eighth-century Japan aimed to “create a localized notion of sainthood” and “elevate local patrons to a place on par with those enlightened beings (i.e., Bodhisattvas).”¹⁴⁸ While valid, this observation may not grasp the whole picture of *endō*’s function in the eighth century given that not only Buddhism, but also other belief systems may have informed the construction of *endō*. The placement of the Eizanji Hakkakudō along with Muchimaro’s tomb may point to another understanding of *endō*’s function.

Such a placement is by no means innovative as there had been examples of aligning tombs and temples close to each other in the seventh century.¹⁴⁹ As Sugaya Fuminori comments, memorial halls were places for spirits of dead, while tombs for burials of bodies.¹⁵⁰ This

¹⁴⁸ Hu, “Embracing the Circle,” 77. This comment on *endō* is certainly appropriate for the Yumedono at Hōryūji, the cultic center of the Prince Shōtoku, who was considered as the incarnation of Kannon. In the case of the Nan’endō, no evidence shows that the Northern Fujiwara treated the spirits of Uchimaro or other previous patriarchs as enlightened beings or something equivalent. Moreover, in the eighth and early ninth centuries, deification of ancestors had not yet been the concern of the Fujiwara as in the later periods. Kamatari was among few ancestors of the Fujiwara clan who was deified and became a subject of worship. It is unclear when the cult of Kamatari emerged, but the tenth century would be the earliest time for his deification. For the cult of Kamatari, see Allan Grapard, “Japan’s Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shinto and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (“Shimbutsu Bunri”) and a Case Study: Tōnomine,” *History of Religions* 23, no.3 (February 1984): 247-265.

¹⁴⁹ Date Muneyasu, “Kofun tera shizoku,” in *Shūmatsuki kofun: Ronshū*, ed. Mori Kōichi (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1973), 255-275. The association between tombs and temples/memorial sites was not limited to Japan. In Tang China, constructing pagodas to store bodily remains after cremation or exposed burials was common among the practitioners of the Three Levels Teachings. Also, according to Shu-Fen Liu, the relationship between pagodas and burial practices took on three forms in China. One is that pagodas served as holding their bodily remains. Another is that pagodas were built next to tombs as memorials. Still another is that pagodas functioned as tomb markers. Shu-Fen Liu, *Zhonggu de fojiao yu shehui* (Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2008), 219-243, 290-316.

¹⁵⁰ Sugaya, “Hakkakudō,” 463.

distinction reflects the impact of Buddhism on Japanese dealing of the dead. Soon after Buddhism was introduced to Japan in the sixth century, it changed the way how funerals should be conducted and deemed it necessary to hold memorial services for spirits of the departed.¹⁵¹ According to Buddhism, one may be reborn in one of the inferior realms such as hells, animals, and hungry ghosts rather than pure lands of Buddhas. As such, Buddhist temples were built one after another to provide memorial rituals to deal with concerns over one's rebirth and salvation. In addition, as early as the seventh century, Japanese held the *Obon* お盆 ceremony for the deceased, and the ceremony had since taken on the form of donations, prayers, and dedications of images, buildings, and sutras to Buddhist temples following the prescription given in the sutra *Urabonkyo* (Ch. *Yulanpen jing* 盂蘭盆經).¹⁵² Held in mid-August in the premodern times, *Obon* has been one of the essential events to accumulate merit for ancestors and pray for their salvation. According to *Yulanpenjing zanshu* 盂蘭盆經讚述, the name of the event, “*obon*,” means “the bowls (*bon*) filled with offerings to save ancestors from hanging upside-down (*yulan*) in purgatory.”¹⁵³ While it might be overreaching, the circular imagery of *endō* may be linked to the idea of *bon* (bowl), signifying offerings made for benefits of ancestors.

While Buddhism exercised great influence over mortuary practices, its notion of rebirth was not fully received in the early period of time. Textual evidence suggests that Japanese in the eighth century envisaged multiple places other than pure lands of Buddhas as postmortem

¹⁵¹ For discussion of Buddhist mortuary practices in seventh and eighth-century Japan, see Jacqueline Stone, *Right Thoughts at the Last Moment: Buddhism and Deathbed Practices in Early Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 29-33.

¹⁵² Smith, *Ancestor*, 15-17.

¹⁵³ T. 2781, 85: 0540a13-14; Stephen Teiser, “Ghosts and Ancestors in Medieval Chinese Religion: The Yun-Lan-Pen Festival as Mortuary Ritual,” *History of Religion* 26, no. 1 (1986): 48.

destinations, such as a heaven, a jeweled place, a realm of the immortals, the Chinese island of Mt. Hōrai 蓬萊 (Ch. Penglai), and so on.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, Buddhist concept of afterlife has co-existed and intersected with traditional belief of spirits, according to which after death one's spirits would reside in mountains or other places.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, in the traditional belief, body and soul are two separate entities and are detached from each other after death.¹⁵⁶ Also, spirits of newly dead (*shirei* 死靈) would not automatically become those of ancestors (*sorei* 祖靈) right after death and are believed to remain in this world for a period of time. It is not until the thirty-third anniversary of death that *shirei* are transformed into *sorei*. It is therefore important to take care of departed spirits before this transformation takes place. Viewing *endō* from these notions of afterlife, we may cast *endō* as a temporary resting place for spirits of the dead before they departed for the netherworld and as a symbol to signify their presence in this world. These functions of *endō* are in line with the associations of octagon with cosmos, spiritual beings, and heavenly realms.

Through the above discussion, we know that the architecture of the Nan'endō possesses multivalent meanings. First, we may delineate the hall as a place where the spirits of departed family members rest for the time being until they were transferred into the state of *sorei* and paradises of Buddhas. Second, it is clear that the hall was to signify the esteemed status of ancestral spirits and mark the presence of familial patriarchs. Third, the hall communicated a salvific wish of the dead to die like the Buddha, while demonstrated a virtuous work of the living to commemorate ancestors.

¹⁵⁴ Stone, *Right Thoughts*, 32-33.

¹⁵⁵ Stone, *Right Thoughts*, 31.

¹⁵⁶ For discussion of how Japanese perceive of the spirits of the dead and the living, see Smith, *Ancestor*, 39-68.

The Interior of the Nan'endō

Description of the Interior

The interior of the Nan'endō, as mentioned above, is divided into two spaces: a *moya*, the inner sanctum where the altar is situated, and a *hisashi*, the one-bay pathway where devotees worship Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Given their different functions, these two spaces in the Nan'endō have separate ceilings, structural configurations, and decorative details. The altar in the *moya* is elevated from the ground and is fashioned in an octagonal shape. Eight pillars rest on the eight corners of the altar and join horizontally with the overhead tie beams. The upper parts of the pillars are painted with images of clouds, waves, and flowers, and patterns of elaborate arabesques. Similarly, the tie beams are depicted in vivid colors with geometric patterns and motifs of flowers and scrolling vines. These painted details create an illusion in that the pillars look as if they were dressed in textile. The inner sanctum has a mirror ceiling (*kagami tenjō* 鏡天井) that shows a golden board in the center and golden logs surrounding the board. This mirror ceiling represents rays of light emanating from the Fukūkenjaku Kannon below and imbues the sanctuary with a feeling of majesty.

Unlike the *moya*, the *hisashi* is paved with square tiles and has no decoration on the surface. Eight pairs of wood planks are installed on the southeast, southwest, northwest, and northeast sides of the hall. Their top and bottom parts are framed respectively by non-penetrating tie beams, namely, *uchinori nageshi* 内法長押 and *koshi nageshi* 腰長押, which stretch across the depth of the walls and join the pillars at the corners. These wood planks in the interior are attached to the slatted windows in the exterior. The spaces underneath the windows are made of white wattle-daub walls, which sit on the tie beams placed on the ground (*chinageshi* 地長押).

Although the *moya* and *hisashi* are demarcated by an elevated altar, the two-tiered rainbow beams (*kōryō* 虹梁), crossing over the pathway, unify the two spaces as a whole.

The Original Visual Program

While the fire of 1046 burned the Nan'endō into ashes, most of its images survived including the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Four Guardian Kings, six monks, the demon figure which the Guardian of the South Zōjōten 增長天 (Skt. Virūḍhaka) stepped upon, and the paintings that depicted the monks Tendai Daishi Zhiyi 智顛 (538-597), Huiguo 惠果 (746-805), and Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664).¹⁵⁷ Three texts tell of the content of the Nan'endō's images before and after the 1046 fire.

The temple record *Kōfukuji ruki* (the *Yamashina ruki* section) states:

One building of the Nan'endō, eight-sided. One can look for its height or other things in *Kōninki*. [The Nan'endō] was built one hundred and four years after the construction of the Golden Hall. The following: [The Nan'endō] houses the sculptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings.[The Fukūkenjaku Kannon] shows eight arms, and its golden appearance shines on the lotus pedestal.There are four pillars¹⁵⁸ of offertory monks, all seated on the platforms. One pillar Zenju Sōjō is seated on a platform, behind which there is a colored cartouche of eulogy. One sculpture of the meditation master Genpin is seated on a platform, behind which there is a colored cartouche of eulogy, and [the sculpture] is made of clay. [There are] images of meditation masters [Hui]shi (J. Eshi), Zhi[yi] (J. Chigi), and Yixing (J. Ichigyō), as well as masters Huiguo (J. Eka), Śubhakarasiṃha (J. Zenmui), Vajrabodhi (J. Kongōchi), and Xuanzang (J. Genjō), each of which is accompanied by attendants. Also, eulogies are written on [the images]. 南圓堂一字。八角。高等可見弘仁記。金堂造立以後一百四年造之。右。安置不空羅索觀音像并四天王像也。……而表八臂。金容映蓮座。……供養僧形四柱。合居櫓善珠僧正一柱。居櫓後在讀文設子。玄賓

¹⁵⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 3. For the records about the 1046 fire and reconstruction of Kōfukuji, see *Zō Kōfukuji ki* 造興福寺記, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 29-59; *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965), 290.

¹⁵⁸ “Pillar (*hashira* 柱)” is the measurement for religious sculptures. For discussion of this word, see Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 308-332.

禪師一軀。居檣後在讚文設子并捻思禪師像。智禪師像。一行禪師。惠果。善無畏三藏。金剛智三藏。玄奘三藏。各在從者。并上在御筆讚文。¹⁵⁹

This configuration of the images in general matches with that recorded in Chikamichi's diaries, *Shichi daiji nikki* 七大寺日記 written in 1106, and *Shichi daiji junrei shiki* written in 1140. As both texts present similar accounts, I select the one longer but will use the other when necessary. The entry on the Nan'endō in *Shichi daiji junrei shiki* (hereafter *Shiki*) states:

The Nan'endō, eight sided, faces to the east with a jewel-shaped roof. The hall is situated to the south of the Western Golden Hall and [houses] a gold *jōroku* seated image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon. An oral transmission states that the manifestation Buddha on the top of the [Fukūkenjaku Kannon] is a Jizō, about which one can look for more details. It also states that there are images of Four Guardian Kings, among which the Guardian King of the South is the most magnificent. There are images of six life-size patriarchs, who are Zenju Sōjō, Genpin Sōzu, Gyōga, Kasō, Jōtō Sōzu, and Shin'ei, all holding incense burners and placed to the west side (back) of the main icon. These [six] images were not [made of] wood, but were dyed cloth, upon which clay were applied, pressed, and spread. On the screen behind Zenju Sōjō, there is calligraphy by Kōbō Daishi. Also, there are paintings of sages and saints: Tendai Daishi (Zhiyi) southeast of the window, Xuanzang northeast of the window, Huiguo Ajari southwest of the window, and Hassen Ajari as a child next to Huiguo. The colored cartouches on these four figure images have inscriptions all brushed by Kōbō Daishi. It is said that the images were also painted by the master. Ancient legend has it that the eight patriarch paintings were inscribed and painted by the hand of the master [Kōbō Daishi] himself. However, on the day Kōfukuji burned down, only these four figure images were taken out. The rest [of the figure images] were all lost and burned to ashes. 南円堂八角東向、寶形造、在西金堂南、金色丈六不空縑索坐像口傳云、子細可尋、頂上化佛者地藏并云、四天王像此天等中南方天殊勝也、等身六祖像、件六祖者、善珠僧正、玄寶僧都、行賀、嘉操、常騰僧都、信睿也、皆持香爐、安中尊之西側、其像其非未(木力)以染布所補土塞張也、善珠僧正後障子有弘法大師御筆、又繪像賢聖等影、天台大師在東戸内南脇、玄奘三藏影在東戸内北脇、惠果阿闍梨影在南戸内西脇、法全阿闍梨童子時影在惠果影側、件四人影之色紙形有銘文、皆是弘法大師御筆也、其影同大師御筆云、古老傳云、八宗祖師影像、大師手自振筆併所畷畷給也、而山階寺燒亡之日、僅所放取者只此四人也、於殘者、皆失(悉)燒亡也。¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19-20. According to Ono Kayo, the word *rai* or *rei* 檣 probably means *raiban* 礼盤, a raised platform and venerated seat covered with a tatami mat. It was used for masters to sit on during rituals. Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 97.

¹⁶⁰ *Shichi daiji*, 50. The *shoji* (screen) that stood behind the sculpture of Zenju was a *tsuitate* 衝立, which is a type of screen that has only one panel set on a stand and usually appears behind images of priests and *kami*. Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 96.

As shown here, the Nan'endō enshrined the sculptures of a seated golden *jōroku*-size Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Four Guardian Kings, and six life-size patriarchs. In addition, there were paintings of Zhiyi, Xuanzang, and Huiguo along with his boy attendant Hassen 法全, which survived from the 1046 fire.

Comparing both accounts, one finds discrepancy in the identification of the six Hossō patriarchs. In *Ruki*, only two among these six sculptures represented actual monks (Genpin and Zenju), while the other four figures were offertory images (*kuyōzō* 供養像), images that were utilized to indicate religious offerings and devotion towards the Three Treasures (Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha) of Buddhism.¹⁶¹ However, by the twelfth century when Chikamichi visited the Nan'endō, all of the six sculptures had come to represent specific monks associated with Hossō Buddhism. This is why they have been called as “six Hōssō patriarchs.” Ono points out that this shift in identity has to do with the establishment of *soshi* 祖師 (patriarchs) as a sectarian concept specifically referring to the founders of Buddhist schools after the mid-ninth century.¹⁶² Furthermore, Ono argues that while the statues of Zenju and Genpin were first made in the early ninth century, they were intentionally differentiated from the other four monks in terms of

¹⁶¹ It is not uncommon to see *kuyōzō* in Chinese and Japanese art. They take various forms such as monks, heavenly beings, and lay Buddhists. However, as Nagaoka Ryūsaku points out, some *kuyōzō* in China were illustrated as the portraits of donors while no such examples exist in Japan. For discussion of offertory images in Asia, see Ishimatsu Hinako, “Kuyōshazō: zūzō ni yoru kishin mei,” in *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 5: Kinōron: tsukuru, tsukaru, tsutaeru*, ed. Nagaoka Ryūsaku (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2014), 179-199. Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 44-49, 186-215; Nagaoka Ryūsaku, “Ontame no zōzō ron: shutai, kigan, hyōgen,” in “*Ontame no zōzō*” *kenkyū*, *Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, ed. Nagaoka Ryūsaku (Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2006-2009), 4-27.

¹⁶² Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 269-270.

gestures, postures, and hand-held objects.¹⁶³ This differentiation is seen in the current six Hossō patriarchs.¹⁶⁴

When Kōkei restored these six sculptures in 1189, he faithfully recreated their iconography, showing three types of posture and three types of gesture.¹⁶⁵ Zenju is shown with the right hand holding an attribute (now missing) and with the index finger of the left hand pointing down. Different from him, Genpin crosses ten fingers together to form a mudra of *gebakuin* 外縛印, which indicates the womb world and a moon disc (*gachirin* 月輪).¹⁶⁶ The other four monks are in the gestures of holding incense burners in their hands. According to Ono, because incense burners were considered as an object of offering and were utilized while one made vows, wishes, and prayer, they are the indications of the original identities of these four monks as the offertory images.¹⁶⁷ Moreover, she considers that the incense burners they hold should have initially signified the act of offerings to the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and expressed prayer for the salvation of Uchimaro.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 93-180.

¹⁶⁴ Various theories have been proposed regarding the identifies of the current six Hossō patriarchs. Scholars have reached consensus over the identities of the three monks Zenju 善珠 (Zenju), Genpin 玄賓 (Genbō 玄昉), and Gyōga 行賀 (Jōtō 常騰). The brackets here indicate Kōfukuji's attributions of the patriarchs' names. I discuss the identification of the current six patriarch monks in Chapter Five. For an overview of scholarship on these six sculptures, see Kobayashi Yūko, "Hossō rokuzō," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 177-198.

¹⁶⁵ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 114-118.

¹⁶⁶ Akiyama Masami, *Butsuzō inzō daijiten* (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1985), 219-220. It should be noted that *gebakuin* shows the ten fingers outside of the palms, while *naibakuin* 内縛印 hides the ten fingers inside the palms.

¹⁶⁷ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 128-162.

¹⁶⁸ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 160-162.

The six patriarchs are in three kinds of postures, *chōki* 長跪, *tatehiza* 立膝, and *fuza* 趺坐, each of which are shown in two monks. *Chōki* is to kneel on both legs; *tatehiza* is to sit with one leg raised flat on the seat and the other lifted up; *fuza*, also known as *kekka fuza*, is to sit with both legs crossed. As a posture of meditation, *fuza* is commonly utilized to represent eminent monks or enlightened beings to signify their spiritual status, whereas *chōki* and *tatehiza* both indicate an act of worship.¹⁶⁹ As such, Zenju and Genpin should be shown in the posture of *fuza*, and the other four monks in *chōki* and *tatehiza*. However, only Zenju is seated with crossed legs while Genpin kneels on both legs. Ono speculates that because by the Kōkei's time, the six sculptures obtained new identities, the artist had no clear idea of the original differentiation between the offertory images and two monks of Genpin and Zenju in terms of gestures, postures, and hand-held objects.¹⁷⁰ For this reason, Kōkei probably mistook the posture of Genpin, which should have been in *fuza*.

Another discrepancy in the two aforementioned texts concerns the medium of the six monk sculptures. One account indicates that they were made of clay and the other dry lacquer. I follow Ono's opinion that the six monks were likely clay images as recorded in *Ruki*.¹⁷¹

The descriptions of the Four Guardian Kings given in *Ruki* and Chikamichi's diaries are very limited. However, a painting of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon provides a glimpse into their iconography. Currently stored at the Nara National Museum, this painting is dated to the last quarter of the twelfth century prior to 1189, showing each two of the Four Guardian Kings

¹⁶⁹ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 101-114.

¹⁷⁰ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 118-119.

¹⁷¹ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 43-44.

standing on both sides of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁷² Moreover, they step upon demon figures, wear armor, have flaming halos and the hip-slung postures. By the attributes held in their hands, we can identify them as follows: Jikokuten 持国天 (Skt. Dhṛtarāṣṭra; Guardian King of the East), who holds a sword in the left hand and has a jewel on his right palm, is shown on the bottom right; Tamonten 多聞天 (Skt. Vaiśravaṇa; Guardian King of the North), who grasps a three-pointed spear in his right hand and lifts a miniature pagoda in his left hand, is shown on the upper right; Zōjōten, who raises a three-pointed spear in his right hand, and wields a sword in the left hand, is shown on the bottom left; Kōmokuten 広目天 (Skt. Virūpākṣa; Guardian King of the West) grabs a lasso in his right hand and holds a three-pointed spear in the left hand, is shown on the upper left. In addition, the body of Zōjōten is painted in red, that of Kōmokuten is painted in light orange, and the other two kings are in faded brown colors. These iconographic features, as Taniguchi Kōsei points out, are based on *Darani jikkyō* 陀羅尼集經 (Skt. *Dhāraṇī-samuccaya-sūtra*).¹⁷³

The bottom two corners of this painting are depicted with Jikokuten and Zōjōten, while the upper two corners are left blank. The Kōmokuten and Tamonten stand to the two sides of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. This placement of the Four Guardian Kings reflects their actual positions on the altar of the Nan'endō as Chikamichi reported that the six monk sculptures were behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. No information is available as to the exact location of the six monk statues,

¹⁷² Taniguchi Kōsei, “Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō kenpon chashoku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō,” *Rokuon zasshū* 4 (2002): 59-70.

¹⁷³ Taniguchi, “Nara Kokuritsu,” 61.

but given the limited space of the altar, they were probably arranged symmetrically, three on each side as in the later period after the fire of 1181.¹⁷⁴

According to *Ruki* the monk paintings in the Nan'endō depicted Huisi 慧思 (515-577), Zhiyi, Yixing 一行 (683-727), Huiguo, Śubhakarasiṃha (Ch. Shanwuwei 善無畏; 673-735), Vajrabodhi (Ch. Jingangzhi 金剛智; 671-741), and Xuanzang. However, the fact that only seven patriarchs were recorded does not match with Chikamichi's report, which states that there were eight patriarch paintings in total. Both *Ruki* and *Shiki* show that the painting of Zhiyi was located in the southeast, Xuanzang was located in the northeast, and Huiguo was located in the southwest. Given that these three patriarch paintings appeared on the three sides of the hall, there should be painting(s) on the northwest as well. In addition, the wood planks, on which the current eight patriarch paintings are illustrated, come in pairs on every intercardinal side of the Nan'endō. The original hall probably had a similar layout of the wood planks and should have had eight patriarch paintings in total.

Neither *Ruki* nor *Shiki* has mention of the identity of the eighth patriarch. However, according to *Kōfukuji ranshōki* 興福寺濫觴記, an Edo-period (1615-1868) compilation of temple records, the eighth patriarch represented Genpin.¹⁷⁵ Different from this record, *Ono ruihishō* 小野類秘抄, written by Kanshin 寬信 (1085-1153), shows that the monk Amoghavajra (Ch. Bukonjingang 不空金剛; 705-774) rather than Genpin was included.¹⁷⁶ I follow the

¹⁷⁴ Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō shozō no saikō," in *Busshi Kaikai ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 271-272; Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 279-297.

¹⁷⁵ *Kōfukuji ranshōki*, in *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969), 457.

¹⁷⁶ Kanshin, *Ono ruihishō*, in *Shingon zenshū*, vol. 36 (Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1977), 9.

identification given in *Ono ruishishō* as the text is dated much earlier than *Kōfukuji ranshōki*.¹⁷⁷

This way, the eight paintings depicted one (Xuanzang) patriarch from the Hossō Buddhist school, two (Zhiyi and Huisi) from the Tendai Buddhist school, and five (Yixing, Huiguo, Śubhakarasiṃha, Vajrabodhi, and Amoghavajra) from the Shingon Buddhist school.

Interestingly, the five Shingon patriarch paintings, which Kūkai brought from China in 806, also represent the figures of Yixing, Huiguo, Śubhakarasiṃha, Vajrabodhi, and Amoghavajra. Ono Kayo contends that Fuyutsugu likely had seen these five paintings, and inspired by them, included the images of Yixing, Huiguo, Śubhakarasiṃha, Vajrabodhi, and Amoghavajra as part of the eight patriarch paintings in the Nan'endō.¹⁷⁸ If this was the case, Fuyutsugu would have commissioned the eight patriarch paintings sometime between 821 and 824. *Ono ruishishō* also indicates the positions of the eight patriarch paintings as follows: Northeast: Vajrabodhi (NNE) and Xuanzang (ENE); Southeast: Zhiyi (ESE) and Huisi (SSE); Southwest: Yixing (SSW) and Huiguo (WSW); Northwest: Śubhakarasiṃha (WNW) and Amoghavajra (NNW).

While the colors of the current eight patriarch paintings have mostly peeled off, the contours of some patriarchs are still visible, showing them in standing postures with their attendants.¹⁷⁹ One figure on the plank of the northeast holds an incense burner, and his attendant

¹⁷⁷ Several scholars have investigated the identity of the eighth patriarch, considering him as either Genpin or Amoghavajra. For their works, see Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji mandara yori mita dōji anchi butsumō,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 183-188; Matsuura Masaaki, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō itakabe soshizō,” in *Jion taishi mie shūei*, ed. Kōfukuji Yakushiji Jion Taishi Mie Shūei Kankōkai (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1982), 237-239; Seya Takayuki, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Hossō rokuso zō o meguru shomondai: zōmei hitei to sono sōi o chūshin ni,” *Bijutsu shigaku* 22 (2001): 46; Ono Kayo, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō no sōkensha Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu o meguru bijutsu: soshiga no mondai o chūshin ni,” in *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 6: Soshikiron: seisakushita hitobito*, ed. Tsuda Tetsuei (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2016), 48-67.

¹⁷⁸ Ono, “Kōfukuji,” 56-63.

¹⁷⁹ Because these eight paintings are in such a bad condition, it is extremely difficult to determine their date through a formal analysis. Nevertheless, a dendrochronological test on two of the planks shows that

carries a sutra scroll. Another figure on the plank of the southwest is shown holding something in front of the chest. These figures are painted in life size on the wood planks that are placed above eye level in the Nan'endō and measure around 2.06 meters wide and 3.99 meters high.

According to *Ono ruihishō* and *Ruki*, the original eight patriarchs were accompanied by boy attendants. In addition, *Ruki* records that the image of Zhiyi had two attendant boys; one held a sutra box (*bonkyō* 梵夾) while the other a piece of textile (*sai* 綵).¹⁸⁰ Given that the size of the original Nan'endō was similar to that of the current building, the original eight patriarchs were probably in life size and were all shown in standing postures. Also, as indicated by *Ruki* and *Shiki*, these paintings bear colored cartouches written with inscriptions.

In summary, an array of images constituted the original visual program of the Nan'endō: sculptures of a *jōroku* eight-armed Fukūkenjaku Kannon seated on the lotus pedestal, Four Guardian Kings, and six monks including four offertory images and two statues of Genpin and Zenju, as well as eight paintings of the patriarchs from the Tendai, Shingon, and Hossō Buddhist schools. Each two of the Four Guardian Kings probably stood to the both sides of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the front part of the altar, while the six monk sculptures were seated on the platforms, three on each side, behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Illustrated on the wood planks at the four intercardinal sides of the hall, the eight paintings should have showed the priests in standing postures and carrying objects such as a sutra box, an incense burner, and a scroll of scripture.

A Posture of Devotion and a Display of Power

at least some of the paintings were very likely remade around the same time as the sculptures. Naraken Kyōiku Inkaei, ed. *Jūyō bunkazai*, 75.

¹⁸⁰ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 3.

It is not uncommon to see representations of monks from the Nara period in the standing posture. One example is the door paintings of the Six Tabernacles of the Six Schools (*Rokushū zūshi* 六宗厨子), made in the eighth century and placed in the Great Buddha Hall at Tōdaiji. The six tabernacles were made to store Buddhist scriptures essential to the six Buddhist schools including Kegon 華嚴, Sanron 三論, Hossō, Kusha 俱舍, Ritsu 律宗, and Jōjitsu 成実. Either rectangular or octagonal in shape, the six tabernacles were depicted with images of the Four Guardian Kings, Bonten (Sk. Brahmā) and Taishakuten (Sk. Indra) and were illustrated respectively with monks from the six Buddhist schools on the doors.¹⁸¹ Although none of the tabernacles exist now, the painting *Kusha Mandara*, dated to 1147-1153, provides a glimpse into the appearances of some of eminent monks. It is commonly held that the depictions of the ten Kusha patriarchs in this work are derived from those illustrated on the doors of the Kusha tabernacle.¹⁸² The mandara shows that the ten Kusha patriarchs stand symmetrically in a circle, surrounding the central Shaka Buddha and two Bodhisattvas from the left and right sides. In addition, the patriarchs are in various gestures and hold different objects such as a rosary, a sutra box, an incense burner, a brush, a scroll of sutras, and so on.

The depictions of these Kusha patriarchs recall the dry-lacquer sculptures of the Ten Disciples dated to 734 in the Saikondō at Kōfukuji.¹⁸³ Currently, only six of the Ten Disciples survive and are shown in standing postures and grasping objects (now missing) in their hands.

¹⁸¹ For the study of this painting, see Anne Nishimura Morse, “The Invention of Tradition: The Uses of the Past in Buddhist Paintings from Nara during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009), 51-70.

¹⁸² Kameda Tsutomu, “Nara jidai no soshizō to Kusha mandara zu,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 1 (August 1948): 45-47; Morse, “The Invention,” 61; Taniguchi Kōsei, “Kusha mandara to Tenpyō fukko,” in *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 1: Yōshiki ron: sutairu to modo no bunseki*, ed. Hayashi On (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2012), 142-145.

¹⁸³ For discussion of these sculptures, see Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji*, 85-91.

They were arranged encircling the Buddha Shaka in the Saikondō. When Chikamichi visited the hall in the twelfth century, he described that these sculptures stood as if they were practicing the ritual of circumambulation.¹⁸⁴

Another example is the illustrations of the ten monks in an embroidery known as *Kajūji shūbutsu* dated to the late seventh or early eighth century.¹⁸⁵ These ten monks are arranged into a circle, five on each side, standing in front of the central icon who has been identified as either Shaka, Miroku, or King Udayana. Some monks carry objects such as incense burners and a plate with food while others hide their hands inside their robes or cross all their fingers together. These figures, identified as offertory images, are shown guiding a group of twelve lay Buddhists to make offerings to the central icon.¹⁸⁶

These eighth-century images of monk are similar to the Nan'endō patriarch paintings in that both show the monks in standing postures, forming a circular layout, and holding various objects in the hands. These commonalities suggest that the eight patriarch paintings should have had their prototypes in the Nara period. Although there had been memorial rituals held for deceased monks in this period, Satō Michiko points out that the treatment of “*soshi*” as a sectarian concept was not established until after the mid-ninth century.¹⁸⁷ Therefore, it is hard to consider that these eight patriarch paintings were made to delineate the sectarian lineages of the Tendai, Shingon, and Hossō Buddhist teachings. Rather, they were likely to indicate adoration toward Buddhist teachings as expressed by their hand-held objects such as incense burners and

¹⁸⁴ *Shichi daiji*, 49.

¹⁸⁵ For the study on the identity of these figures, see Hida Romi, “Kajūji shūbutsu saikō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 212 (March 1994): 75-80.

¹⁸⁶ Hida, “Kajūji,” 68-69.

¹⁸⁷ Satō Michiko, “Soshie no shiteki kenkyū,” *Geinō no kagaku* 9 (March 1978): 21-24.

sutra boxes. Their standing postures and circular layout may have likewise possessed a similar meaning, signifying the act of devotion such as circumambulation, which was conducted by walking around icons or stupas.

The grouping of the patriarchs from the Tendai, Shingon, and Hossō Buddhist schools within a single space was unprecedented. It is not surprising that the image of Xuanzang was selected as part of the group since Kōfukuji was the headquarters of Hossō Buddhism and the clan temple of the Northern Fujiwara family. The other seven patriarch paintings probably resulted from Fuyutsugu's interactions and Kōfukuji's connections with contemporary religious figures such as Saichō (767-822) and Kūkai. Paul Groner suggests that Saichō may have attended a debate chaired by Fuyutsugu at Kōfukuji in 813 and if so, they would have known each other by this time.¹⁸⁸ In addition, Fuyutsugu was one of the biggest supporters of the monk, aiding him in the establishment of Enryakuji, which is the headquarters of Tendai Buddhism on Mt. Hiei.¹⁸⁹ Given his close relationship with the Emperor Saga, Fuyutsugu may have known Kūkai in the early 800s through the emperor, who admired the monk's literary ability and in 809 asked him to write calligraphy on two folding screens.¹⁹⁰ As Ono's study indicates that Fuyutsugu may have seen the five Shingon patriarch paintings around 821 that were brought back by Kūkai from China, he should have known the monk by this time.¹⁹¹

The inclusive religious milieu of Nara in the early ninth century also contributed to the creation of the eight patriarch paintings in the Nan'endō. In 810, Kūkai was appointed as the

¹⁸⁸ Paul Groner, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School* (Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley, 1984), 88.

¹⁸⁹ Groner, *Saichō*, 162-164.

¹⁹⁰ Yoshito Hakeda, *Kūkai: Major Works Translated, with An Account of His Life and A Study of His Thought* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1972), 39.

¹⁹¹ Ono, "Kōfukuji," 59-63.

superintendent (*bettō*) of Tōdaiji. This appointment allowed him to build up relationships with priests in Nara, such as Shūen 修圓 (769-835) who was from Kōfukuji and became the abbot of the temple in 822.¹⁹² It is unclear when Shūen got to know Kūkai, but likely corresponded with him as early as 813.¹⁹³ Shūen was representative of Buddhist clergy living in early ninth-century Nara. In addition to studying Hossō Buddhism, he took interest in the new Buddhist teachings that Kūkai and Saichō transmitted from China in 805 and 806, and formed relationships with these two monks.¹⁹⁴ As Abe Ryūichi argues, the Nara monasteries, known as the Six Nara Schools, studied a wide range of Buddhist doctrines at the time and did not present strong sectarian inclinations as they did in the later periods of time.¹⁹⁵

On the one hand the eight patriarch paintings demonstrated the efforts of the Northern Fujiwara family to venerate eminent monks and sponsor various Buddhist teachings, which in turn earned them merit as well as respect. On the other hand, the paintings displayed social capital of the family, showing their close relationship with different religious groups. Yet, the depictions of the patriarchs from different Buddhist schools may have had another function, which is revealed in the context of commemorative performances discussed below.

¹⁹² *Kōfukuji bettō shidai* 興福寺別当次第, in *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969), 709-710. For a discussion of Shūen's life, see Sherry Fowler, *Murōji: Rearranging Art and History at a Japanese Buddhist Temple* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), 44-45.

¹⁹³ Ryūichi Abe, *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 239-240, xv (see entry 813).

¹⁹⁴ Groner, *Saichō*, 35; Fowler, *Murōji*, 45-46.

¹⁹⁵ Abe, *The Weaving*, 34-55.

Ritualizing Piety, Death, and Memory

In 817 Fuyutsugu initiated the memorial ritual Hokke-e 法華会 in the Nan'endō for his deceased father Uchimaro.¹⁹⁶ The ritual was a series of lectures on the eight fascicles of the *Lotus Sutra* and was performed day and night for seven days in a row, from the thirtieth day of the ninth month to the sixth day of the tenth month—Uchimaro's death anniversary. In addition, the Hokke-e was carried out in a format of combined lectures and debates. Participants included lecturers (*kōji* 講師), who offered the expositions on the sutras, auditors (*chōju* 聴衆), who were monastic officials and attendees, and five debaters (*ryūgisha* 堅/立義者), who answered questions regarding Buddhist doctrine.¹⁹⁷ Therefore, in addition to praying for Uchimaro's salvation, the ritual was held to promote Buddhist teachings at Kōfukuji. Other activities were likely to take place during the performance of the Hokke-e as well, such as recitation of sutras, offerings of incenses, prayers for departed spirits, transference of merit, and veneration of the Three Treasures.¹⁹⁸ The family set aside some revenue from their estate Shikatanoshō 鹿田庄 to cover the costs of the ritual.¹⁹⁹ Because of this funding, the ritual continued to be held regularly after Fuyutsugu's death. According to Ono, the scale of the Hokke-e and its content remained almost unchanged throughout the Heian period.²⁰⁰ Also, by the end of the eleventh century,

¹⁹⁶ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; *Kōfukuji engi*, 322. For the study of this Hokke-e, see Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 240-252. *Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji* 興福寺年中行事, written in the late Kamakura period, is another historical text that provides a glimpse into this ritual. For this, see “*Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji*,” *Yamato bunka kenkyū* 13, no. 1 (1968): 27.

¹⁹⁷ *Kōfukuji engi*, 322. The entry to Hokke-e in *Kōfukuji engi* refers to *kōji* as “*kōshō* 講匠 (masters of lectures).”

¹⁹⁸ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 252-268.

¹⁹⁹ *Kōfukuji engi*, 322.

²⁰⁰ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 248.

participation in the Hokke-e as debaters became prerequisite for Kōfukuji monks to gain access to the Yuima-e, the most important ceremony of the temple.²⁰¹

One can imagine that while the Hokke-e was held, the interior of the Nan'endō was enlivened with an integration of visual images, ceremonial sounds, and bodily movement. With these sensory elements, the ritual brought the performance of *tsuizen kuyō* 追善供養 into a climax. As a practice that already existed in Indian Buddhism, *tsuizen kuyō* is a form of offerings (*kuyō*; Skt. *pūja*) and is often translated as “memorial services,” but has a more complex meaning tied to the Buddhist notion of merit.²⁰² The practice of *tsuizen kuyō* is based on the idea that the living can accumulate merit and confer it on the dead by making offerings such as food, sutras, images, rituals, buildings, and so on to the Three Treasures of Buddhism. In other words, the practice involves religious offerings and devotion to Buddhism, and transference of merit (*ekō* 廻向; Skt. *pariṇāmanā*) to the deceased, which usually takes place toward the end of memorial rituals.²⁰³ Because *tsuizen kuyō* is conducted by the living on the behalf of the dead, it has been a significant way to show filial piety and an integral part of ancestral commemoration. As a ritual performance of *tsuizen kuyō*, the Hokke-e empowered the acts of offerings and activated the transaction of merit from the living to the dead.

Viewing the Nan'endō and its images in the context of *tsuizen kuyō*, one realizes that they were not merely material offerings, but also engines of merit-making. As Nagaoka Ryūsaku shows, offertory images in China were expected to make continuous offerings to deities on the

²⁰¹ Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993-2014). *Chūyūki*, Jōtoku 2.10.12. (4: 72-73).

²⁰² For discussion of *tsuizen kuyō*, see Fujiki Masao, “Nihonjin no senzo kuyōkan no tenkai,” in *Bukkyō minzokugaku taikei 4*, ed. Fujiki Masao (Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1988), 89-106.

²⁰³ Fujiki, “Nihonjin,” 95.

behalf of donors, praying for their benefits and showing their religious piety.²⁰⁴ In other words, predicated on their material property and visual forms, offertory images can continuously perform acts of devotion and accumulate merit even when donors no longer exist. While no records tell of specifically how the six monk sculptures in the Nan'endō functioned, Ono contends that they were created to symbolically pray for the salvation of Uchimaro as actual monks who participated in the Hokke-e.²⁰⁵ Also, because Zenju and Genpin were the eminent priests who mastered the skills of prayers, Ono considers that their sculptures in the Nan'endō would have increased the efficacy of the memorial ritual. The eight patriarch paintings may likewise have functioned in a similar way, showing reverence toward Fukūkenjaku Kannon and accumulating merit for Uchimaro's felicity.

It is obvious that images of monks had a prominent place in the visual program of the Nan'endō. I contend that their conspicuous presence had to do with the conduct of *tsuizen kuyō* as prescribed in the story of Mokuren 目連 (Ch. Mulian) from *Urabonkyō*. The story tells that Mokuren's mother was reborn as a hungry ghost, and all of the efforts he made to offer her food were in vain. Mokuren then asked help from the Buddha, who said to him:

'Your mother's sins are grave; there is nothing that you as a single individual can do about it. You must rely on the mighty spiritual power of the assembled monks of the ten directions: for the sake of seven generations of ancestors and those in distress, you should gather [food] of the one hundred flavors and five kinds of fruit, place it in a bowl, and offer it to those of great virtue of the ten directions.' The Buddha decreed that the assembly of monks should chant prayers on behalf of seven generations of ancestors of the donor, that they should practice meditation and concentrate their thoughts, and then receive the food. At this time, Mu-lien's mother gained release from all of sufferings as a hungry ghost. Mu-lien told the Buddha 'Future disciples of the Buddha who practice filial devotion must also carry out the yu-lan-pen offering.' The Buddha said 'wonderful.'"²⁰⁶

²⁰⁴ Nagaoka, "Ontame no," 16-17.

²⁰⁵ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 262-263, 266-273.

²⁰⁶ Moriya Misuo, *Chūgoku ko saijiki no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Teikoku Shoin, 1963), 359-361; Teiser, "Ghosts," 47-48. This passage is from *Jingchu suishiji* 荆楚歲時記 (*Record of Seasonal Observances in Jingchu*)

As scholars points out, the story conveys the idea that it would be of little or no help to the salvific status of the dead if offerings are made directly to them.²⁰⁷ Also, to conduct *tsuizen kuyō* by laypeople alone is discouraged, and only by making offerings to the Buddha and “relying on the mighty spiritual power of the assembled monks” could suffering of the dead be alleviated and filial piety of the living be fulfilled. As early as the seventh century, the Japanese ruling class had followed the prescription given in *Urabonkyō*, repaying kindness to their ancestors and deceased parents through dedication of images, sutras, and rituals to Buddhist temples.²⁰⁸ Therefore, the story may explain why the Northern Fujiwara family gathered the images of the patriarchs from the Shingon, Tendai, and Hossō Buddhist schools. The images were depicted to assure and enhance the efficacy of the offerings (the dedication of the Nan’endō and performance of the Hokke-e) that the family made on the behalf of their ancestors. Also, the images may have symbolically functioned as the recipients of these offerings.

In his groundbreaking book *The Rites of Passage*, Arnold van Gennep observed that in human cultures there are rites that accompany changes of life or states: birth, coming-of-age, marriage, and death.²⁰⁹ Such rites mark a transitional period of time when individuals or groups move from one place to another, enter adulthood from adolescence, become a member of a

written by the Chinese monk Zong Lin (ca. 498-561) and is based on *Urabonkyō*. The translation is by Stephen Teiser.

²⁰⁷ Teiser, “Ghosts,” 49; Smith, *Ancestor*, 16-17.

²⁰⁸ Smith, *Ancestor*, 15-16, 19; Takeda Chōshū, “Shichisei fubo kō,” in *Sōsō bōsei kenkyū shūsei 3*, ed. Takeda Chōshū (Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1979), 45-65. *Obon* was one of the occasions that this kind of offerings took place. According to Robert Smith, it was not until the end of the twelfth century that people made offerings directly to ancestors rather than priests in the *obon* festival. In addition, it is often to see in votive inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries that such offerings were made for the benefits of “my fathers and mothers of the seven generations (*shichisei fubo* 七世父母).”

²⁰⁹ Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

society or club, and traverse from life to death. Van Gennep proposed three sub-stages in these rites of passage: separation, transition (margin), and incorporation (aggregation), and each of these stages are marked by three rites, preliminal, liminal, and postliminal. When the passage of individuals or groups from one realm to another takes place, they would have to leave their previous world. This period of time is what Van Gennep called “separation.” Then, they travel through a stage of “transition” in which they have no clear rank or identity until they reach the next one “incorporation.” In this last period, they join a new social structure that assigns them a stable and clearly-defined status. Applying Van Gennep’s scheme of rites of passage, we can interpret the Hokke-e as the ceremony of “transition” as well as “incorporation” for the Northern Fujiwara clan.

The ritual unified various components—space, time, and images—into an ensemble that further established a liminal stage, one that blurred the boundary between the living and the dead, divine and human, and clergy and laity. In this stage, segregated from their current state of life, the living gathered together, witnessed the dedication of the Hokke-e and transference of merit, and imagined the passage of the dead from death, rebirth to ultimate enlightenment. This stage also brought out “incorporation” or what Victor Turner called “*communitas*,” which is defined as an undifferentiated structure or a communion of equal individuals.²¹⁰ During the performance of the Hokke-e, all of the Northern Fujiwara family members assumed an equal status as descendants. Coming together for Uchimarō’s welfare, they may share their recollection of him, feel linked to the family, and reconfirmed their places in the kinship relationship.

In the meantime, they did not simply remember Uchimarō and recollect his life events, but also created family memories, forming a common image of their past and a shared value of

²¹⁰ Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1969), 96-97.

community. Through a series of commemorative practices that involved visual production, architectural construction, epigraphic writing, and ritual performance, the family showed how significant memory of their past patriarchs was to their present prosperity and future lives. This memory, however, would disappear if it only stayed in the minds of the family. As Pierre Nora remarks “memory attaches itself to sites,”²¹¹ the Nan’endō and its images provided an anchor and a board on which memory of the family was fastened and inscribed. When the Northern Fujiwara thought about and told of their experiences of commemoration, they thought and told of what they saw and felt in the space. The visual aspects of the Nan’endō and sensory effects of the Hokke-e allowed them to construct a narrative of their past and develop a memorable image of the moment. Therefore, on the one hand, the visual space of the Nan’endō and its Buddhist images served as a means to construct memory of the departed family members, while on the other hand became parts of such memory. The space and the ritual created a sanctuary where memory became crystalized, death found a refuge, and piety was manifest.

Conclusion

By examining the political circumstances of the early ninth century, inscription of the bronze lantern, and history of the Fujiwara clan in the eighth and early centuries, I propose that the Northern Fujiwara family built the Nan’endō to re-enshrine the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in order to commemorate ancestors and demonstrate their superiority over the other Fujiwara lineages after the Kusuko Incident. These two purposes were interrelated and had to do with the notion of *sekizen yokei*, according to which meritorious deeds of one generation will generate abundant blessings to another. Like their forebears Nakamaro and Empress Kōmyō, the Northern

²¹¹ Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire,” *Representations* no. 26 (Spring, 1989): 22.

Fujiwara family may have attributed their current political success to the good works of their ancestors and wanted to pay the kindness through the construction of the Nan'endō and enshrinement of the Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which was associated with the first two patriarchs of the clan. Uchimaro was very likely the initiator of the project, but passed away before the completion of the Nan'endō in 813. Because of his untimely death, the family may have changed the main beneficiary of the hall from previous patriarchs to Uchimaro.

By discussing the origin of *endō* and exploring other octagonal structures made in the seventh and eighth centuries, this chapter shows that the architectural features of the Nan'endō were intended to signify the eminence of ancestors and mark their presence in the world. In addition, the Nan'endō may have been imagined as a place where spirits of the dead resided temporarily and received merit dedicated by the living. Lastly, given that the shape of octagon was association with sacred power and supernatural beings, the hall was a place charged with an aura of sacredness.

Through the analyses of travel accounts, temple records, and relevant images, I reconstruct the visual program of the Nan'endō, showing that the hall contained sculptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Four Guardian Kings, and six monks with four as offertory images and two as the portraits of Zenju and Genpin, as well as eight paintings of the patriarchs from the Tendai, Shingon, and Hossō Buddhist schools. Through their gestures, postures, and hand-held objects, the six monk sculptures and eight patriarch paintings communicated religious piety and material offerings made by the living on the behalf of the dead. These monk images were to ensure, enhance, and perpetuate the efficacy of the Hokke-e. In addition, the form and iconography of the interior images were indebted more to artistic tradition of the Nara period than that of the Heian period.

The architecture of the Nan'endō, its interior images, and bronze lantern altogether constitute an ensemble that integrated religious devotion and ancestral commemoration. The performance of the Hokke-e activated the salvific function of the ensemble and turned it into a liminal space in which the family developed a sense of *communitas*, unifying the living and the dead into a single kinship group. Moreover, the ritual and icons along with their architectural setting gave form to the family's past and transformed the Nan'endō into a site of memory.

Chapter Three

Transforming Memories:

The Emergence of the Nan'endō as a Miraculous Site in the Mid-Eleventh Century

Introduction

In his essay “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin,” the renowned art historian Alois Riegl proposes that a building is “deliberate” at the moment of its creation but can become an “unintentional” monument with the passage of time—at least numerous generations after its inception.¹ By this proposition, Riegl means that while a monument is initially intended to be a memorial by its creator, it can later obtain unintended significance as a work of art, a historical artifact, or an object of cultural heritage. Therefore, in his view, monuments possess a transitory character and can turn into something whose meaning goes beyond the original designation. In a similar vein, the Nan'endō, which continued to interact with its surrounding social environment, resisted being a memorial alone. As historical records show, the hall took on a new role—a miraculous site—beginning in the mid-eleventh century, one that people considered gave rise to the prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara clan for centuries. This chapter investigates the process in which the Nan'endō was transformed from a memorial for mourning into a miraculous site for generating success, and the sociopolitical implications behind this changed character.

¹ Alois Riegl, “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin,” in *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, ed. Nicholas Stanley Price, Mansfield Kirby Talley, and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro (Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 1996), 72.

The first part of the chapter explores the extent to which the Northern Fujiwara interacted with the Nan'endō during the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century. It also raises a question of why the hall did not fade away with the demise of its initiator and passage of time. In answering these inquiries, I analyze diaries written by clan members, examine construction of *ujidera* (family temples), and discuss division of the kinship organization that occurred after the late ninth century. I also explore the relationship between the material form of the Nan'endō and transformation of its religious meaning. I conclude that multiple factors, such as physical presence of architecture, changes in familial structures, and practices of ancestral commemorations, sustained the connection between the hall and the Northern Fujiwara clan.

The second part of the chapter begins with discussion of the historical background in which the hall became a sacred place tied to the welfare of the Northern Fujiwara clan. It then analyzes the Nan'endō *setsuwa* (anecdotal tales),² arguing that they recast the hall as a repository of collective memories on the one hand, while demonstrated the sanctity of the site on the other. Another focus of this section is concerned with the replications of the hall, three cases of which are discussed. By positioning these copies of the Nan'endō within the history of the family, I show that in addition to expressing religious piety, they were made to honor ancestors of the family and construct familial authority.

² The word “*setsuwa*” was coined in modern Japan to refer to anecdotal literature such as the *Nihon ryōiki* and *Konjaku monotagari shū*. This literary genre encompasses a wide range of works in both oral and written forms. Generally speaking, *setsuwa* tales are very brief narratives, often surround a specific theme, and contain didactic meanings. For the definition of *setsuwa* and discussion of its use as a literature genre, see Michelle Osterfeld Li, *Ambiguous Bodies: Reading the Grotesque in Japanese Setsuwa Tales* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 14-30.

The Nan'endō after the Early Ninth Century

After the early ninth century, the Northern Fujiwara family utilized the Nan'endō to memorialize other family members besides Fujiwara no Uchimaro (756-812), whose memorial service Hokke-e (Assembly on the *Lotus Sutra*) was initiated in 817 by Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu (775-826) as discussed in Chapter Two. In 846, Fujiwara no Yoshifusa 藤原良房 (804-872) initiated the ritual Chōkō-e 長講会 (Long Lecture Assembly) at Kōfukuji to commemorate his parents Fuyutsugu and Fujiwara no Mitsuko 藤原美都子 (791-828).³ The ritual took place for forty days from the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month to the fourth day of the ninth month.⁴ The opening and closing dates marked the death anniversaries of Fuyutsugu and Mitsuko. Since the Chōkō-e lasted for several days in a row, it focused on the lectures of the all Buddhist canon (*issaikyō* 一切經) rather than one specific scripture. It is unclear about how the ritual was conducted at this time, but a late Kamakura-period (1185-1333) text *Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji* 興福寺年中行事 (Annual Event Calendar of Kōfukuji) shows that it was held in the Nan'endō on the first and last days, and was performed in the Lecture Hall on the other thirty-eight days.⁵ Initially Yoshifusa and his daughter Fujiwara no Meishi 藤原明子 (828-900) funded the ceremony, but

³ *Kōfukuji engi*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 322-323. For discussion of the Chōkō-e, see Satō Kenji, *Chūsei kenmon no seiritsu to kasei* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000), 133-134.

⁴ According to *Kōfukuji engi*, Fuyutsugu died on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month in 826. However, other sources like *Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji*, compiled in the Kamakura period, indicate that the Chōkō-e began on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month. *Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji*, *Yamato bunka kenkyū* 12, no. 12 (1967): 36; Yoneda Yūsuke et al., *Shin sekkanke den*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1995), 11.

⁵ *Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji*, 36.

after both died, whether it could be continued was at stake.⁶ Recognizing this issue, Fujiwara no Yoshiyo 藤原良世 (823-900) and other family members designated that each year a certain amount of the revenue from the fiefs left by Uchimaro as well as the clan's estate Shikatanoshō 鹿田庄 were allotted to pay for the costs of the ritual.⁷ Because of this financial support, the Chōkō-e along with the Hokke-e became events that were held regularly in the Nan'endō.

Nevertheless, as Satō Kenji's study shows, these two ceremonies were not on the event calendar (*nenjū gyōji*) of the *sekkanke* (House of Regents), and nor were they part of the religious activities that the family attended annually and regularly.⁸ This poses questions of whether the family still held the Nan'endō in high esteem after Yoshifusa's generation, and the extent to which they participated in activities related to the building prior to the mid-eleventh century. A search of diaries written by the family members, such as *Teishinkōki* 貞信公記 (907-948), *Shōyūki* 小右記 (978-1032), *Midō Kanpakuki* 御堂関白記 (998-1021), *Shunki* 春記 (1026-1054), and *Gonki* 権記 (991-1017) indicates that the family made offerings such as ritual banners and lamps to the Nan'endō, but these offerings only took place a few times.⁹ The family

⁶ *Kōfukuji engi*, 323.

⁷ *Kōfukuji engi*, 323.

⁸ Satō, *Chūsei kenmon*, 107-147, 150-158.

⁹ Fujiwara no Sukefusa, *Shunki*, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vol. 7 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965); Fujiwara no Sanesuke, *Shōyūki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-11 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1959-1986). *Shunki*, Eishō 3.2.24 (327); *Shōyūki*, 1.9.5 (1: 232). The bibliographic information for each entry below includes titles, reign year, month, and day, which are then followed by a bracket that shows volume and page number. The same rule will be applied to other historical texts. Although it does not include all of the diaries, the database *Sekkanki kokiroku* 撰関期古記録 (The Ancient Records of the Period of the Fujiwara Regency) provided by International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) is very useful in searching records concerning the life of the Northern Fujiwara clan. International Research Center for Japanese Studies, *Sekkanki kokiroku*, <http://db.nichibun.ac.jp/ja/category/heian-diaries.html> [accessed August 23, 2016].

also ordered the recitation of sutras to be performed in the hall multiple times.¹⁰ However, most of these scriptural readings were sponsored by Fujiwara no Sanesuke 藤原実資 (957-1046), a descendent from the Ono no Miya 小野宮 branch of the Northern Fujiwara clan. Taking these records altogether, one can say that only a few members of the clan took interest in making extra offerings to and holding additional activities in the hall. It seems that while the Nan'endō remained in the memories of the family, its engagement with their lives was limited during the tenth to mid-eleventh century.

One may then wonder why the Nan'endō did not fall into oblivion, but instead emerged as a miraculous site. As demonstrated below, three factors sustained the connection between the hall and the Northern Fujiwara clan: (1) the culture of commemoration in the family; (2) the change of the familial structure; (3) the physicality of the building.

Construction of *Ujidera* and Culture of Commemoration

After the mid-ninth century, generations of the Northern Fujiwara built their own family temples or memorial sites in and around Heiankyō (present-day Kyoto), such as Hosshōji, Hōkōji, Hōjōji, Byōdōin, and among others.¹¹ Many of these *ujidera* were magnificent, filled with splendid images and occupying huge precincts. Because there were many of these sites, it is

¹⁰ *Shōyūki*, Kankō 2.1.9 (2: 87), *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 3.1.11 (3: 176), *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 5.1.10 (4: 123), *Shōyūki*, Kannin 3.1.11 (5: 103), *Shōyūki*, Jian 3.1.10 (6: 138), *Shōyūki*, Chōgen 3.9.23 (8: 199), *Shōyūki*, Chōgen 3.9.27 (8: 201), *Shōyūki*, Chōgen 4.1.9 (8: 213); Minamoto Tsuneyori, *Sakeiki* 左経記, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vol. 6 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). *Sakeiki*, Manju 3.9.24 (188), *Sakeiki*, Manju 3.10.1 (188), *Sakeiki*, Chōgen 1.12.11 (255), *Sakeiki*, Chōgen 8.6.16 (418). Only in few cases we know the purposes of these sutra readings. One case from *Shōyūki* indicates that the performance was to placate calamities, and the other three cases from *Sakeiki* were all for the purpose of safe childbirth.

¹¹ For the study on the *ujidera* of the Northern Fujiwara clan, see Sugiyama Nobuzō, *Fujiwara no ujidera so no inge* (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 1968); Sugiyama Nobuzō, *Inge kenchiku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981), 277-486.

impossible to discuss each of them. I thus give a few examples below and categorize them into two groups: those for the *sekkanke* and those for other lineages of the clan. Through this investigation, we will grasp the development of memorial culture in the family and understand how such a development was related to the Nan'endō.

Family Temples for the Sekkanke

Gokurakuji

Fujiwara no Mototsune 藤原基経 (836-891), who was Yoshifusa's successor, commissioned the construction of Gokurakuji 極楽寺 sometime during his lifetime, but he died in 891 before its completion. His son Fujiwara no Tokihira 藤原時平 (871-909) overtook the construction work, and by 899, the temple had been equipped with basic facilities, fulfilling the need of worship.¹² Evidence shows that the family utilized Gokurakuji as a place to hold memorial services for Mototsune and pray for his afterlife salvation.¹³ The family also commemorated him through other kinds of Buddhist patronage. In 941, one of Mototsune's another sons, Fujiwara no Tadahira 藤原忠平 (880-949) dedicated the entire Buddhist cannon to Gokurakuji and copied sixteen scrolls of the *Lotus Sutra* on the behalf of his deceased parents.¹⁴ Moreover, he asked not only family members, but also other non-Fujiwara courtiers to attend the

¹² It is unknown how many buildings were erected at the temple by 899. But the family petitioned to make it a registered temple (*jōgakuji* 定額寺) in the same year. Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 319.

¹³ Fujiwara no Tadahira, *Teishinkōki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vol. 8 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1956); *Rihōōki* 吏部王記, in *Shiyō sanshū* (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1974). *Teishinkōki*, Enchō 3.11.20 (106), *Rihōōki*, Jōhei 2. 3.27 (61).

¹⁴ *Honchō seiki* 本朝世紀, in *Kokushi taiki*, vol. 9 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964). *Honchō seiki*, Tengyō 4, 8.26 (9: 54-57). The votive text for the *issaikyō* dedication, see *Honchō seiki*, Tengyō 4.8.26 (9: 57).

dedication ceremony, turning the event into a stage to demonstrate the prestige of his household. In addition to serving as a memorial site, Gokurakuji was a funerary place to inter the ashes of Mototsune's third son Fujiwara no Nakahira 藤原仲平 (875-945).¹⁵ In all, Gokurakuji served as the ceremonial center for the household of Mototsune, whose successor Tadahira nonetheless founded another temple for his own use.

Hosshōji 法性寺

Between 923 and 931, Tadahira erected Hosshōji in the southwest of the capital. The function of the temple resembled that of Gokurakuji. After Tadahira died, his ashes were interred in the proximity of the temple, and memorial services were held there to pray for his welfare.¹⁶ His grandson Fujiwara no Koretada 藤原伊尹 (924-972) initiated the Hokke Hakkō 法華八講 in 970, which was a series of the eight lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*, and according to Satō, was performed regularly during the rest of the Heian period.¹⁷ Hosshōji also served as a place where the family celebrated Tadahira's birthday.¹⁸ One record in *Teishikōki* tells specifically of how the celebration was conducted. In 939, when Tadahira turned sixty, his son Fujiwara no Morosuke 藤原師輔 (908-960) celebrated his birthday by holding Buddhist rituals at Hōsshōji, dedicating Buddhist icons, copying and reading sutras, and chanting the name of the Buddha.¹⁹ While

¹⁵ *Teishinkōki*, Tengyō 8. 9. 5 (221), *Teishinkōki*, Tengyō 8. 9. 7 (221).

¹⁶ *Nihon kiryaku (kōhen)*, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965). *Nihon kiryaku*, Tenryaku 3.8.18 (11: 65), *Nihon kiryaku*, Tenryaku 3.10.2 (11: 66), *Nihon kiryaku*, Tenroku 1.8.9 (11: 117).

¹⁷ *Nihon kiryaku*, Tenroku 1.8.9 (11: 117); Satō, *Chūsei kenmon*, 131.

¹⁸ *Nihon kiryaku*, Enchō 7.9.17 (11: 29), *Nihon kiryaku*, Tengyō 2.8.20 (11: 38), *Nihon kiryaku*, Tenryaku 3.3.15 (11: 62).

Hosshōji was built primarily for Tadahira, it was also utilized to commemorate other family members such as Morosuke, his daughter Fujiwara no Anshi (927-964), and others.²⁰

Hosshōji remained important to Tadahira's descendants. Generations of regents continued to expand its precinct by creating new Buddhist halls and even established their own residences on the ground.²¹ While Hosshōji had assumed an important position in the *sekkanke* for centuries, in the 1240s, Fujiwara no Michiie 藤原道家 (1193-1252) converted it into Tōfukuji, which later became a prominent Zen temple.

Hōjōji 法成寺

After taking tonsure in 1019, Fujiwara no Michinaga (966-1028), one of the most powerful statesmen in the Heian period, established Hōjōji as his residential cloister for the practice of Buddhism. Located in the land between the present-day Kyoto Municipal Hospital and the Imperial Palace, the temple contained numerous halls organized around a beautiful lake and enshrined a variety of Buddhist icons made from luxurious materials.²² Hōjōji no longer exists, but we know that the first structure built there was an Amida Hall called Muryōjuin, which was consecrated in 1020 and enshrined nine monumental sculptures of Amida Buddha. Michinaga died there in 1027 facing the nine Amida images with hands holding cords attached to the

¹⁹ *Teishikōki*, Tenryō 2.12.25 (197).

²⁰ *Nihon kiryaku*, Tendoku 2.6.4 (11: 73), *Nihon kiryaku*, Tendoku 4.6.22 (11: 79), *Nihon kiryaku*, Kōhō 1.6.17 (11: 93), *Nihon kiryaku*, Kōhō 2.4.24 (11: 95), *Nihon kiryaku*, Kōhō 2.4.27 (11: 95), *Nihon kiryaku*, Kanwa 1.8.2 (11: 155).

²¹ Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 346-355.

²² For the building history of Hōjōji, see Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 375-439.

icons.²³ After the erection of Golden Hall and Godaidō (The Hall of the Five Great Myōō) in 1022, Michinaga changed the name of the temple from Muryōjuin to Hōjōji. A few years before his death in 1027, Michinaga dedicated an ordination platform for his wife Minamoto no Rinshi 源倫子 (964-1053) and his daughter Fujiwara no Shōshi 藤原彰子 (988-1074) to receive precepts and take orders.²⁴ In order to concentrate on their spiritual pursuit, Rinshi and Shōshi respectively erected the Northwestern and Northeastern Cloisters in 1021 and 1030 to serve as their residences at Hōjōji.²⁵

After Michinaga's death, the temple became a site for his memory. On the first death anniversary of Michina in 1028, his son Fujiwara no Yorimichi 藤原頼通 (992-1074) donated a number of Buddhist scriptures to the temple.²⁶ This act of commemoration seemed to have become family tradition at this time. As early as the ninth century, Fuyutsugu dedicated copies of the *Lotus Sutra*, *Muryōgikyō* 無量義經 (Skt. *Amitartha-sūtra*), and *Fugen kyō* 普賢經 to the Nan'endō probably in conjunction with the performance of the Hokke-e in 817 for the salvation of Uchimarō.²⁷ One shall remember that Tadahira also made offerings of sutras to Gokurakuji for

²³ William H. McCullough and Helen Craig McCullough, trans., *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes: Annals of Japanese Aristocratic Life in the Heian Period*, vol. 2 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980), 762-763.

²⁴ Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 410-411.

²⁵ Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 394-395, 415.

²⁶ *Shōyūki*, Chōgen 1.11.4 (8: 105-106).

²⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 20. *Fugen kyō* 普賢經 is the abbreviated name of the sutra *Kan Fugen Bosatsu gyōbō kyō* 觀普賢菩薩行法經. This sutra is also known as *Kan Fugen kyō* 觀普賢經 and *Fugenkan kyō* 普賢觀經. Charles Muller, “*Kan Fugen Bosatsu gyōbō kyō* 觀普賢菩薩行法經,” Digital Dictionary of Buddhism, [http://buddhism-dict.net.www2.lib.ku.edu/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?89.xml+id\(%27b89c0-666e-8ce2-83e9-85a9-884c-6cd5-7d93%27\)](http://buddhism-dict.net.www2.lib.ku.edu/cgi-bin/xpr-ddb.pl?89.xml+id(%27b89c0-666e-8ce2-83e9-85a9-884c-6cd5-7d93%27)) [accessed September 11, 2018].

his father Mototsune in 941. Two years after Michinaga's death in 1029, the family held a splendid Hokke Jikkō 法華十講, which was a series of ten lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*.²⁸ After that year, the *sekkanke* continuously performed the shorter version of this ritual, Hokke Hakkō, until the end of the Heian period.²⁹ In addition, the family dedicated new buildings at Hōjōji in memory of Michinaga. For example, in 1079, his grandson Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101) commissioned the erection of two pagodas and other structures there. In the dedicatory text (*ganmon* 願文), Morozane expressed that the construction of these buildings would benefit the spirit of Michinaga and perpetuate the longevity of his family.³⁰ Through these commemorative activities, the *sekkanke* remembered Michinaga and tied their memories of him to the place of Hōjōji.

Family Temples for Other Lineages of the Northern Fujiwara Clan

Tōhokuin 東北院

Fujiwara no Saneyori 藤原実頼 (900-970) established Tōhokuin, a sub-temple located in the precinct of Hosshōji during his lifetime.³¹ The temple served as a place where his ashes were interred in 970. To signal Saneyori's position as the first patriarch of the Ono no Miya branch,

²⁸ *Ruijū zatsurei* 類聚雜例, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 29 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1959). Chōgen 2.11.30 (29: 271).

²⁹ Satō, *Chūsei kenmon*, 130-131.

³⁰ Fujiwara no Sanetsuna, "Hōjōji tō kuyō ganmon," in *Honchō zoku monzui*, vol. 29 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965), 214-216. It should be noted that the text was written by Fujiwara no Sanetsuna (1012-1082) on the behalf of Morozane.

³¹ For studies on the Tōhokuin, see Sugiyama, *Inge kenchiku*, 349; Fukutō Sanae, *Ie seiritsushi no kenkyū: sosen saishi, onna, kodomo* (Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 1991), 142-148.

his son Sanesuke frequently dedicated memorial rituals in his memory at Tōhokuin.³² Moreover, he added a banquet into the services and made it a regular event.³³ It is obvious that Sanesuke took memorial activities devoted to his father seriously. This attitude is evident by his critique of the absence of his nephew Fujiwara no Kintō 藤原公任 (d. 1041) in Saneyori's memorial service held in 1012.³⁴ Tōhokuin also served as a place to commemorate other family members in addition to Saneyori.³⁵ For example, Fujiwara no Sukehira 藤原資平 (986-1068) dedicated the Womb World and Diamond World mandalas, the *Lotus Sutra*, one scroll of the *Muryōgikyō*, and one scroll of *Kan Fugen kyō* to the temple on the forty-ninth day of Sanesuke's death.³⁶ As Fukutō Sanae points out, Tōhokuin was intended to function as a gathering place for the family and as a site to demonstrate power of their lineage.³⁷

Kajūji 勸修寺

The Emperor Daigo (885-930) founded Kajūji to commemorate his deceased mother Fujiwara no Inshi 藤原胤子 (d. 896), a descendant of the Northern Fujiwara clan.³⁸ While

³² *Shōyūki*, Shōryaku 4.5.18 (1: 278), *Shōyūki*, Kanwa 1.5.18 (1: 98), *Shōyūki*, Tengen 5.5.18 (1: 37), *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 1.5.18 (3: 24), *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 3.5.18 (3: 229).

³³ *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 1.5.18 (3: 24).

³⁴ *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 1.5.18 (3: 24).

³⁵ *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 4.6.24 (4: 52), *Shōyūki*, Chōwa 2.2.14 (3: 82). For discussion of this, see Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 145-146.

³⁶ Fujiwara no Sukehira, *Ōtame bōkō On no miya udaijin yonjūkyūnichi tsuizen*, in *Honchō zoku monzui*, vol. 29 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965), 231-233.

³⁷ Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 143.

³⁸ It is not clear exactly when he commissioned the construction of the temple. But in 905, it was designated as a registered temple (*jōgakujī*). Hashimoto Yoshihiko, *Heian kizoku shakai no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976), 288.

established by the imperial house, the temple was used as a private space for the Kajūji lineage of the clan, whose first patriarch was Inshi's father, Fujiwara no Takafuji 藤原高藤 (838-900). During the Engi era (901-923), Inshi's brother Fujiwara no Sadakata 藤原定方 (873-932) erected the Western Hall at Kajūji, marking the beginning of the temple as a ceremonial center for the Kajūji Northern Fujiwara.³⁹ On the forty-ninth day after Sadakata's death in 932, his wife and other family members ordered the recitation of sutras to be performed at the temple.⁴⁰ The family thereafter initiated the Hokke Hakkō for Sadakata sometime during the Tengyō era (938-947),⁴¹ and according to Kyōraku Mahoko, turned it into a regular activity for which the chieftains of the family took charge.⁴² Moreover, participation in this ritual seemed to be essential for claiming one's membership of the Kajūji lineage and adherence to this social group.⁴³ The temple continued to function as a memorial site after the generation of Sakatada and as a tie linking family members for centuries.

What Made the Nan'endō Distinctive?

The above discussion of *ujidera* of the Northern Fujiwara clan shows that they were utilized primarily as places to conduct memorial services for departed clan members. The dedication of scriptures was one of the prominent activities of commemoration. Moreover, it is

³⁹ *Kajūji monjo*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 83 (Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1965), 310; Hashimoto, *Heian kizoku*, 288.

⁴⁰ *Kajūji kyūki* 勸修寺旧記, in *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 27 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1984), 96.

⁴¹ *Kajūji kyūki*, 87.

⁴² Kyōraku Mahoko, "Heian jidai no ie to dera: Fujiwarashi no Gokurakuji, Kajūji o chūshin toshite," *Nihonshi kenkyū* 346 (1991): 18-20.

⁴³ Kyōraku, "Heian jidai no ie," 18.

common to see that the Northern Fujiwara held Hokke-e or its variants for the welfare of the departed family members and turned the rituals into regular events that gathered the families together and fostered communal ties. These *ujidera* were therefore not only for the purpose of memorialization, but also the signification of kinship relationship and formulation of group identity. It is thus possible that the Nan'endō remained connected to the Northern Fujiwara clan because of their continuous preoccupation with the commemoration of deceased family members and associated religious practices. Nevertheless, one may wonder why it was the Nan'endō that became identified as a site tied to the family's welfare and what distinguished the hall from other *ujidera*.

The Nan'endō was different from these *ujidera* discussed above in that the former was for the whole clan (*uji*) of the Northern Fujiwara while the latter was for various sub-lineages or households (*ie*) of the clan. This distinction had to do with changes in the structure of the family that occurred beginning from the late ninth to early tenth century. While several factors contributed to the changes, it suffices to say that because families naturally grew larger with the increase of their members, they would inevitably experience segmentations over the course of history.⁴⁴ The first division within the Fujiwara clan occurred after Fujiwara no Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659-720) died in 720, when his four sons Fujiwara no Fusasaki 藤原房前 (681-737), Fujiwara no Muchimaro 藤原武智麻呂 (680-737), Fujiwara no Umakai 藤原宇合 (694-737), and Fujiwara no Maro 藤原麻呂 (695-737) formed the four lineages of the clan: the Hokke 北家

⁴⁴ For discussion of the transformation of *uji* and emergence of *ie* in the Northern Fujiwara family, see Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 11-39; G. Cameron Hurst III, "The Structure of the Heian Court: Some Thoughts on the Nature of "Familial Authority" in Heian Japan," in *Medieval Japan: Essays in Institutional History*, ed. John W. Hall and Jeffrey P. Mass (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974), 43-45. It should be also noted that there are several levels of groups within a kinship organization with *uji* (clan) as the most inclusive one, followed by lineage, sub-lineage, and *ie* (household) that was the most basic unit.

(Northern House), Nanke 南家 (Southern House), Shikike 式家 (Ceremonial House), and Kyōke 京家 (Capital House). While these four branches continued to exist, the Northern Fujiwara assumed the leadership position of the clan beginning after the early ninth century as discussed in Chapters One and Two. The power of the family continued to grow in the following two centuries with the appointment of their leaders as the regents to the emperors and their monopolization over the post. As such, the regents and their heirs gradually formed a specific line of the Northern Fujiwara clan, the so-called *sekkanke*, while others who were not from the *sekkanke* established their own lineages, such as Ono no Miya, Kajūji, Kan'in 閑院, among others. These sub-lineages were composed of various households (*ie*) that at times competed with one another in seeking political power and economic resources. Such segmentation or the emergence of sub-lineages within the Northern Fujiwara clan took place beginning in the early regency of Mototsune and Tadahira.⁴⁵ Many historians have considered that the construction of *ujidera* within the clan reflected and partook of this restructuring of kinship organization.⁴⁶

In her study of the Ono no Miya family, Fukutō Sanae points out that Sanesuke had little interest in his grandfather Tadahira's memorial services at Hosshōji, but instead placed great importance on the participation of his father's at Tōhokuin.⁴⁷ She also notes that when Sanesuke attended the ritual Hokke Hakkō held for Michinaga's father Fujiwara no Kane'ie 藤原兼家

⁴⁵ Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 27.

⁴⁶ Kyōraku, "Heian jidai no ie," 1-25; Tanaka Risada, "Sosen saishi ni miru ie ishiki: uji kara ie e," *Nihon bungaku* 52, no. 7 (2003): 8-10; Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 140-148; Takahashi Hideki, "Chūsei zenki no sosen saishi to futatsu no ie," in *Nihon kazokushi ronshū 7: Shinzoku to sosen*, ed. Yoshie Akiko and Sasaki Junnosuke (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 166-182.

⁴⁷ Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 141-142.

(929-990) at Hōkōin 法興院 in 1022, he was arranged to seat in a place for “guests.”⁴⁸ In the case of the *sekkanke*, as the above and Satō’s study shows, the memorial services for a regent would usually take place in his own family temple.⁴⁹ For example, the ceremony for Tadahira was performed at Hosshōji rather than Gokurakuji, and that for Michinaga at Hōjōji instead of other *ujidera*. Furthermore, Satō observes that the *sekkanke* did not preside over memorial rituals held for patriarchs prior to Tadahira, who was regarded as the founder of the *sekkanke*.⁵⁰ Therefore, by Michinaga’s time, various sub-lineages of the Northern Fujiwara had formed their own kinship organizations and utilized *ujidera* to signal the distinction among different lineage groups.

In contrast, when the Nan’endō was created in 813, the Northern Fujiwara clan had not yet been divided into several branches. For this reason, it was the whole clan rather than individual households that took responsibility for the maintenance of the building and paid for the expenses of the Hokke-e and Chōkō-e.⁵¹ This relationship with the family sets the hall apart from Kōfukuji, which was for the Fujiwara clan, and from other *ujidera*, which were for sub-lineages of the Northern Fujiwara and individual households of the *sekkanke*. Because of this character, the hall could aptly serve as a monument to represent the *entire* clan as a single unit. Moreover, if one

⁴⁸ Fukutō, *Ie seiritsushi*, 144. *Shōyūki*, Chian 2.7.2 (6: 115).

⁴⁹ Satō, *Chūsei kenmon*, 121-136.

⁵⁰ Satō, *Chūsei kenmon*, 135.

⁵¹ This can be seen in *Zō Kōfukuji ki* 造興福寺記 (Records of Kōfukuji’s Construction), written in the twelfth century concerning the process in which Kōfukuji was rebuilt after its destruction by fire in 1046. The document lists the names of over three hundred members of the Fujiwara clan, who financed the reconstruction work from 1046 to 1048. In addition to clan members, the government allotted funds to pay for the restoration. *Zō Kōfukuji ki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 29-59. For discussion of this incident, see Kusaka Sakiko, “Heian makki no Kōfukuji—mitera kannen no seiritsu,” *Shimado* 28, (1970): 79-82.

aligns the Nan'endō created in 813 along with other *ujidera* built hereafter, a pattern of memorial performances emerges. Following the footsteps of Uchimaro and Fuyutsugu, their successors employed a series of similar strategies—the construction of Buddhist buildings/temples, dedication of scriptures, and performance of the Hokke-e or its variants such as the Hokke Hakkō (a series of eight lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*) and Hokke Jikkō (a series of ten lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*)⁵²—to commemorate the departed family members. It seems that the creation of the Nan'endō heralded a flourishing memorial culture in the Northern Fujiwara clan and therefore, the site best exemplified the family's tradition of honoring their ancestors. While this observation is made in hindsight, a historical text clearly shows that the family was aware of the familial tradition of constructing *ujidera* and of the value embodied by these memorial temples.

In 1005 Michinaga dedicated a temple called Jōmyōji 浄妙寺 to his ancestors at the family's gravesite in Kohata 木幡, Uji, which is located in present-day Kyoto Prefecture. Composed by Ōe Masahira (952-1012) on the behalf of Michinaga, the votive text for the consecration of the temple begins with a discussion of the reason for the construction of Jōmyōji, and then explains how the family could flourish for hundreds of years by enumerating chronologically the “innumerable” good deeds conducted by their ancestors—an array of family temples and their associated memorial rites.⁵³ In other words, Michinaga attributed the prosperity

⁵² The Hokke Hakkō was very popular in the Northern Fujiwara family, who held the ritual for various reasons. The family sometimes expanded the ritual into a series of ten lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*, the so-called Hokke Jikkō. For the study of the Hokke Hakkō and Hokke Jikkō, and their relationships with the Fujiwara clan, see Yamamoto Nobuyoshi, “Hokke Hakkō to Michinaga no sanjikkō jō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 77 (September 1970): 71-84; Yamamoto Nobuyoshi, “Hokke Hakkō to Michinaga no sanjikkō ge,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 78 (November 1970): 81-95. For English scholarship on the rituals, see Willa Tanabe, “The Lotus Lectures: Hokke Hakko in the Heian Period,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 39, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 393-407.

⁵³ Ōe Masahira, “I sadaijin kuyō Jōmyōji ganmon,” in *Honchō monzui, Honchōzoku monzui*, vol. 29 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965), 324-326. While the Nan'endō is not among the list given here, it

of the family to a series of meritorious acts that his ancestors had done. The ancestors mentioned in the text include the preceding six patriarchs prior to Michinaga, from Fuyutsugu, Yoshifusa, Mototsune, Tadahira, Morosuke to Kane'ie, and other important figures of the family such as Fuhito and Empress Kōmyō. By listing them, Kudō Miwako contends that Michinaga intended to honor his ancestors and demonstrate that he inherited their righteous deeds by constructing Jōmyōji.⁵⁴ The layout of the Buddhist structures along with the ancestors' names might have had another function of presenting a prestigious history of the family, and nothing could be better than these "good works." The Jōmyōji votive text provides valuable insights into Michinaga's perception of *ujidera*, showing that he recognized their multivalent value as accumulating merit as well as extolling the family success, lineage, and history.

Materiality and Memory

Scholars from the studies of memory have showed that people remember through not only their minds, but also uses of materials such as texts, paintings, prints, photographs, monuments, and other types of media.⁵⁵ Materials, no matter in what form, can function as a mnemonic device as well as a carrier of memory. The visual and tactile aspects of materials can serve as stimuli for the evocation of memory, calling to mind people, events, and scenes of the past.

Similarly, the physical appearance of the Nan'endō, such as its pyramidal roof, octagonal

appears in the account of Fujiwara's *ujidera* in *Gōdanshō* 江談抄 (Ōe's Conversation), which was composed in the first half of the twelfth century. *Gōdanshō*, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 27 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960), 517.

⁵⁴ Kudō Miwako, *Heianki no ganmon to bukkuyōteki sekaikan* (Kyoto: Bukkyō Daigaku, 2008), 120.

⁵⁵ The journal *Memory Studies* devoted an issue titled "Memory, Materiality, Sensuality" to explore the relationship between materiality and memory. For the introduction of this issue, see Lindsey A. Freeman and Benjamin Nienass, and Rachel Daniell, "Memory, Materiality, Sensuality," *Memory Studies* 9, no. 1 (2016): 3-12.

podium, and eight-sided body may cause beholders to recall things related to the hall. Although no texts recount the family's visits to the hall during the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century, the annual ritual Yuima-e possibly provided chances for them to view the Nan'endō from the outside. As the most important ceremony at Kōfukuji and dedicated to Fujiwara no Kamatari (614-669), the ritual brought together clan members, eminent monks, aristocratic courtiers, and imperial envoys. Because the Yuima-e was held in the Lecture Hall,⁵⁶ which was situated on the south-north axis behind the central compound of Kōfukuji, attendees of the ceremony may have seen the Nan'endō on their left-handed side once passing the entrance of the temple on the way to the Lecture Hall. Though brief, this viewing of the Nan'endō from the outside may have served as confirmation of its existence and a reminder of its connection to the Northern Fujiwara family.

Nevertheless, the destruction of the Nan'endō was probably more powerful than glances of the building in calling to mind such a connection. In the twelfth month of 1046, a fire swept the grounds of Kōfukuji, destroying the majority of its buildings including the Nan'endō. This incident must have been shocking for the Northern Fujiwara clan since this was the first time in three hundred years that a disaster like this took place at Kōfukuji.⁵⁷ The reconstruction of the temple began quickly afterward and was completed two years later in 1048. While no records tell of how the family reacted to the destruction of the Nan'endō, the recreation of the hall may have led to a renewed interest in its history and relationship to the Northern Fujiwara clan. As Robert Nelson and Margaret Olin remark, "sometimes an object becomes a monument only when it is

⁵⁶ In his diary *Gyokuyō*, Kujō (Fujiwara) no Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207) indicated that the Lecture Hall was a place for holding the Yuima-e. Fujiwara no Kanezane, *Gyokuyō*, vols. 1-3 (Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1988). *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.6.12 (2: 505).

⁵⁷ While few fires took place prior to 1046, none of them caused as huge damage as this one. Kusaka, "Heian makki," 78.

destroyed or altered,”⁵⁸ the destruction and reconstruction of the Nan’endō may likewise have prompted a discovery of its significance as an edifice of the family’s past. As the following and Chapter Four show, references to the Nan’endō in courtier diaries and Buddhist literature increased tremendously after the mid-eleventh century. It is also after the fire of 1046 that we began to see replications of the hall conducted by the Northern Fujiwara clan. In his travel diary *Shichi daiji junrei shiki* written in 1140, Ōe Chikamichi commented on the beauty of the bronze lantern that stood in front of the Nan’endō and indicated that there was a copy of it situated in front of the Phoenix Hall at Byōdōin, which Yorimichi built in 1052.⁵⁹ The copy is no longer extant but was presumably made around the time of the Phoenix Hall’s construction. Therefore, it is likely that the fire of 1046 may have made some impacts on the family’s perception of the Nan’endō, leading to the replication of the hall’s bronze lantern at Byōdōin. It may have been also around this time that the place acquired a special status as representing the beginning of the clan’s glorious history and origin of their prosperity.

A New Character

Historical Background

The Nan’endō emerged as a miraculous site against the background in which the *sekkanke* began to face challenges from the imperial house in the late eleventh century. The *sekkanke* reached its peak during the lifetime of Michinaga, who utilized marriage politics to the fullest. By marrying his three daughters to successive emperors, he became both the father-in-law and

⁵⁸ Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin, eds., *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 205.

⁵⁹ Ōe Chikamichi, *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 50.

grandfather of sovereigns. However, his son Yorimichi failed to produce heirs for the imperial family in the later part of his life and witnessed the ascendancy of Emperor Go-Sanjō 後三条 (1034-1073) to the throne in 1068. Go-Sanjō's enthronement marked the first time in 170 years that the sovereign was unrelated to the Northern Fujiwara clan. The emperor and his successors devised a series of policies to restore the authority of the imperial house and restrict the power of the *sekkanke*.⁶⁰ Under these political circumstances, the *sekkanke* began to strengthen their ties with Kōfukuji in order to control its large landholdings and religious prerogative.⁶¹ However, the untimely death of two chieftains Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101) and Fujiwara no Moromichi 藤原師通 (1062-1099) in 1101 and 1099 substantially weakened the power of the family, leaving the next heir Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162), who was only twenty-four years old, to combat the retired emperors. Given this situation, it is thus not surprising that the significance of the Nan'endō grew in the late eleventh century, and the hall gradually became a miraculous site.

Nan'endō Setsuwa Tales

⁶⁰ For discussion of this, see G. Cameron Hurst, III, "Insei," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2: Heian Japan*, ed. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 583-632; Mikael Adolphson, *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000), 98-124.

⁶¹ Yasuo Motoki, "Kōfukuji in the Late Heian Period," in *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, ed. Joan R. Piggott (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006), 301-325; Kusaka, "Heian makki," 75-104.

The Nan'endō *setsuwa* appeared in the late eleventh century and revolves around the theme—the construction of the Nan'endō—in the early ninth century.⁶² One of the earliest *setsuwa* is from *Daishi gogyōjō shūki* 大師御行状集記, which was compiled by Keihan 経範 (1031-1104) in 1089. The *setsuwa* takes on the form of a *waka* poem, stating that “A dwelling was built on the southern shore of Mt. Fudaraku. The wisteria waves in the north have flourished until even now.”⁶³ A postscript written at the end of the poem indicates who recited it aloud: “It is said that the corvée workers (人夫 *ninpu*), who constructed the [Nan'endō's] foundation, recited this poem.”⁶⁴ In accord with the fact that the hall enshrined the icon Fukūkenjaku Kannon, the first sentence of the poem portrays the dwelling as located on Mt. Fudaraku, the abode of the Kannon in the southern sea of India. This portrayal seems to pay attention to the landscape features of the Nan'endō, which has been situated on the top of a hill and has overlooked Sarusawa Pond to its south. If one views the Nan'endō across from the southern edge of the pond, it would seem to rise out of the water, calling to mind the image of Mt. Fudaraku sitting upon the southern sea in India. In the second sentence of the poem, the character “wisteria 藤 (*fuji*)” refers to the Northern Fujiwara family as part of their surname consists of “*fuji*.” Taken these two sentences together, the poem conveys an idea that because of their dedication of the Nan'endō, the Northern Fujiwara family continued to flourish for generations. It should be also noted that this *setsuwa* is written right after a description of the hall's early history. The description narrates that in answering Fuyutsugu's inquiry on how to make his family prosper, Kūkai selected a site

⁶² To date Hashimoto Masatoshi's study on these *setsuwa* tales is the most thorough. For this work, see Hashimoto Masatoshi, “Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa* no tenkai to waka, engi” (PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2004), 93-138.

⁶³ *Daishi gogyōjō shūki*, in *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 8 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1983), 514.

⁶⁴ *Daishi gogyōjō*, 514.

on the grounds of Kōfukuji to build the Nan'endō and enshrine the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁶⁵ Since the earlier temple records in *Kōfukuji ruki* (*Yamashina ruki* section) make no mention of the monk's role in the construction of the hall, this account was probably developed much later after the ninth century.⁶⁶

Such a *waka* poem concerning the meaning of the Nan'endō's creation gradually came to have different versions with changes primarily made in the sequence of certain characters. The main idea that the hall was the source of the family's success remains almost unchanged. Nevertheless, the texts that are inserted before or after the poems identify other figures besides corvée workers to chant the poem. These figures include an old man, a ghost, and *kami* Isagawa Myōjin 率川明神 at Isagawa Shrine, which was a subsidiary of Kasuga Shrine.⁶⁷ To give an example, in his travel diary *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, Chikamichi included two *setsuwa* tales of the Nan'endō. One of them states that an old man recited the poem while the other indicates that according to an oral transmission (*kuden* 口伝), this old man was in fact Isagawa Myōjin who was sent by Kasuga Daimyōji to do this.⁶⁸ In a slightly later version from *Fukuro zōshi* 袋草紙 compiled by Fujiwara no Kiyosuke 藤原清輔 (1104-1177) during 1156-1159, the *setsuwa*

⁶⁵ *Daishi gogyōjō*, 514.

⁶⁶ One of the earliest accounts that links Kūkai to the Nan'endō is found in *Yamato no kuni Nara gen Kōfukuji garan ki* 大和国奈良原興福寺伽藍記, compiled in 1079 by Kan'en 還圓. *Yamato no kuni Nara gen Kōfukuji garan ki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 62.

⁶⁷ Hashimoto, "Chūsei Bukkyō setsuwa," 94-97. For examples of the appearance of ghosts in the *setsuwa*, see *Irohaji ruishō* 伊呂波字類抄, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 214; *Asabashō* 阿娑縛抄, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 58 (Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidai, 1971), 258. For information on the Isagawa Shrine, see Narashi Henshū Shingikai, ed., *Narashi shi: Jisha hen* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1985), 181-184.

⁶⁸ *Shichi daiji*, 50-51.

identifies the old man as the manifestation of Kasuga Daimyōjin.⁶⁹ Therefore, as Hashimoto Masatoshi points out, from the mid-twelfth century on, the Nan'endō *setsuwa* incorporated the element of Kasuga Daimyōjin into the narratives of the hall's origin, reflecting the amalgamation of Kasuga Shrine and Kōfukuji that was taking place at the time.⁷⁰ Also worth noting is that in parallel to this institutional development, the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon became identified as the Buddhist incarnation of Kasuga Daimyōjin. Although this identification is significant in the history of the hall, Hashimoto observes that in many cases, the *setsuwa* tales focus on the *act* of constructing the foundation rather than the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, whose entire name is often absent in the narratives.⁷¹

For instance, in the aforementioned *Fukuro zōshi*, the *setsuwa* begins with a *waka* poem and then goes on to say that “the moment when the foundation of the Nan'endō emerged, the old man appeared; once the foundation of the hall appeared, he recited the poem...”⁷² In the twelfth-century text, *Ōkagami uragaki* 大鏡裏書, another example reiterates the importance of the act in a different manner, describing that the foundation of the Nan'endō started to fall apart at the time it was being built; however, when an old man showed up and recited the poem, the collapse stopped.⁷³ Like the narrative in *Fukuro zōshi*, this *setsuwa* also indicates that this old man was in fact Kasuga Daimyōjin. On the one hand, by making this deity appear in the process

⁶⁹ Fujiwara no Kiyosuke, *Fukuro zōshi*, in *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 29 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995), 145.

⁷⁰ Hashimoto, “Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa*,” 101.

⁷¹ Hashimoto, “Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa*,” 116-117.

⁷² *Fukuro zōshi*, 145.

⁷³ *Ōkagami uragaki*, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960), 257. For the study of this *setsuwa* in *Ōkagami uragaki*, see Numajiri Toshimichi, “Tōmatsubon *Ōkagami uragaki no Nan'endō setsuwa*,” *Kokugakuin daigaku daigakuin kiyō bungaku kenkyūka* 39 (2007): 185-204.

of the hall's construction, these *setsuwa* stories endow the site with an aura of sacredness. On the other hand, the emphasis on the foundation of the hall may suggest that the site was sacred on its own right.

The descriptions of the construction of the hall's foundation may have been inspired by anecdotes of the Fujiwara members. In *Kōfukuji ruki*, two entries on the Five-Storied Pagoda describe that the Empress Kōmyō along with princesses, courtiers, corvée workers, ladies-in-waiting, and government officials “carried bamboo baskets and moved soil” for the construction of the pagoda's foundation in 730.⁷⁴ Similar events also took place for the construction of Hōjōji in the eleventh century. In his diary *Sakeiki*, Minamoto no Tsuneyori (985-1039) reported that Michinaga asked courtiers and aristocrats to “carry soil and move logs” to help construct the foundations of various buildings at Hōjōji.⁷⁵ Another record from *Shōyūki* indicates that at the request of Michinaga, aristocrats “hauled stones” for the construction of a hall at the same temple.⁷⁶ These events may serve as the writing sources for the production of these *setsuwa* narratives.

Another type of the *setsuwa* narrative shows Kūkai's empowerment of the hall's foundation through the performance of the earth-calming (*chindan* 鎮壇) ritual, which was to pacify the spirits of the earth and ensure the safety of construction work. This practice can be traced at least back to the eighth century and entailed burials of ritual objects called *chindangu* 鎮壇具 inside the foundation of buildings. *Chindangu* usually consist of precious objects such as mirrors, jewels, pearls, gold, and the like. As Chapter Two discusses, *chindangu*, which were

⁷⁴ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 1, 12.

⁷⁵ *Sakeiki*, Kannin 4.2.12 and 4.2.15 (88-89).

⁷⁶ *Shōyūki*, Jian 1.2.29 (6: 16), *Shōyūki*, Jian 3.6.8, 11 (6: 171-172).

buried at the time of the Nan'endō's creation in 813, are extant and include coins issued in 708, 760, 765, and 796. One of the earliest *setsuwa* tales focusing on the hall's *chindangu* is found in “*Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon nado koto* 興福寺南円堂不空羅索等事,”⁷⁷ a text drawn from now lost *Jūgodaiji nikki* 十五大寺日記 (The Diary of the Fifteen Great Temples), which was created circa. 1120 and 1140.⁷⁸ A brief sentence in the text describes the discovery of the hall's *chindangu* that were allegedly utilized by Kūkai for the performance of the earth-calming ritual.⁷⁹ This theme of the Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales has several variations, many of which appear in Shingon esoteric texts produced after the twelfth century. The later versions are longer at length, giving more details about the circumstances in which the *chindangu* were uncovered.⁸⁰ Moreover, in these *setsuwa* narratives, it is not uncommon to see the appearance of esoteric monks who are given the role of recounting the provenance of the *chindangu*.⁸¹ One should remember that there had been accounts telling of Kūkai's involvement in the construction of the Nan'endō. As Hashimoto contends, it is likely that *setsuwa* tales with the theme of the hall's creation grew out of the affiliation between the Northern Fujiwara family and Shingon esoteric monks.⁸² Indeed, as discussed in Chapter Four, not only Kōfukuji monks, but also

⁷⁷ Tanaka Minoru, “Shichi daiji junrei shiki to jūgo daiji nikki,” *Nara Bunkazai Kenkyūjo gakuho* 21 (1972): 29-31. The text is from *shōgyō* 聖教 (sacred teaching) stored at Kōzanji and is published in this article.

⁷⁸ Tanaka, “Shichi daiji,” 40.

⁷⁹ Tanaka, “Shichi daiji,” 30.

⁸⁰ For more on this, see Hashimoto, “Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa*,” 126-133.

⁸¹ For an example of this, see *Jikkishō* 実婦抄, in *Taishō daizōkyō*, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaigyoku (Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924-1932) no. 2497, 78: 0713a21-28. Hereafter, I abbreviate texts from the *Taishō daizōkyō* as *T.* which is followed by the text number, volume, page, register, and line numbers.

⁸² Hashimoto, “Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa*,” 133.

Shingon priests took part in the family's worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and production of its copies.

The Nan'endō *setsuwa* also link the hall's creation with the misfortune of courtiers from the Minamoto clan. An example can be seen in a *setsuwa* from *Kōfukuji ruki*, telling that eight Minamoto courtiers died on the day of the hall's consecration.⁸³ Another instance is concerned with Minamoto no Toshifusa 源俊房 (1035-1121), who was a contemporary of Tadazane and a rival of the *sekkanke* in the twelfth century. Recorded in *Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon nado koto*, this *setsuwa* describes that although no one except the Fujiwara was allowed to enter the Nan'endō, Toshifusa got inside the building and upon doing this, his nose began bleeding.⁸⁴ Hashimoto points out that this *setsuwa* was probably based on a real incident recorded in *Chūyūki* 中右記, the diary of Fujiwara no Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062-1141).⁸⁵ Munetada reported that in 1096, people were upset by the incident that Toshifusa and other courtiers, though not from the Fujiwara family, climbed the podium of the Nan'endō and entered the building to see the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁸⁶ Reading these *setsuwa* along with the contemporary political situation, it is clear that they reflect the *sekkanke*'s anxiety over their loss of domination at court and their desire to revive the family.

The Nan'endō *setsuwa* stories communicate the power of the site through the incorporation of the deity Kasuga Daimyōjin and eminent monk Kūkai in the narratives and through the illustration of the death of the eight Minamoto courtiers. It is very likely that the

⁸³ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 3.

⁸⁴ Tanaka, "Shichi daiji," 30.

⁸⁵ Hashimoto, "Chūsei Bukkyō *setsuwa*," 106-107.

⁸⁶ Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993-2014). *Chūyūki*, Eichō 9.9.27 (3: 101).

creators of these *setsuwa* tales were from the circle of the Northern Fujiwara clan as the content of the tales shows the familiarity with the family's history, social relations, and political status. The various elements—the Kasuga Daimyōjin, the death of the eight Minamoto, and Kūkai's performance of the earth-calming ritual—of the Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales are related to the family in some way or another, suggesting that the production of the *setsuwa* relied on the (re)imagination of the past and present events associated with them. The *setsuwa* tales were therefore discursive practices intended to cast the Nan'endō in a new light and more importantly, to transform its existing “memoryscape,” bringing in the integration of historical and contemporary memories of the hall. Consequently, the history of the site was expanded, including not only the stories of one or two generations (Uchimaro and Fuyutsugu) of the Northern Fujiwara, but also those of the entire clan. As such, the Nan'endō became a repository of collective memories and a mnemonic device through which the family recollected the past events, refashioned their history, and constructed a shared image of themselves. Since these *setsuwa* stories are short prose and some of them take on the form of *waka* poems, they should be considered not merely as texts, but also as oral performances. Because of this quality, the *setsuwa* narratives should have spread quickly in the circle of the Northern Fujiwara family.

The Replications of the Nan'endō

An entry in *Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記 records that Fujiwara no Shōshi 藤原彰子 (988-1074) dedicated an octagonal hall at Hōjōji in 1057 and enshrined a golden *jōroku*-size (about 485 centimeters) Amida sculpture in the building.⁸⁷ Moreover, the record states that “the hall was

⁸⁷ *Fusō ryakki*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikei*, vol. 12 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965). *Fusō ryakki*, Tengi 5.3.14 (12: 294).

also an octagonal structure whose foundation was modelled after the miraculous one of the Nan'endō 堂亦八角之構，偏寫南圓堂靈勝之基。⁸⁸ As such, this building at Hōjōji, though no longer in existence, was intended to be a copy of the Nan'endō and was believed to possess a foundation that was invested with the same sacred power. To what extent the Hōjōji octagonal hall was similar to the original is impossible to know as no information regarding its appearance is given in *Fuso ryakki*. However, whether the Hōjōji octagonal hall looked exactly the same as the original was probably not Shōshi's main concern. For one thing, the building's octagonal shape sufficiently served as a recognizable element to link it with the Nan'endō. For another thing, it was the foundation of the replicated that truly mattered and was the essence of this copying practice. As Sherry Fowler remarked, “repetition is a fundamental expression in Buddhist piety,”⁸⁹ Shōshi may have wanted to demonstrate her faith in the power of the site and perpetuate the felicity of the family through this replication. She may also have regarded the construction of the Nan'endō's copy as an act of remembrance, honoring what her ancestors had done hundreds of years ago, and as a practice of preservation, keeping the memory of the family's past fresh and alive.

In her study on the Phoenix Hall at Byōdōin, Mimi Hall Yiengpruksawan shows that Shōshi's descendants—Fujiwara no Taishi (1095-1156) and an unnamed Fujiwara woman—engaged with the production of the Phoenix Hall's copies respectively at Shōkōmyōin in Kyoto, built by Emperor Toba (1103-1156) in 1136, and at Muryōkōin in Hiraizumi, constructed by Fujiwara no Hidehira (d. 1187) between 1157 and 1187.⁹⁰ While more research needs to be done,

⁸⁸ *Fusō ryakki*, Tengi 5.3.14 (12: 294).

⁸⁹ Sherry Fowler, “Travels of the Daihōonji Six Kannon Sculptures,” *Ars Orientalis* 36 (2009): 185.

⁹⁰ Mimi Hall Yiengpruksawan, “The Phoenix Hall at Uji and the Symmetries of Replication,” *The Art Bulletin* 77, no. 4 (December, 1995): 665-671. To create architectural copies was not uncommon in the

Shōshi may be the first Fujiwara woman who initiated the culture of architectural copying within the clan. It is possibly through this very act of imitation that Shōshi voiced her contribution in the sustenance of the family.

Fujiwara no Shōshi 藤原璋子 (1101-1145), who was the consort of Emperor Toba (1103-1156), established the Tōendō 東円堂 (Eastern Round Hall) to the northeast side of Kōfukuji's main compound. While the building no longer remains, we know from historical texts that it was open on the south and enshrined a golden *jōroku* Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁹¹ The hall was consecrated in 1124 on the death anniversary of Uchimaro, the sixth day of the tenth month. Since the Tōendō was identical to the Nan'endō in terms of its main icon and architectural form, the hall was probably intended to be the replication of the Nan'endō. It is likely that Shōshi wanted to commemorate Uchimaro through this construction project. A study of her life and relevant political situation, however, suggests that the creation of the Tōendō was less an act of memorialization than a display of lineage and power.

history of East Asian Buddhism. For other examples, see Hsueh-man Shen, "Copies without the Original: King Asoka's 84,000 Stupas and Their Replications in China," in *Between East and West: Reproductions in Art: Proceedings of the 2013 CIHA Colloquium in Naruto, Japan, 15th-18th January 2013*, ed. Shigetoshi Osano (Cracow: IRSA, 2014), 227-236; Di Luo, "A Grain of Sand: *Yingzao Fashi* and the Miniaturization of Chinese Architecture" (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2016).

⁹¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 20; *Shichi daiji*, 51. These texts do not indicate the construction date of the Tōendō. *Kōfukuji ranshōki* 興福寺濫觴記, which is an Edo-period compilation of the history of Kōfukuji, records that the hall was built in 1139. However, by analyzing other records and related historical circumstances, Adachi Kō convincingly argues that the Tōendō should be constructed in 1124. The hall was later destroyed by fire in 1511 or 1522, and has never been restored. The image that shows the remains of the hall can be seen in *Yamato meisho zue* 大和名所図会 (The Illustrations of the Famous Places of Yamato), which was created in 1791. Adachi Kō, "Kōfukuji Tōendō ni kansuru gobyū," in *Kodai kenchiku kenkyū ge* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shuppan, 1987), 184-191; Akisato Ritō, *Yamato meisho zue*, vol. 3 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1995), 100.

Shōshi was not from the *sekkanke*, but the lesser known Kan'in branch of the Northern Fujiwara clan, whose first patriarch was Fujiwara no Kinsue 藤原公季 (967-1029).⁹² The family rose to political eminence during the reign of Emperor Go-Sanjō, whose consort Fujiwara no Moshi 藤原茂子 (d. 1062) was also a descendant of the Kan'in Fujiwara and was the mother of the next Emperor Shirakawa. In 1118, Shōshi married Shirakawa's grandson Toba (1103-1156). Therefore, by this time two women from the Kan'in branch of the Northern Fujiwara clan were respectively the mother of the retired emperor Shirakawa and wife of the next Emperor Toba. This marital connection surely solidified the family's position at court and gave them a big advantage over other Fujiwara members. In contrast, the chieftain of the *sekkanke* Tadazane was forced by Shirakawa to resign from the post of the regent in 1120 and was completely out of politics for the next ten years. Situating the Tōendō's construction in this context, one can argue that Shōshi legitimized the lineage of the Kan'in branch and signified the power of her family by replicating the Nan'endō, which had then become the spiritual center of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

Another copy of the Nan'endō was from Fukūin 不空院, a former *matsuji* 末寺 (branch temple) of Kōfukuji situated in Nara City.⁹³ The building collapsed in the Ansei Earthquake in 1854 and was rebuilt as a rectangular structure in 1935. It enshrines a sculpture of Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the previous octagonal hall. Dated to the first half of the thirteenth century, this sculpture is considered to be a copy of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon that Kōkei restored at the

⁹² For a study on Shōshi, see Tsunoda Bun'ei, *Taikenmonin Shōshi no shōgai: Shōtei hishō* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1985).

⁹³ *Kōfukuji matsuji chō*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 458. For discussion of Fukūin's history, see Narashi Henshū Shingikai, ed., *Narashi shi*, 109-111.

Nan'endō in 1189.⁹⁴ According to Muromachi-period temple records *Kankebon shoji engishū* 菅家本諸寺縁起集 and *Daijōin jisha zōjiki* 大乘院寺社雜事記 (1450-1508), written by the Kōfukuji monk Jinson (1430-1508), Fukūin initially served as the residence of the monk Ganjin 鑑真 (688-763) in the eighth century.⁹⁵ Jinson also reported that Kūkai lived at Fukūin during the Kōnin era (810-824) in order to perform the earth-calming ritual for the Nan'endō. Also, while staying there, Kūkai commissioned an octagonal hall to be modelled after the Nan'endō and named the building as “Fukūin.” This account of Fukūin's early history is hardly to be taken as truth since no historical texts dated prior to the eleventh century link the Nan'endō to Kūkai or Fukūin.⁹⁶ Another text *Nara bōmoku sekkai* 奈良坊目拙解, dated to the Edo period (1615-1868), tells a different story, describing that the Kōfukuji monk Ensei 円晴, probably a contemporary of the eminent monks Eison (1201-1290) or Jōkei (1155-1213), constructed the Fukūin octagonal hall as a copy of the Nan'endō.⁹⁷ While Ensei was from Kōfukuji, he seemed to be associated with the Shingon Risshū school as well. Probably because of him, Fukūin was also affiliated with Saidaiji, the headquarters of the school.

⁹⁴ Asai Kazuharu, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Juntei Kannon zō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 382 (March 1998): 61.

⁹⁵ *Kankebon shoji engishū*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 377; *Daijōin jisha zōjiki*, in *Zōho zoku shiryō taisei*, vol. 29 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1978), 235-236.

⁹⁶ It should be also noted that as discussed in Chapter Two, Fuyutsugu likely had viewed the paintings of the five Shingon patriarchs that Kūkai brought back from China in 806. This may serve as a reason why Fuyutsugu decided to enshrine the images of these five Shingon patriarchs inside the Nan'endō. Besides this, no other evidence indicates Kūkai's involvement in the creation of the hall in the early ninth century.

⁹⁷ Murai Kodō, *Nara bōmoku sekkai* (Kyoto: Sōgeisha, 1977), 220-221.

In contrast to this account, another description in *Nara bōmoku sekkai* considers Ensei as the revivor of Fukūin rather than initiator.⁹⁸ Regardless of this discrepancy, the construction of the octagonal hall at Fukūin should take place after the mid-eleventh century since the idea of the Nan'endō as a miraculous site became prominent after this time. Moreover, the creation of this hall indicates that the belief in the power of the site had gone beyond the members of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

Conclusion

After the creation of the Nan'endō in 813, memorial rituals Hokke-e and Chōkō-e continued to be performed in the hall for departed family members. However, through the investigation of courtier diaries, I show that the Northern Fujiwara family took little interest in conducting worship activities at the Nan'endō during the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century. In contrast, the family built other memorial temples one after another beginning after the mid-ninth century. In addition to holding memorial services, these temple sites functioned as family gathering places and signification of their lineages, prestige, and history. The clan's continuous practices of ancestral memorialization kept the Nan'endō relevant to their religious lives. Other factors such as changes in kinship organization and physicality of the Nan'endō also contributed to the hall's enduring presence in the history of the clan.

The Nan'endō emerged as a miraculous site against the political backdrop in which the *sekkanke* gradually lost their domination at court. The changed character of the hall is indicated by its *setsuwa* tales that appeared in the late eleventh century and narrate the sacred origin of the Nan'endō. Several components of *setsuwa* narratives, such as Kasuga Daimyōjin's involvement

⁹⁸ Murai, *Nara bōmoku*, 221.

in the construction of the building and abrupt death of the Minamoto courtiers, invested the site with a sacred quality. Moreover, the *setsuwa* show an intent to reimagine and refashion the narratives of the Nan'endō by drawing on elements of the family's history in different periods of time. As such, the sanctuary became associated with not only one or two generations (the creators of the hall) of the Northern Fujiwara family, but also the entire clan. Consequently, the hall was transformed into a site of collective memory, through which the family created a shared image of themselves and recollected their glorious history.

The sanctification of the Nan'endō also finds its manifestation in the replications of the hall. The Northern Fujiwara family commissioned the copies of the Nan'endō out of their religious piety and their attempt to honor ancestors and demonstrate the power of lineage. As two copies were commissioned by two Fujiwara women, the replications of the Nan'endō seems to serve as a means of power to voice their places in the households, display their lineages, and fashion their roles as keepers of familial tradition.

Chapter Four

The Protector of the Northern Fujiwara Clan:

Images, Iconography, and Worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon

The sacrality or holiness of a book is not a priori attribute of a text but one that is realized historically in the life of communities who respond to it as something sacred or holy. A text becomes ‘scripture’ in active, subjective relationship to persons, and as part of a cumulative communal tradition.¹

—William Graham, *Beyond the Written World: Oral Aspects of Scripture in History of Religion*

Introduction

Probably no Buddhist icons were tied to the Northern Fujiwara clan as long as the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Different sources indicate that the family regarded this icon as their protector that gave rise to their longstanding prosperity.² The family also identified the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as the Buddhist manifestation of their tutelary *kami* (local divinities), collectively called Kasuga Daimyōjin, at Kasuga Shrine in the twelfth century. Only this representation of Fukūkenjaku Kannon obtained this special relationship with the Northern Fujiwara clan. How and when did this exalted status of the icon come into being? Why did the family take interest in Fukūkenjaku Kannon? What was the implication of the icon’s relationship

¹ William Graham, *Beyond the Written World: Oral Aspects of Scripture in History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 5.

² For an overview of this, see Hatta Tatsuo, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon shinkō no tokusei ni tsuite: Kōfukuji Nan’endō o chūshin ni,” in *Reigen jūin to shinbutsu shūgō: Kodai jūin no chūseiteki tenkai* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoin, 2003), 63-95. To give an example, one entry in *Kōfukuji ruki* states that “The Fujiwara clan has flourished and prospered because of the power of this icon.” *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 3.

with the family? This chapter aims to answer these questions by investigating the cult of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and production of its images in the history of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

The cult of a particular image of a Buddhist deity is by no means unique to the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Other Buddhist icons in Japan also acquired individualized characters and were regarded particularly efficacious.³ They are, using Robert Sharf's words, "embedded within a specific historical/mythical narrative, often tied to a particular temple or locale that gives it its 'personality.'"⁴ This is also the case with the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Nevertheless, as William Graham observes about the holiness of scriptures, the efficacy of this icon is far from being self-evident. The cult of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon should not be reduced to the faith of the Northern Fujiwara clan alone. Instead, it has to be considered as a historical process and a product of community worship. As this study shows, the cult is like what Graham states "realized historically in the life of communities" and "as part of a cumulative communal tradition."

The first part of this chapter examines the iconography of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, worship of deity in Tang China, and its transmission to Japan in the eighth century. Attention is also given to images of this deity produced during this time, particularly those associated with the Fujiwara clan. This examination tells of the religious meaning of the deity and its reception in eighth-century Japan. More importantly, it unravels that at this time, the Fujiwara's worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon was diverse in character and did not concentrate on a specific form of the deity.

³ An example of this is the Amida triad at Zenkōji. The replications of this icon became a phenomenon in the Kamakura period (1185-1333). For the cult of the Zenkōji Amida triad, see Donald McCallum, *Zenkōji and Its Icon: A Study in Medieval Japanese Religious Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

⁴ Robert Sharf, "On the Allure of Buddhist Relics," *Representations*, no. 66 (Spring 1999): 83.

The second part of the chapter focuses on the emergence of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as the protector of the Northern Fujiwara clan beginning in the late eleventh century. I investigate *sekkanke*'s worship of the deity particularly during the time of Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162) through the utilization of courtier diaries. I also examine copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon made from the late eleventh to thirteenth century and in doing so, demonstrate that through the promotion and replications of the icon, the *sekkanke* strengthened their authority over and their ties with Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine, which together constituted a shrine-temple complex in the early twelfth century. The icon also served as a nexus connecting the family with Shingon monks whose engagement with the worship of the icon was marked by the depiction of its iconographical feature—the deer skin—in a manner similar to that in Womb World mandalas.

Scriptures and Iconography of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara

Fukūkenjaku Kannon (Skt. Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara; Avalokiteśvara with the Unfailing Rope) is one of the manifestations of Avalokiteśvara (J. Kannon), who out of compassion, vows to save sentient beings from suffering. The deity's name consists of two Sanskrit characters “*Amogha* (certain)” and “*pāśa* (rope).” Taken together, the name “Amoghapāśa” literally means “the one who surely owns a rope” and was translated as “*bukong juansuo* 不空羂索 (never-empty rope)” in Chinese.⁵ Thus, although Buddhist scriptures have no mention of why Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara has this name, the deity is understood as “the Avalokiteśvara with an unfailing rope,” and that the rope indicates his compassion as well as

⁵ Mori Masahide, “Indo no Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 262 (May, 2002): 44.

weapon, by which he rescues people without fail.⁶ Fukūkenjaku Kannon is also one of the esoteric forms of Avalokiteśvara, whose iconography adopts that of Hindu divinities and is characterized by multiple arms, heads, and eyes.

The origin of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara is unclear. Nevertheless, as scriptures of the deity were first introduced to China in the Sui dynasty (581-618), Amoghapāśa should have appeared in India prior to this time. The earliest extant Amoghapāśa sutra in China is the one translated by Jñānagupta (Ch. Dunajueduo 闍那崛多; ca. 522-600) in 587.⁷ It is a very short text titled as *Bukongjuansuo zhou jing* 不空羼索咒經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku jukyō*). In 659, another Amoghapāśa sutra, *Bukongjuansuo shenzhou xin jing* 不空羼索神咒心經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku shinju shinkyō*) was translated by Xuanzang (602-664). The structures of these two texts are similar and were arguably derived from the sutra *Shiyimian guanshiyin shenzhou jing* 十一面觀音咒經 (J. *Jūichimen Kannon jukyō*), which centers on Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara (Skt. Ekadaśamukha Avalokiteśvara) and was translated by Yaśogupta 耶舍崛多 (dates unknown) in the late sixth century.⁸ In 693, Mañicintana (Ch. Bao Siwei 寶思惟; d. 721) and Bodhiruci (Ch. Putiliuzhi 菩提流志; d. 722) respectively translated another two Amoghapāśa sutras, *Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni zizaiwang zhou jing* 不空羼索陀羅尼自在王咒經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku darani jizaiō jukyō*) and one

⁶ Mori, “Indo no Fukūkenjaku,” 44.

⁷ There was another Amoghapāśa sutra dated in the Sui dynasty. While this sutra is missing, according to the preface written by Bolun to *Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni jing* (J. *Fukūkenjaku Kannon daranikyō*), it was translated by an anonymous translator. *T.* 1096, 20: 9b27-9b28.

⁸ Maria Reis-Habito, “The Amoghapāśa Kalparāja Sutra: A Historical and Analytical Study,” *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions* 11 (1999): 41-42; Soeda Ryūshun, “Fukūkenjakukyō no seiritsu ni tsuite,” *Mikkyō kenkyū* 40 (1931): 100-126; Ōtsuka Nobuo, “Amoghapāśakalparāja ni okeru seken jōjuhō giki to Fukūkenjaku Kannon ni tsuite,” in *Mandara no shosō to bunka jō: Yoritomi Motohiro hakashi kanreki kinen ronbunshū*, ed. Yoritomi Motohiro Hakashi Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2005), 43.

fascicle of *Bukongjuansuo zhou xin jing* 不空羼索咒心經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku Kannon ju shinkyō*). Fourteen years later Bodhiruci added thirty fascicles of new translations to the latter scripture in 707-709 and made it into a separate text called *Bukongjuansuo shenbian zhenyan jing* 不空羼索神變真言經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku shinpen shingonkyō*). In 700, Li Wuchan 李無諂 (dates unknown) translated *Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni jing* 不空羼索陀羅尼經 (J. *Fukūkenjaku daranikyō*), the preface of which was written by Bolun 波崙 (dates unknown). By examining these six translations, scholars consider that they are based on two Sanskrit texts.⁹ Those scriptures translated by Jñānagupta, Xuanzang, and Bodhiruci are of one text, while those by Li and Mañicintana are of the other. This distinction is indicated by their content and structures.¹⁰

The first group of the sutras begins with a description of the setting, the palace on Mt. Potalaka (J. Fudaraku), where Amoghapāśa resides and preaches the sutras.¹¹ The description then goes on to narrate the potency of *dhāraṇī*, which are short strings of magical syllables or spells, and enumerates numerous benefits of reciting them.¹² The benefits are varied, such as

⁹ Reis-Habito, “The Amoghapāśa Kalparāja,” 41-44; Dorothy C. Wong, “The Case of Amoghapāśa,” *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 2 (2007): 151-152.

¹⁰ Reis-Habito, “The Amoghapāśa Kalparāja,” 49-50. For other discussion over these scriptures, see Koichi Shinohara, *Spells, Images, and Mandalas: Tracing the Evolution of Esoteric Buddhist Rituals* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 126-134.

¹¹ *T.* 1093, 20: 0399a06-0399a09; *T.* 1094, 20: 0402b08-0402b13; *T.* 1095, 20: 0406a24-0406a27; *T.* 1092, 20: 0227a07-0227a18.

¹² *T.* 1093, 20: 0399b06-0402a24; *T.* 1094, 20: 0402c17-0405c13; *T.* 1095, 20: 0406b17-0409a21. *Dhāraṇī* can be translated as “that by which to sustain something” and is generally considered as a mnemonic device. They are usually few lines long as opposed to mantra, which is another type of incantation, longer at length, and can run several pages long. Mantras are also referred as “true words” and are considered to be “a linguistic device for deepening one’s thought as well as an instrument for enlightenment.” Ryūichi Abe, *The Weaving of Mantra* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 5-6; Charles D. Orzech and Henrik H. Sørensen, “*Mudra, Mantra, Mandala*,” in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011), 78-80.

cure of illness, avoidance of calamities, accumulation of fortune, elimination of karmic defilements, and protection from curses, demons, and ghosts. In contrast, the second group of sutras starts directly with *dhāraṇī*, then tells of the benefits of chanting the *dhāraṇī*, and instructs how to set up a ritual space for the performance of incantation.¹³ Despite these differences, both groups of sutras describe the iconography of the deity, prescribe how to make its images, and instruct on the establishment of altar spaces. Overall, these scriptures focus the teaching on the efficacy and power of deity's *dhāraṇī*.

Finally, there are two more Chinese translations of Amoghapāśa sutras, which were translated by Amoghavajra (Ch. *Bukonjingang* 不空金剛; 705-774) during his stay in China from 746 to 774.¹⁴ Amoghavajra's works are *Bukongjuansuo Piluzhenafu daguanding guang zhenyan* 不空羼索毘盧遮那佛大灌頂光真言 (J. *Fukūkenjaku Birushana butsu daikanjō kōshingon*), and *Foshuo Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni yigui jing* 佛說不空羼索陀羅尼儀軌經 (J. *Bussetsu Fukūkenjaku darani gikikyō*), both of which are the partial retranslations of Bodhiruci's *Bukongjuansuo shenbian zhenyan jing*.¹⁵

These seven scriptures show Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara in various iconographical forms, prescribing him either seated or standing with one, three, or eleven heads, and having two, four,

¹³ T. 1097, 20; T. 1096, 20.

¹⁴ There is one Amoghapāśa sutra translated after the Tang Dynasty, that is, *Fushuo Sheng Guanzizai pusa Bukong wang mimi xin tuoluoni jing* 佛說聖觀自在菩薩不空王秘密心陀羅尼經 (J. *Bussetsu shō Kanjizai Bosatsu Fukūō himitsu shin daranikyō*), which is a retranslation of Jñānagupta's *Bukongjuansuo zhou jing*. This scripture was translated by Dānapāla (Ch. Shihu 施護), who lived in Kaifeng, China between 982 and 1017. Ōtsuka, "Amoghapāśakalparāja," 41, 43.

¹⁵ Ōtsuka, "Amoghapāśakalparāja," 44.

six, or more arms.¹⁶ In addition, the texts describe the deity holding different attributes, such as a rosary, lasso, sutra, jar, lotus flower, trident, jewel, and staff, as well as performing a “fear-not” mudra (Skt. *abhaya*; J. *semui-in* 施無畏印).¹⁷ In several Amoghapāśa scriptures, Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara also has three eyes and wears a deer skin as well as a crown with an image of Amitabha.¹⁸ The diverse representations of Amoghapāśa with multiple arms, heads, and implements point to the incorporation of various elements borrowed from Hindu deities to formulate its iconography.¹⁹ Scholars consider that the belief in Amoghapāśa’s *dhāraṇī* appeared prior to the establishment of associated rituals and production of deity’s images.²⁰ This process of formulating Amoghapāśa belief might explain why the deity seems to lack a standardized form and assumes a wide range of iconographical features in scriptures.

Images of Amoghapāśa have been found across various areas from India, South Asia, Himalayas, to East Asia. The earliest extant example is a sculpture dated to sometime between 733 and 749 in the Hokkedō (Lotus Hall) at Tōdaiji. Places such as Nepal and Tibet yield numerous icons of Amoghapāśa.²¹ Nevertheless, art historians have struggled to find examples in

¹⁶ T. 1097, 20: 0428a03; T. 1097, 20: 0427c29-0428a01; T. 1092, 20: 0250a27; T. 1092, 20: 0265b13; T. 1092, 20: 0268c12-0268c13; T. 1092, 20: 0292b23-0292b24; T. 1096, 20: 0415b18-0415b19; Yoritomi Motohiro, *Mikkyō butsu no kenkyū* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1990), 636-637.

¹⁷ T. 1097, 20: 0422b23-0422b25; T. 1096, 20: 0415b14-0415b16; T. 1092, 20: 0250a29; T. 1092, 20: 0265b16-0265b17; Yoritomi, *Mikkyō butsu*, 637-639.

¹⁸ T. 1096, 20: 0410c11; T. 1096, 20: 0410c17-0410c18; T. 1097, 20: 0422b21-0422b22; T. 1092, 20: 0232b06-0232b07.

¹⁹ Ōtsuka, “Amoghapāśakalparāja,” 48-49; Tanaka Kimiaki, “Indo, Chibetto, Neparu no Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” in “Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Juntei Kannon zō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 382 (March 1998): 86.

²⁰ Ōtsuka, “Amoghapāśakalparāja,” 47-48; Mori, “Indo no Fukūkenjaku,” 57-59.

²¹ Tanaka, “Indo, Chibetto, Neparu,” 89-95; Pratapaditya Pal, “The Iconography of Amoghapāśa Lokeśvara—II,” *Oriental Art* 23.1 (1967): 21-28; R. O. Meisezhall, “Amoghapāśa, Some Nepalese Representations and Their Vajrayānic Aspects,” *Monumenta Serica* 24 (1967): 455-505.

India. Most of the earlier works that are attributed as Amoghapāśa are from the Pala dynasty (circa eighth through twelfth centuries), but none have an iconography completely in agreement with scriptural prescriptions.²² Moreover, these works are identified as Amoghapāśa primarily because one of their hands holds a lasso.²³ The deer skin, another defining feature of the deity, appears occasionally. Therefore, because the iconography of Amoghapāśa in India seems to have several variations and was still in the state of flux during this time, it is hard to distinguish this deity from other esoteric Avalokiteśvara.²⁴

Worship and Images of Bukongjuansuo Guanyin in China

While Amoghapāśa sutras were transmitted to China in the sixth century, no information is available with regard to the circumstances of deity's worship at this time. It seems that the devotion to Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara did not gain currency until the late seventh century in China.²⁵ The rise of the deity has been linked to the sovereign of Empress Wu Zetian 武則天 (624-705; r. 684-705), who usurped the throne in 683 and changed the name of the dynasty to Zhou the next year. In order to justify her rule, Empress Wu proclaimed herself as an incarnation of the Future Buddha Maitreya (J. Miroku) as well as the Cakravartin of the Golden Wheel, the

²² Mori, "Indo no Fukūkenjaku," 59; Pratapaditya Pal, "The Iconography of Amoghapāśa Lokeśvara—I," *Oriental Art* 22.4 (1966): 234.

²³ Janice Leoshko, "The Appearance of Amoghapāśa in Pāla Period Art," in *Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia*, ed. A. K. Narain (New Delhi: Kanak Publications, 1985), 128-132.

²⁴ Leoshko, "The Appearance of Amoghapāśa," 131; Mori, "Indo no Fukūkenjaku," 59.

²⁵ For research on the worship of this deity in China, see Antonino Forte, "Brief Notes on the Kashmiri Text of the *Dharani Sūtra of Avalokiteśvara of the Unfailing Rope* Introduced to China by Manicintana (d. 721)," in *Buddhism and Buddhist Art of the Tang*, ed. Kathy Cheng-mei Ku (Taiwan: Chuefeng Fojiao Jijinhui, 2006), 13-28; Wong, "The Case of Amoghapāśa," 152-154.

universal monarch and ideal Buddhist ruler.²⁶ Although Empress Wu also advocated Confucianism and Daoism, she was particularly known for her patronage of Buddhist images and sponsorship of scriptural translations. A group of foreign translators, such as aforementioned Manicintana, Bodhiruci, and Divakara (Ch. Dipoheluo 地婆訶羅; 613-687) gathered at her court in Luoyang. They not only introduced new Buddhist scriptures, but also contributed to the spread of “esoteric” teachings.²⁷ Under Empress Wu, several esoteric forms of Avalokiteśvara became popular, which in turn propelled the production of their images in places such as capital Luoyang, Longmen grottos, and Dunhuang caves.

Under the suggestion of her trusted monk Fazang (643-712), who was the third patriarch of the Huayan 華嚴 (Skt. Avataṃsaka; J. Kegon) school, Empress Wu endorsed *Avataṃsaka* Buddhism and sponsored the retranslation of *Avataṃsaka Sūtras* in 695. *Avataṃsaka* teachings focus on the Universal Buddha Vairocana (J. Birushana 毘盧遮那), who presides over a

²⁶ For discussion of the relationship between Empress Wu and Buddhism, see Chuan-Ying Yen, “The Sculpture from the Tower of Seven Jewels: the Style, Patronage, and Iconography” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986), 3-30; Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky, “Wu Zetian and Buddhist Art of the Tang Dynasty,” *Tang Studies* 20, no. 21 (2002): 113-50; Inamoto Yasuo, “Narachō ko mikkyō no zenshi ni kansuru oboegaki: Chūgoku bushū zengo no jōkyō o chūshin ni,” in *Ko mikkyō: Nihon mikkyō no taidō*, ed. Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2005), 139-144; Dorothy C. Wong, “The Art of *Avataṃsaka* Buddhism at the Courts of Empress Wu and Emperor Shōmu/Empress Kōmyō,” in *Avataṃsaka Buddhism in East Asia: Huayan, Kegon, Flower Ornament Buddhism: Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture*, ed. Robert Gimello, Frederic Girard, and Imre Hamar (Wiesbaden : Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012), 223-260.

²⁷ Recently scholars have questioned the existence of esoteric Buddhism as a distinctive tradition separate from other “exoteric” Buddhist teachings in Tang China. As such, the use of the word “esoteric” to characterize Buddhist practices and associated artistic activities during this time is not without problems. I use the word in a general sense and do not consider it refer as a systematic and distinctive Buddhist development outside of Mahayana Buddhism. For an overview of scholarship on this issue, see Charles D. Orzech, Richard K. Payne, and Henrik H. Sørensen, “Introduction: Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia: Some Methodological Considerations,” in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne (Leiden and Boston: Brill Publication, 2011), 3-13.

transcendental world that is adorned with luxurious treasures everywhere and is filled with his countless manifestations of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and heavenly beings. This depiction of the Vairocana's cosmos finds its visual manifestation in a group of sculptures, constructed in 672-675 by Empress Wu and Emperor Gaozong (328-683) at Fengxian Temple in Longmen. In addition to *Avataṃsaka* teachings, Empress Wu believed in esoteric Avalokiteśvara. In 697, at her request, Fazang held a ceremony of *dhāraṇī* chanting in front of an Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara mandala in order to dispel invasion from the Khitans. The performance proved to be effective as the Khitan was defeated by the Turks not long afterward. In sum, Empress Wu endorsed various Buddhist teachings, commissioned rituals for the national protection, and utilized Buddhism to augment her political authority. The cult of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara took shape and became entrenched in this political context.

A number of Amoghapāśa sutras were introduced at the beginning of the Zhou dynasty, such as the scriptures translated by Mañicintana (693), Bodhiruci (693), and Li Wuchan (700). Mañicintana's and Bodhiruci's translations were undertaken in capital Luoyang at Fushoujisi 佛授記寺, one of the centers that promulgated Empress Wu's political ideology. Antonino Forte links Mañicintana's translation project to the political campaign of Empress Wu, who was eager to reinforce her rule through Buddhist patronage.²⁸ Empress Wu assumed the title Cakravartin (Ch. 轉輪聖王 *zhuanlun shengwang*) one month after Mañicintana finished the translation of *Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni zizaiwang zhou jing*. Also, Forte speculates that the sutra was prohibited from view until 712 because of its secret content and connection to the notion of Cakravartin.²⁹

²⁸ Forte, "Brief Notes," 21-24.

²⁹ Forte, "Brief Notes," 21-24.

Another incident also shows the connection between Mañicintana’s translation and Empress Wu. In 693, Huizhi 慧智 (ca. 676-703), the son of a Brahmin envoy and Buddhist monk, composed a poem called “*Zan Guanshiyin pusa song* 讚觀世音菩薩頌 (*Odes in Praise of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara*)” and dedicated it to “the Divine Emperor who turns the Golden Wheel perfectly.”³⁰ The content of the poem focuses on a mural painting that depicted Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara. Forte suggests that Mañicintana’s translation of *Bukongjuansuo tuoluoni zizaiwang zhou jing* might have prompted the production of this painting because both works were made in the same year, and Huizhi seemed to have worked with Mañicintana.³¹ The poem tells that Huizhi saw this painting in person, and describes that Amoghapāśa wears a floral crown, holds a golden lotus flower, and has a rainbow-like nimbus.³² Moreover, the deity wears a deer skin over the shoulder and a necklace in the form of a dragon-king.³³ This depiction of the deity’s necklace is mentioned only in Mañicintana’s translation.³⁴ Huizhi wrote the poem in Sanskrit first and then translated it into Chinese afterwards. By making the Sanskrit version, Forte suggests that Huizhi realized the political agenda of fashioning Empress Wu as Cakravartin and of demonstrating that the country she ruled was the center of the Buddhist world.³⁵

³⁰ T. 1052, 20. The poem does not specify which Avalokiteśvara is depicted in the painting, but describes that the deity wears a deer skin. For information on Huizhi’s life, see Antonio Forte, “Hui-chih (fl. 676-703 A.D.), a Brahmin Born in China,” *Annali dell’Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 45 (1985): 105-134.

³¹ Forte, “Hui-chih,” 114, 121; Forte, “Brief Notes,” 23.

³² T. 1052, 20: 0067b01-0067b08; 0068a01.

³³ T. 1052, 20: 0067b04; T. 1052, 20: 0067b07.

³⁴ T. 1097, 20: 0430c21- 0430c22; Reis-Harbio, “The Amoghapāśa Kalparāja,” 48.

³⁵ Forte, “Hui-chih,” 122-125.

By investigating the motivation behind the Mañicintana's translation and production of Huizhi's poem, we know that the emergence of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara in the late seventh century had much to do with the sponsorship of Empress Wu and the propagation of her kingship. As Forte remarks, the cult of the deity during her rule was "closely bound up with the ideas of royalty as conceived by Buddhists of the day, with the figure of the Cakravartin, and consequently with the idea of the protection of the Chinese Buddhist state."³⁶

No images of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara created during the reign of Empress Wu survive today.³⁷ Nevertheless, about eighty paintings of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara remain in the Dunhuang area, among them around thirty dating to the Tang dynasty (618-907).³⁸ The majority of these works are depicted as *bianxiang* 變相 (transformation tableaux or sutra paintings) on the walls of caves. The earliest representation of Amoghapāśa is a series of eight paintings dated to 776 from Dunhuang Cave 148.³⁹ The paintings appear inside a niche on the north wall of the cave and accompanies a statue of Amoghapāśa, which unfortunately no longer exists. In addition, they illustrate the scenes from Xuazang's translation of *Bukongjuansuo*

³⁶ Forte, "Brief Notes," 24.

³⁷ Dorothy Wong points out that an example from the North Cave of Leigutai 擂鼓台 at Longmen might represent "an incipient form of Amoghapsa." This image of Avalokiteśvara is a relief carving on the wall of the cave entrance and is shown with eight arms. Moreover, the deity flanked the entrance with a sculpture of Eleven-headed Kannon on the opposite wall. Wong, "The Case of Amoghapāśa," 153.

³⁸ For discussion of these paintings, see Peng Jin-Zhang, "Dunhuang Bukongjuansuo Guanyin jing bian yanjiu," *Dunhang yanjiu* 1 (1999): 1-24.

³⁹ For a brief introduction of the images inside Cave 148, see Peng Jin-Zhang, ed., *Mijiao huaJuan* (Hong Kong: The Commercial Press, 2003), 37-54; Dorothy Wong, "Qiba shiji Guanyin zaoliang de fanyan," in *Yishushi zhong de hanjin yu tangsong zhi bian*, ed. Yen Chuan-Ying and Shih Shou-Chien (Taipei: Shitou Publication, 2014), 206-213. For discussion of the paintings, see Peng, "Dunhuang Bukongjuansuo," 14; Fan Jin-Shi, "Xuazang yijing han Dunhuang bihua," *Dunhuang yanjiu* 2 (2004): 3-4; Wong, "Qiba shiji," 209-210.

shenzhou xin jing and are arranged in the eight screen panels.⁴⁰ The scenes show devotees engaged in the incantation of *dhāraṇī* and depict the performance of the *humo* 護摩 (J. *homa*) ritual, which was a votive offering of fire. The cartouches of the paintings contain excerpts from the scripture. Another niche on the south wall depicts sutra paintings (*bianxiang*) arranged in the eight panels and enshrined a sculpture of the Cintāmaṇicakra Avalokiteśvara (J. Nyoirin Kannon), which is missing. These paintings are based on *Ruyilun tuoluoni jing* 如意輪陀羅尼經 (J. *Nyoirin darani kyō*), which focuses on the *dhāraṇī* of Cintāmaṇicakra Avalokiteśvara.

Another painting of Amoghapāśa in Dunhuang appears on the east side of the south wall of Cave 384 dating to the middle Tang dynasty (781-848).⁴¹ The deity is shown seated on a lotus pedestal with six arms, holding various attributes in the hands including a two-pronged spear, a willow branch, a lasso, a water jar, a lotus, and a vase. A wrap patterned with dots covers the left shoulder to indicate a deer skin. This image of Amoghapāśa, heavily bejeweled, wears a crown with a seated image of Amitābha Buddha and a mandorla with the motifs of flames, flowers and rainbows. The Moonlight (Sk. Candraprabha) and Sunlight (Sk. Sūryaprabha) Bodhisattvas accompany Amoghapāśa on the top left and right. The Four Guardian Kings are seated slightly below the Bodhisattvas with two on each side. The figures of Vasiṣṭha (old man) and Lakṣmī (Goddess of Wealth, Fortune, and Prosperity) appear respectively on each side of Amoghapāśa's lotus pedestal. Two wrathful beings stand on the two bottom corners and flank a pond inside which there are two dragon kings (*nāga*). Like Cave 148, this image of Amoghapāśa is placed facing a painting of Cintāmaṇicakra Avalokiteśvara, which is located on the east side of the north wall; the two Avalokiteśvara attend a recessed niche.

⁴⁰ Fan, "Xuanzang yijing," 3-4.

⁴¹ Peng, *Mijiao*, 83-85.

Scholars have summarized some traits in the illustrations of Amoghapāśa at Dunhuang during the Tang dynasty.⁴² First of all, the deity is often shown with either six or eight arms. This depiction is seldom described in Amoghapāśa sutras, in which four-armed Amoghapāśa is more common.⁴³ Moreover, none of the aforementioned Amoghapāśa sutras describe the deity with eight arms. The eight-armed form of the deity might have to do with the accounts of its iconography in the two earlier translations of Amoghapāśa sutras, *Bukongjuansuo zhou jing* and *Bukongjuansuo shenzhou xin jing*. While both sutras give brief delineations of the deity's iconography and do not prescribe the number of his arms, they mention that Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara looks like Maheśvara (J. Daijizaiten 大自在天 or Makeishura 摩醯首羅), another name for the Hindu divinity Śiva.⁴⁴ Maheśvara is shown with eight arms and three eyes, as well as riding on a cow in *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā sūtra* (J. *Daichidoron* 大智度論).⁴⁵ Another text *Shiyimian shenzhou xinjing yishu* 十一面神咒心經義疏 (J. *Jūichimen shinju shinkyō gisho*), written by Xuanzang's disciple Huizhao 慧沼 (J. Eshō; 650-714), also indicates that Amoghapāśa has eight arms.⁴⁶

Second, the majority of Amoghapāśa images from the Tang dynasty are seated on a lotus pedestal with a piece of deer skin hanging off the left shoulders. It is also common to see that the deity wears a crown with an effigy of Amitabha. While prescribed in several sutras, one of the

⁴² Peng, "Dunhuang Bukongjuansuo," 3-24; Nakamura Natsuyo, "Chūgoku tonkō ni okeru Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō ni kansuru kenkyū," *Nagoya daigaku dagakuin bungaku kenkyūka kyōiku kenkyū suishin shitsu nenpō* 2 (2008): 224-228.

⁴³ Yoritomi, *Mikkyō butsu*, 636.

⁴⁴ *T.* 1093, 20: 0402a01-0402a02; *T.* 1094, 20: 0405b22.

⁴⁵ *T.* 1509, 25: 0073a06-0073a07.

⁴⁶ *T.* 1802, 39: 1004c22-1004c23.

deity's iconographic features—the third eye—rarely appears in these images. The implements of Amoghapāśa are varied including trident, lasso, rosary, axe, wheel, monk staff, lotus flower, willow branch, and water jar. Interestingly, less than half of the paintings show the deity holding a lasso. Moreover, none of the representations have the same configuration of attributes.⁴⁷

In conclusion, the deer skin seems to be the most prominent characteristic of Amoghapāśa and is illustrated in most of deity's images at Duhuang. In addition, images of Amoghapāśa often juxtapose those of Cintāmaṇicakra Avalokiteśvara, and in this situation, they are often placed flanking the entrance to attend main icons.⁴⁸ Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara is often shown at the entrance as well, and this placement might be related to its power for protection of the nation.⁴⁹ Yen Chuan-Ying points out that the forms of Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara occasionally conflate with those of Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara, and the distinction between them was sometimes obscure.⁵⁰ Given that these two deities gained currency around the same time under the rule of Empress Wu,⁵¹ it is possible that they were regarded similarly as apotropaic divinities for the protection of the nation and avoidance of calamities.

⁴⁷ Nakamura, "Chūgoku tonkō," 225.

⁴⁸ Nakamura, "Chūgoku tonkō," 228.

⁴⁹ Chuan-Ying Yen, "Tang dai shiyimian Guanyin tuxiang yu xinyang," *Foxue yanjiu zhongxin xuebao* 11 (2006): 100-101. See examples of the aforementioned Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara in the north cave of Leigutai at Longmen and the sculpture of the deity at the Tower of the Seven Treasures (Chibaotai 七寶臺).

⁵⁰ Yen, "Tang dai shiyimian," 103.

⁵¹ For the study of the belief in Eleven-headed Avalokiteśvara in China, see Yen, "Tang dai shiyimian," 93-110.

Worship and Images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in Eighth-Century Japan

Transmission of Fukūkenjaku Kannon from China to Japan

The transmission of Fukūkenjaku Kannon to Japan has been credited to the Japanese monk Genbō 玄昉 (d. 746), who studied in China for nineteen years under Zhizhou 智周 (668-123), the third Chinese patriarch of Faxiang (J. Hossō) School. After his return to Japan in 735, Genbō quickly rose to prominence at court, successfully healing the illnesses of Emperor Shōmu's mother Fujiwara no Miyako 藤原宮子 (d. 754).⁵² Although Genbō specialized in Hossō doctrine he also studied sutras that featured esoteric Avalokiteśvara such as Eleven-headed Kannon and Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁵³ Genbō brought back some 5,000 fascicles of Buddhist scriptures and commentaries from China. The arrival of these texts prompted the spread of a great number of sutras centered on esoteric Avalokiteśvara and contributed to the rise of devotion to these deities. While sutras of Fukūkenjaku Kannon had been known in Japan probably as early as 732, it was not until the years from 736 to 738 that saw the intense transcription of Fukūkenjaku Kannon sutras including those translated by Xuanzang, Yaśogupta, and Mañicintana.⁵⁴ Li Wuchan's and Bodhiruci's translations were transcribed in 747 and 753.⁵⁵ Thus, by the mid-eighth century, various scriptures of the deity had been circulating in Japan.

The religious policy of the state also played an important role in the dissemination of Fukūkenjaku Kannon sutras. This is evident in *Ubasoku kōshinge* 優婆塞貢進解 (Letters for Monastic Ordination Presented by Lay Buddhists), which were ordination documents presented

⁵² Hayami Tasuku, *Kannon shinkō* (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1970), 86.

⁵³ Hayami, *Kannon shinkō*, 87-88.

⁵⁴ See pp. 89-90 of the appendix in Ishida Mosaku, *Shakyō yori Narachō Bukkyō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1930).

⁵⁵ See pp. 83, 85 of the appendix in Ishida, *Shakyō yori*.

to the government for the approval of monastic ordination. As indicated by these texts, the incantation of Fukūkenjaku Kannon *dhāraṇī* was part of the training for Buddhist ordinands.⁵⁶ Moreover, *Amoghapāśa Avalokiteśvara dhāraṇī sūtra* was one of the sutras commonly studied by ordinands between the years of 732 and 745.⁵⁷ The frequent use and copy of Amoghapāśa sutras indicate the popularity of the deity at court and the belief in the power of its *dhāraṇī*.

Images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the Fujiwara Family

With the increased interest in Fukūkenjaku Kannon, the production of its images became prevalent. As indicated by extant examples and historical records, images of the deity were created for various purposes, from the protection of the nation, expression of piety, elimination of sin, to salvation of the deceased.⁵⁸ They also took on different forms, having four, six, eight, and twenty arms in either standing or seated postures.⁵⁹ In addition, three social groups were engaged in the devotion of Fukūkenjaku Kannon: (1) the imperial family and Empress Kōmyō, (2) the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community, and (3) eminent monks such as Genbō and Ganjin 鑑真 (688-763). The following focuses on the images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon related to Empress Kōmyō and the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community from the eighth century.

⁵⁶ Horiike Shunpō, “Nara jidai Bukkyō no mikkyōteki seikaku,” in *Nihon kodaishi ronsō*, ed. Kodaigaku Kyōkai (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1960), 628-629.

⁵⁷ Abe, *The Weaving*, 160.

⁵⁸ For the survey of Fukūkenjaku Kannon images in the eighth century, see Asai Kazuharu, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Juntei Kannon zō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 382 (March 1998): 29-51.

⁵⁹ All of the extant images of the deity from the eighth century take the standing form. From historical records, we know that only one image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon made in a seated form in this period. However, it is not uncommon for historical sources to make no mention of deity’s posture, suggesting that there might have been more seated images of the deity produced in this period than previously thought. *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1940), 207.

The Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Hokkedō at Tōdaiji is a dry-lacquer sculpture dated to sometime between 733 and 749. The provenance of this work is obscure, but it was closely associated with Empress Kōmyō and monk Rōben 良弁 (689-773), who mastered *Avataṃsaka* teachings.⁶⁰ This Fukūkenjaku Kannon has a massive body with three eyes and eight arms, two of which are raised in front of the chest with two hands pressed together in a mudra of reverence (J. *gasshōin* 合掌印; Skt. *anjali mudra*). A crystal held between the two hands is related to the seventh chapter of *Golden Light Sutra* (J. *Konkōmyō saishō kyō*; Skt. *Suvarṇabhāṣottama-sūtra*), in which Bodhisattva associates jewels with *dhāraṇī* spells and preaches on their power for avoidance of all kinds of calamities.⁶¹ The other six hands of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon carried attributes, only three of which remain, including (clockwise) a lotus flower, a lasso, and a monk's staff. The icon wears a silver crown with a standing image of Amida, from which rays of light emit to symbolize the Buddha's incalculable wisdom. The crown is also decorated with threads of jade, glass, mirrors, and a flaming jewel, and was intended to evoke an image of light.

Asai Kazuharu connects the representation of light in this Fukūkenjaku Kannon with Empress Kōmyō, whose name literally means “brightness.”⁶² Where the name came from is unknown, but it is possible that Kōmyō emulated the name “*Chao* 曩 (illumination)” that Empress Wu Zetian gave to herself. Also, because the abode of Kannon is called as “Kōmyōsan 光明山 (The Mountain of Brightness)” in *Avataṃsaka Sūtra*, Asai links the icon to the teaching

⁶⁰ Asai Kazuharu, “Hokkedō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no seiritsu,” in *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 4: Tōdaiji to Heijōkyō*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1996), 167-173.

⁶¹ Asai, “Hokkedō honzon,” 171.

⁶² Asai, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 42-43.

of this scripture.⁶³ Indeed, Tōdaiji was the center for the studies of *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, and lectures on this sutra were first performed in the Hokkedō in 740.⁶⁴ In addition, the sculpture served as the focus of the ritual Hokke-e, which was a series of lectures on the *Lotus Sutra* initiated in the Hokkedō in 746 by the royal family.⁶⁵ Despite these connections to Buddhist teachings, Asai speculates that the icon was also dedicated to quell the rebellion of Fujiwara no Hirotsugu (d. 740), a member of the Ceremonial branch of the Fujiwara clan.⁶⁶ The rebellion took place in 740 and resulted from Hirotsugu's discontent over his banishment to distant Dazaifu in present-day Kyūshū.

Three images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon were enshrined at Kōfukuji in the eighth century, but none of them survive today. One was enshrined in the Kōdō (Lecture Hall) by Fujiwara no Matate (715-766) and his sister in 746 for their deceased parents Fujiwara no Fusasaki 藤原房前 (681-737) and Queen Muro (d. 746).⁶⁷ Also, they commissioned this sculpture because Queen Muro vowed to make an image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and copy a *dhāraṇī* sutra of the deity, but passed away before realizing the vow. As discussed in Chapter Two, this icon was possibly moved to the Nan'endō in 813 and given its construction date, was arguably a dry-lacquer sculpture. Another Fukūkenjaku Kannon was commissioned in 772 by Fujiwara no Ieyori 藤原家衣 (743-785) and Ōno no Nakachi 大野仲仟 (d. 781) in memory of Fujiwara no Nagate 藤原

⁶³ *T.* 278, 09: 0590a08-09; Asai, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 42.

⁶⁴ *Tōdaiji yōroku* 東大寺要録, in *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1985), 90-91.

⁶⁵ *Tōdaiji yōroku*, 151-152.

⁶⁶ Asai, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 41.

⁶⁷ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 16-17.

永手 (714-771), who was a descendant of the Northern Fujiwara clan and the uncle of Fujiwara no Uchimarō 藤原内麻呂 (756-812).⁶⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki* describes this image as “a niche of sandalwood Fukūkenjaku Bosatsu 不空羼索菩薩檀像一龕” placed in the Jizōdō in the eastern precinct of Kōfukuji.⁶⁹ The image was probably a *dangan* 檀龕, a type of *danzō* (sandalwood images), which shows icons carved in high relief as part of and inside the niche.⁷⁰ Still another image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was from the Saikondō (Western Golden Hall). Except that this image had a mandorla, no other information is given in *Kōfukuji ruki*.⁷¹ When courtier Ōe Chikamichi 大江親通 (d. 1151) visited the Saikondō in 1140, he made no mention of this icon, but instead discussed a miraculous golden sculpture of Juntei Kannon (Skt. Cundī Avalokiteśvara; Buddha-mother Kannon) that had three eyes and eighteen arms.⁷² He did not indicate the date of this sculpture. In the sutra *Fukūkenjaku shinpen shingonkyō*, Fukūkenjaku Kannon assumes a form that has three eyes and eighteen arms.⁷³ By the twelfth century, the identification of this Fukūkenjaku Kannon may have had been changed. If this was the case, the image would have been possibly created after the introduction of this sutra to Japan in 753.

⁶⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19; Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji garan no seiritsu to zōzō,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 172.

⁶⁹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 19.

⁷⁰ For an introduction of different types of *danzō*, see Christian Boehm, *The Concept of Danzō: Sandalwood Images in Japanese Buddhist Sculpture of the 8th to 14th Centuries* (London: Saffron Book, 2012), 13-16.

⁷¹ *Kōfukuji ruki*, 13.

⁷² Ōe Chikamichi, *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 49.

⁷³ *T.* 1092, 20: 0268c12.

Another image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon was one of a pair of the embroideries that flanked the Birushana Buddha in the Daibutsuden (Great Buddha Hall) at Tōdaiji. Although the embroideries were destroyed by fire in 1181, the inscriptions woven along the borders are recorded, indicating that they depicted respectively Kanjizai (Kannon) Bosatsu 觀自在菩薩 and Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁷⁴ According to the inscription, Empress Kōken (718-770) commissioned the embroidery of Kanjizai Bosatsu in 754, and this work was completed on the death anniversary of Emperor Shōmu in 757.⁷⁵ The inscription woven in the embroidery of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon does not specify its construction date, but indicates that it was commissioned by the “Emperor (either Kōken or Junnin 淳仁 (733-765; r. 758-764)” for the welfare of Empress Kōmyō who was then still alive.⁷⁶ Measuring thirty-five *shaku* 尺 (around 1060 centimeters) tall and twenty-five *shaku* (about 757 centimeters) wide, this huge embroidery of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was hung on the west side of the hall. As such, it is referred to as the “West Mandara” in the inscription as opposed to the “East Mandara,” which is the embroidery of the Kanjizai Bosatsu. In *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, Chikamichi reported that the embroidery of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon had twenty arms.⁷⁷ One passage of the inscription woven on this image is worth mentioning as it informs us of how the imperial family and Empress Kōmyō understood the religious meaning of the deity. The passage states:

Kanjizai Bosatsu...manifests himself as a Bosatsu because of his original vow to eliminate and relieve all sufferings. Bosatsu dwells in the Western World of Ultimate Bliss to serve and attend Amida Buddha....Bosatsu manifests himself with eleven heads or thousand

⁷⁴ *Tōdaiji yōroku*, 145-146.

⁷⁵ *Tōdaiji yōroku*, 145.

⁷⁶ *Tōdaiji yōroku*, 146. The embroidery was presumably created around 757, which corresponds to the reigns of two sovereigns. Therefore, the emperor refers to either Kōken or Junnin.

⁷⁷ *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, 33.

arms and thousand eyes. This is why the deity is called Kanjizai and Kanzeon. Bosatsu is also called Horse-headed [Kannon] or Fukūkenjaku [Kannon]. Because there exist vows, Bosatsu is aware of any [supplications of devotees]. Because there exists faith, Bosatsu responds to any [invocations of devotees]. Although [the forms of Bosatsu] vary according to karmic affinity, they are in fact one and the same. 觀自在菩薩…其本願化形菩薩。拔濟一切之苦。其住也在西方極樂世界。奉侍阿彌陀佛…。或現一十一面。或現千手千眼。乃名觀自在。乃名觀世音。又稱馬頭。又稱不空羂索。所以有至願。則無所不感。有至信。則無所不應。隨緣雖異。其實一也。⁷⁸

As this passage indicates, Fukūkenjaku Kannon is considered as one of the transformed bodies of Kanjizai Bosatsu. This understanding explains why this pair of the embroideries illustrated the images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kanjizai Bosatsu, who were regarded as “one and the same.” Also, the passage implies that different transformed bodies of Kannon serve as the expedient means to save sentient beings. Therefore, although the deity of Fukūkenjaku Kannon was connected to *Avatamsaka* teachings and was worshipped because of its powerful *dhāraṇī* in the eighth century, its religious meaning as expressed here resonates more with that given in the *Lotus Sutra*, which describes Kannon taking on thirty-three forms, human and nonhuman alike, in order to rescue all beings.

Another descendant of the Northern Fujiwara clan, Fujiwara no Kiyokawa 藤原清河 (d. 779) financed the construction of the Kenjakudō 羂索堂 (Hall of the Lasso) at Tōshōdaiji in Nara and the hall’s images including a Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the Eight Classes of Supernatural Beings (*J. Hachibushū*).⁷⁹ It is unclear when the building was constructed, but Kiyokawa likely made donations in the early 760s.⁸⁰ His patronage of the project was probably a

⁷⁸ *Tōdaiji yōroku*, 146.

⁷⁹ *Shoji engi shū* 諸寺縁起集, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 277.

⁸⁰ Asai, “Raichōgo no Ganjin—sono hito to zōkei,” in *Meihō Nihon no bijutsu 6: Tōshōdaiji*, ed. Ōta Hirotarō, et al. (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1990), 135.

result of his close relationship with the Chinese monk Ganjin, who founded Tōshōdaiji in 759 and was a devotee of Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁸¹ Therefore, the building might have been utilized to facilitate the monk's worship of the deity. Nevertheless, given that other Fujiwara members also worshipped Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Kiyokawa might be a devotee of the deity as well and possibly dedicated the building to express his own piety.

The Kenjakudō no longer exists, but a statue, which is currently called “Shūhōō Bosatsu 衆宝王菩薩” from Tōshōdaiji, may have been originally enshrined as the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the building.⁸² It should be mentioned that another statue, known as “Shishiku Bosatsu 獅子吼菩薩,” from the temple is also identified as Fukūkenjaku Kannon. These two sculptures were probably made around the same time when the Kenjakudō was erected.⁸³ While all of the arms of the two statues are broken off, the holes in the back of their torsos indicate that the Shūhōō Bosatsu originally had six arms, and the Shishiku Bosatsu had four arms. An account from *Shichi daiji junrei shiki* tells that Ganjin manifested himself as Fukūkenjaku Kannon with three eyes and six arms while preaching at Dafuguangsi 大福光寺 in China.⁸⁴ Another account from *Ganjin wajō saniji* 鑑真和上三異事 (Three Strange Things about the Monk Ganjin), written in 831 by Hōan 豐安 (764-840), describes that when Ganjin preached on Buddhist precepts at Damingsi 大明寺 in Yangzhou, a three-eyed six-armed Bodhisattva suddenly appeared from a

⁸¹ Asai, “Raichōgo,” 133, 139; Asai, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 46.

⁸² Asai, “Raichōgo,” 139.

⁸³ Asai, “Raichōgo,” 138-139.

⁸⁴ *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, 57.

stupa and called himself “Hannyasen 般若仙,” which may be one of the forms of Maheśvara.⁸⁵ Given these accounts, Asai speculates that the main icon of the Kenjakudō was likely to be the six-armed Shūhōō Bosatsu.⁸⁶

The Shūhōō and Shishiku Bosatsu are similar in height, respectively measuring 173.2 and 171.8 centimeters tall. In addition, the torsos and legs of each statue along with the bases were made in the single-block technique using *kaya* 榿 (*torreya nucifera*).⁸⁷ Both statues show the third eye incised on the forehead and wear a piece of fabric crossing from the left shoulder to the right side of the waist with a tie in front of the torso. As the fabric, in an irregular shape, appears to be stretchy and smooth like leather, it might be an indication of a deer skin. While most of the surfaces of the two sculptures are now unpainted, traces of colors are found in the hair, eyes, and drapery. The decorative details such as belts and head bands are finely carved and look like jewels sheathed on the bodies.

The Shūhōō and Shishiku Bosatsu were intended to be *danzō* as indicated by their construction material. Because sandalwood did not grow in Japan, other types of high-quality aromatic wood such as *kaya*, *hinoki*, and *keyaki* 欂 (*zelkova serrata*) served as substitutes to make *danzō* over the course of history.⁸⁸ However, a recent study utilizing technological

⁸⁵ *Ganjin wajō saniji*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Shidenbu*, vol. 72 (Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 34; Asai, “Raichōgo,” 139.

⁸⁶ Asai, “Raichōgo,” 139.

⁸⁷ The two works had been considered to be carved from *hinoki* 桧 (Japanese cypress). A recent study on the material of these two sculptures using technological equipment confirms that they were made of *kaya*. For this study, see Kaneko Hiroaki et al., “Nihon kodai ni okeru mokuchōzō no jushu to yōzaikan shichi-hachi seki o chūshin ni,” *Museum* 555 (August, 1998): 23-26.

⁸⁸ For studies of *danzō*, see Boehm, *The Concept*, 13-16, 107-130; Suzuki Yoshihiro, “Danzō no shōrai to nihon teki tenkai-hakuki chōkoku ron josetsu,” *Rokuon zasshū* 13 (March, 2011): 31-36; Inoue Tadashi,

equipment confirms that *danzō* made in Japan from the eighth to early ninth century are predominantly carved from *kaya*.⁸⁹ Also, the study shows that *hinoki* and *keyaki* were consistently utilized to make armatures or wood-cores for clay and dry-lacquer sculptures during this time. It is therefore clear that *kaya* was chosen consciously as a substitute material for *danzō*. In addition to this material property, other formal elements—such as precise carving and single-block wood construction—of the Shūhōō and Shishiku Bosatsu are the characteristics of sandalwood imagery.

Originating in India, the concept of *danzō* is derived from a well-known legend in which the first image of the Buddha was made of ox-head sandalwood (*sendan* 梅檀) by the order of King Udayana of Kausambi. Because of this legend, *danzō* was highly valued and was associated with “auspicious images (*zuizō* 瑞像).” Although *danzō* had appeared in Japan as early as the late seventh and early eighth centuries, it was not until after the mid-eighth century that they began to be produced in greater number and its religious significance became widely known. Ganjin is credited with officially introducing the concept of *danzō* to Japan and popularizing the production of sandalwood images.⁹⁰ Thus, the sculptures of the Shūhōō and Shishiku represent a new type of Buddhist imagery that Ganjin transmitted from China.

Another image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon that may be linked to the Fujiwara family is a standing sculpture dated to the late eighth or early ninth century from Kōryūji 広隆寺 in Heiankyō (present-day Kyoto). This Fukūkenjaku Kannon has eight arms, but no third eye

“Danzō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 253 (June 1987); Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Danzō: byakudan butsu kara nihon no mokuchō butsu e* (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2011).

⁸⁹ Kaneko Hiroaki et al., “Nihon kodai,” 3-53; Kaneko Hiroaki et al., “Nihon kodai ni okeru mokuchōzō no jushu to yōzaikan II-hachi kyūseki o chūshin ni,” *Museum* 583 (April, 2003): 5-44.

⁹⁰ Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Danzō*, 9.

appears on the forehead. Instead, a crystal is shown between the eyebrows to represent an *ūrṇā*, which is one of the thirty-two marks of a transcendental being. This statue probably corresponds to the *danzō* recorded in *Kōryūji shizai kōtai jitsurokuchō* 廣隆寺資財交替實錄帳 (Inventories and Records of Kōryūji), which was compiled in 890.⁹¹ According to this document, the Kōryūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon served as the attendant of a Yakushi Buddha, which was also a *danzō* enshrined in the Golden Hall.⁹² Sasaki Moritoshi suggests that these two icons might have been created to appease the vengeful spirit of Prince Sawara 早良親王 (750-785), who starved himself to death to show his innocence after the assassination of Fujiwara no Tanetsugu 藤原種繼 (737-790), a descendant of the Ceremonial branch of the Fujiwara.⁹³ Mizuno Keizaburō connects the Kōryūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon to the Northern Fujiwara family through Fuyutsugu's cousin Fujiwara no Fujitsugu 藤原藤嗣 (773-817), who donated funds to construct the Jikidō of the temple sometime before 818.⁹⁴

In summary, the above investigation indicates that the Fujiwara's worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the eighth century was associated with the teachings of the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Lotus Sutra*, incantation of *dhāraṇī* spells, and practice of *danzō*. No single Buddhist teaching or practice was dominant. Empress Kōmyō was a devotee of Fukūkenjaku Kannon as evidenced by her close relationship with the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the embroidery painting of the divinity commissioned by the imperial family. Also, Kōmyō seemed to have aligned herself with

⁹¹ *Kōryūji shizai kōtai jitsurokuchō*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Jishibu*, vol. 83 (Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 230.

⁹² *Kōryūji shizai kōtai jitsurokuchō*, 230.

⁹³ Sasaki Moritoshi, "Kōryūji zō Fukūkenjaku Kannon ryūzō," *Kokka* 106, no. 1268 (June, 2001): 23-24.

⁹⁴ Mizuno Keizaburō, *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Heian jidai jūyō sakuhin hen ni* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1976), 62-63.

Empress Wu through the creation of the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. The association of this icon with the imagery of brightness and *Avatamsaka* teachings recalls Empress Wu's utilization of Buddhism to legitimize her sovereignty. As mentioned, Forte characterizes the worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in China as "bound up with the ideas of royalty as conceived by Buddhists of the day, with the figure of the Cakravartin, and consequently with the idea of the protection of the Chinese Buddhist state."⁹⁵ Given the wide adoption of Chinese institutional, religious, political, and artistic models by the Nara court, Forte considers that the same ideas also governed Kōmyō's devotion of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and patronage of the Hokkedō sculpture.⁹⁶

Nevertheless, not all of deity's images patronized by the Fujiwara clan had a political agenda. The Kōdō and Jizōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannon at Kōfukuji were created to commemorate the departed family members and pray for their salvation. After the mid-eighth century, we begin to see that the Fujiwara members commissioned images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon as *danzō* in keeping with the newest practice of Buddhism introduced by Ganjin. In sum, the Fujiwara's devotion of Fukūkenjaku Kannon did not concentrate on a particular form of the deity and was diverse in character, drawing on various Buddhist teachings and engaging with different currents of the deity's cult in the eighth century. The family chose this Kannon as the focus of worship probably because of its popularity in China, promotion by Empress Kōmyō and eminent monks, and its inclusive religious character connected to various doctrines and Buddhist practices.

⁹⁵ Forte, "Brief Notes," 24.

⁹⁶ Forte, "Brief Notes," 25.

Worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Heian Period

The Fujiwara's interest in Fukūkenjaku Kannon seemed to decline during the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century. Extant records of the family's devotion to the deity during this time are scant. We know one example of a sculpture dated to 867 from Anshōji 安祥寺 in Kyoto.⁹⁷ This image, no longer in existence, had three heads and six arms, and was commissioned by Fujiwara no Junshi 藤原順子 (809-871) who was the daughter of Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu (775-826). As discussed in Chapter Three, while the Northern Fujiwara family continued to make offerings and ordered recitation of sutras to be performed in the Nan'endō, such acts of devotion took place only a few times from the tenth to mid-eleventh century. The production of images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon also drastically decreased after the Nara period. A possible reason for this decline was the rise of the Shingon and Tendai Buddhist schools in the ninth century. These two religious institutions promulgated worship of other deities and enjoyed patronage from the Northern Fujiwara clan and other prominent aristocrats. This situation may explain why the family took little interest in Fukūkenjaku Kannon during these two hundred years.

As the Nan'endō emerged as a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century, the devotion to the hall's Fukūkenjaku Kannon rapidly grew within the Northern Fujiwara clan. The family began to identify the icon as their protector and as the Buddhist form of their tutelary *kami* Kasuga Daimyōjin at Kasuga in the twelfth century. With the establishment of these new identities, the eight-armed seated form of Fukūkenjaku Kannon gradually became synonymous with the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ *Anshōji shizaichō*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Jishibu 1*, vol. 83 (Tokyo: Zaidanhōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972), 301.

⁹⁸ As far as I know, except one painting currently at the Tokyo National Museum, all of extant free-standing images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the seated eight-armed form, made after the tenth century, are

The cult of the deity arose against the backdrop in which the family lost dominance in politics beginning during the reign of the Emperor Go-Sanjō (1034-1073; r. 1068-1072). The emperor and his successors devised a series of policies to restore the authority of the imperial house and restrict the power of the *sekkanke*. Under these political circumstances, the *sekkanke* strengthened their ties with Kōfukuji in order to control its large landholdings and religious prerogative.⁹⁹ According to Kusaka Sakiko, the *sekkanke* began to refer Kōfukuji as their tutelary temple (*mitera* 御寺) during the time of Fujiwara no Moromichi 藤原師通 (1062-1099).¹⁰⁰ Also, Moromichi's son Kakushin 覚信 (1065-1121) was sent to take orders at Kōfukuji in 1074 and later became the first abbot of the temple from the *sekkanke* in 1110.

These efforts, however, hardly turned the course of history in favor of the *sekkanke*. The untimely death of the two chieftains, Moromichi in 1099 and Fujiwara no Morozane 藤原師実 (1042-1101) in 1101 substantially weakened the power of the family, leaving the next heir Fujiwara no Tadazane 藤原忠実 (1078-1162) to combat the ambitious retired emperors. During

copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. This painting at the Tokyo National Museum is dated to the twelfth century and depicts an eight-armed Kannon seated on the lotus pedestal. Asai identifies it as Juntei Kannon, while another scholar Takasaki Fuhiko considers it as Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Fukūkenjaku Kannon was also worshipped as part of the Six Kannon, which includes Shō Kannon (Skt. Āryāvalokiteśvara; Sacred Kannon), Senju Kannon (Skt. Sahasrabhuja Avalokiteśvara; Thousand-armed Kannon), Batō Kannon (Skt. Hayagrīva Avalokiteśvara; Horse-headed Kannon), Jūichimen Kannon, and Nyoirin Kannon (Skt. Cintāmaṇi Avalokiteśvara; Jewel-holding Kannon). The above configuration is based on Tendai Buddhist texts. The Fukūkenjaku Kannon is replaced with Juntei Kannon in the Shingon tradition. The cult of the Six Kannon gained significance after the tenth century. Asai, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 75; Takasaki Fuhiko, "Tanakashi kizō no den Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō ni tsuite," *Museum* 336, (March 1979): 10-16. For the study of the images and worship of the Six Kannon, see Sherry Fowler, *Accounts and Images of Six Kannon in Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016).

⁹⁹ Yasuo Motoki, "Kōfukuji in the Late Heian Period," in *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, ed. Joan R. Piggott (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006), 301-325; Kusaka Sakiko, "Heian makki no Kōfukuji—mitera kannen no seiritsu," *Shimado* 28, (1970): 75-104.

¹⁰⁰ Kusaka, "Heian makki," 91.

the chieftainship of Tadazane, the *sekkanke*'s devotion to the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon came to an unprecedented degree. Since the family was facing a difficult time, Tadazane's favor of this icon is hardly taken merely as a result of his religious piety, but also a political calculation. As the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was situated in Kōfukuji and was dedicated by the ancestors of the Northern Fujiwara clan, the icon was surely an ideal focus of worship that could anchor the family with Kōfukuji and Kasuga Shrine, both forming a powerful shrine-temple complex in the first half of the twelfth century.

Accounts

Records about the *sekkanke*'s veneration of Fukūkenjaku Kannon appear more frequently toward the end of the eleventh century and are abundant after Tadazane assumed the chieftain position in 1102. Moreover, these records indicate that different from the previous century, worship of the deity became a matter for the entire family. Not only Tadazane, but also other family members such as his son Fujiwara no Yorinaga 藤原頼長 (1120-1156), his retainer Fujiwara no Munetada 藤原宗忠 (1062-1141), his grandmother Minamoto no Reishi 源麗子 (1040-1114), his mother Fujiwara no Zenshi 藤原全子 (1060-1150), and his daughter Fujiwara no Taishi 藤原泰子 (1095-1156) showed their devotion to Fukūkenjaku Kannon in various ways.¹⁰¹ It is common to see that the family commissioned images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and

¹⁰¹ Fujiwara no Tadazane, *Denryaku*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-1970); Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993-2014); Fujiwara no Yorinaga, *Taiki*, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). The bibliographic information for each entry below includes journal title, reign year, month, and day, which are then followed by a bracket that shows volume and page numbers. The same rule will be applied to other diaries as well. There are two editions of *Chūyūki*. One is published in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*. The other is published in *Zōho shiryō taisei*. The *DNK* edition is more reliable, but is not complete yet. I mainly use the *DNK* version, but cite the *ZST* edition if needed. When doing this, I put the abbreviation

requested monks to perform consecration ceremonies.¹⁰² There are also cases that the family simply called on monks to set up an altar and dedicated rituals to the deity.¹⁰³ Their devotion to Fukūkenjaku Kannon took on other forms. Records indicate that they studied, copied, and recited sutras of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and chanted its *dhāraṇī*, as well as painted its images by their own hands.¹⁰⁴ The purposes of these religious activities were varied, from praying for pregnancy, family prosperity, to cure of illness.¹⁰⁵ In some cases, the worship occurred because of fear of breaking taboo (*mono imi* 物忌み) or revelation of the deity in dreams.¹⁰⁶ Many of these rituals took place at residences of the family rather than in the Nan'endō and were performed by monks from both Kōfukuji and Shingon schools.

The family also offered sutras such as *Daihannyakyō* 大般若經 (Sk. *Mahāprajñāpāramitā sutra*) and Fukūkenjaku Kannon sutras to the Nan'endō and sponsored the performance of quick

ZST before the volume number. *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.4.29 (2: 138); *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.6.13 (2: 142), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.8.19 (2: 150), *Denryaku*, Tennin 1.6.23 (2: 294), *Denryaku*, Tenei 2.7.29 (3: 154); *Chūyūki*, Jōtoku 2.10.11 (4: 70), *Chūyūki*, Chōji 2.2.7 (6: 20); *Taiki*, Kyūan 6.9.10 (2: 38), *Taiki*, Kyūan 6.10.22 (2: 44), *Taiki*, Kyūju 1.8.23 (2: 132), *Taiki*, Kyūju 2.9.29 (2: 171), *Taiki*, Kyūju 3.3.28 (2: 205).

¹⁰² *Denryaku*, Kōwa 4.2.19 (1: 107-108), *Denryaku*, Kōwa 4.5.28 (1: 125), *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.10.3 (1: 240), *Denryaku*, Chōji 2.12.19 (2: 111), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.6.13 (2: 142), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.12.25 (2: 164), *Denryaku*, Tennin 2.6.24 (3: 28), *Denryaku*, Tenei 1.5.21 (3: 89-90), *Denryaku*, Tenei 1.6.27 (3: 94), *Denryaku*, Tenei 2.7.29 (3: 154).

¹⁰³ *Denryaku*, Chōji 1.8.25 (2: 9), *Denryaku*, Chōji 2.12.19 (2: 111), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 2.7.29 (4: 113).

¹⁰⁴ *Denryaku*, Tennin 2.10.24 (3: 55), *Denryaku*, Tenei 1.4.26 (3: 87), *Denryaku*, Tenei 1.5.21 (3: 89-90), *Denryaku*, Tenei 2.9.24 (3: 174), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.5.18 (4: 36), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.10 (4: 43), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.20 (4: 45), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.5.24 (5: 29), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.11.6 (5: 53), *Denryaku*, Gen'ei 1.8.16 (5: 74); *Taiki*, Kyūan 6.2.27 (2: 17), *Taiki*, Kyūan 6.9.10 (2: 38), *Taiki*, Kyūju 2.9.29 (2: 171), *Taiki*, Kyūju 2.10.20 (2: 173); *Chūyūki*, Shōtoku 2.10.11 (4: 70).

¹⁰⁵ *Taiki*, Kyūju 3.3.28 (2: 205); *Denryaku*, Tenei 1.5.21 (3: 89-90), *Denryaku*, Tennin 1.6.23 (2: 294), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.8.19 (2: 150).

¹⁰⁶ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.1.13 (5: 5), *Denryaku*, Gen'ei 1.7.10 (5: 68), *Denryaku*, Gen'ei 1.7.26 (5: 70), *Denryaku*, Gen'ei 1.8.16 (5: 74); *Chūyūki*, Kashō 2.1.15 (7: 11).

readings (*tendoku* 転読) of scriptures there.¹⁰⁷ The devotion to the deity also took the form of actual visits to the hall from the capital. For example, an entry in *Chūyūki* shows that in 1098 Munetada travelled to the Nan'endō and conducted an array of activities there, offering lamps, studying sutras of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, and praying in front of the icon.¹⁰⁸

In addition, the family commissioned copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. One example in *Chūyūki* tells that Zenshi dedicated a three-*shaku* (around ninety centimeters) sculpture of Fukūkenjaku Kannon along with the Four Guardian Kings in 1111 and placed them in a tent-like structure set on an octagonal platform (*chō* 帳).¹⁰⁹ Zenshi vowed to make these images the last year when her son Tadazane fell ill, and they were made in the “Nan'endō manner (*Nan'endō yō* 南円堂様)”. Besides these images, Zenshi offered one scroll of the *Daihannyakyō*. The ceremony for the consecration of the images and dedication of the sutra was spectacular. A crowd of thirty-one monks gathered at Kaya-no-in 賀陽院, which was the residence of Zenshi's granddaughter Taishi. The Kōfukuji monk Eien 永縁 (d. 1125) presided over the ceremony, followed by his preaching and *tendoku* performance conducted by a group of thirty monks. Another instance in *Chūyūki* shows that after waking up from a dream, in which someone told him to make an image of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Munetada commissioned a one-*shaku* and six-*sun* (about forty-eight centimeters) copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as he thought that the person in his dream was the deity of the Nan'endō.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ *Denryaku*, Chōji 1.7.2 (2: 2), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.7.13 (2: 147), *Denryaku*, Tennin 3.7.5 (3: 95), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 3.1.11 (4: 146); *Chūyūki*, Kashō 1.4.29 (6: 174).

¹⁰⁸ *Chūyūki*, Shōtoku 2.10.11 (4: 70).

¹⁰⁹ Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-7 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). *Chūyūki* Ten'ei 2.7.29 (ZST, 4: 61).

¹¹⁰ *Chūyūki*, Kashō 2.1.15 (7: 11).

The family also conducted a combined worship of the icon with Kasuga Daimyōjin. As indicated by *Chūyūki*, the Northern Fujiwara clan had visited the Nan’endō along with Kasuga Shrine as early as the late eleventh century.¹¹¹ In addition, it is not uncommon to see that they offered sutras to both sites at the same time.¹¹² There are also cases in which the worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon occurred because of an event associated with Kasuga Shrine. For example, in 1112 Tadazane sent his son Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠通 (1097-1164) to Nara as the construction of the Kasuga Western Pagoda (Kasuga Saitō 春日西塔) began on this day.¹¹³ While absent from this event, Tadazane read four hundred scrolls of the *Heart Sutra* (Sk. *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*) for Kasuga Daimyōjin, asked the Ninnaji monk Jōkaku 定覚 (dates unknown) to perform a ritual devoted to Fukūkenjaku Kannon, and chanted all day long. Another instance is that in 1111, Tadazane read sutras of Fukūkenjaku Kannon out of fear that his delay in visiting Kasuga Shrine might upset Kasuga Daimyōjin.¹¹⁴ In addition, Tadazane copied a sutra of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and offered a painting of the deity on the tenth day of the seventh month in 1113 because a “shaking,” which may be caused by an earthquake, took place five days ago while the family made offerings to Kasuga Shrine.¹¹⁵ The close connection between the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin was further marked by the actual building—Kasuga Western Pagoda—which was consecrated in 1116 and was situated on the grounds of the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex, at the location of present-day Nara National Museum.

¹¹¹ *Chūyūki*, Kanji 6.9.2 (1: 157).

¹¹² *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.7.13 (2: 147), *Denryaku*, Tennin 3.7.5 (3: 95); *Chūyūki*, Kashō 1.7.14 (6: 194).

¹¹³ *Denryaku*, Ten’ei 3.8.7 (3: 248).

¹¹⁴ *Denryaku*, Ten’ei 2.9.24 (3: 174).

¹¹⁵ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.10 (4: 43).

The pagoda and its images unfortunately no longer exist, but several records tell of their appearances.¹¹⁶ Built by the order of Tadazane, the pagoda was a five-storied structure encircled by a corridor and a south gate. The doors of the pagoda were painted with images, subjects of which are however unknown. The building enshrined the Buddhas of the four directions, which probably consisted of the Shaka, Yakushi, Amida, and Miroku Buddhas.¹¹⁷ In his diary, Tadazane specified that each of the Buddhas had two attendants, and the Shaka Buddha was accompanied by Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹¹⁸ The fact that he had no mention of what the attendants were for the other three Buddhas but Fukūkenjaku Kannon indicates that it was significant to him. Furthermore, Tadazane inserted objects inside all of the sculptures. The deposits for each icon included Sanskrit syllables (*bonji* 梵字), written or printed on paper, and a lotus pedestal, upon which stood a mirror incised with Sanskrit syllables.¹¹⁹ The mirror was very likely to be a moon disk (*gachirin* 月輪), which was often invoked in the esoteric meditation practice to symbolize one's awakening-seeking mind (*bodaishin* 菩提心).¹²⁰ Made as mirrors or wooden

¹¹⁶ Adachi Kō, “Kasuga Saitō to Kōfukuji tō to no kankei,” in *Tōba kenchiku no kenkyū* (Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1987), 246-279. The following discussion on this pagoda is based on Adachi's study and records from *Denryaku* and *Chūyūki*.

¹¹⁷ Adachi, “Kasuga Saitō,” 263-267; *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.26 (4: 46). Tadazane only indicated that one of the four Buddhas was Shaka in his diary *Denryaku*. Nevertheless, by examining relevant records, Adachi convincingly argues that the other three sculptures should represent the Buddhas Yakushi, Amida, and Miroku rather than the four *honji* Buddhas of the Kasuga Shrine. The latter are usually consisted of the Shaka Buddha, Yakushi Buddha, Jizō Bosatsu, and Eleven-headed Kannon. The designation of the Shaka Buddha as one of the *honji butsu* of the Kasuga Shrine appeared in the Kamakura period. Also, according to *Chūyūki*, the Kasuga West Pagoda was modelled after the Five-storied Pagoda at Kōfukuji, which enshrined the Yakushi, Shaka, Amida, and Miroku Buddhas.

¹¹⁸ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.7.26 (4: 46).

¹¹⁹ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 4.2.26 (4: 230).

¹²⁰ For discussion on *gachirin*, see Takata Osamu, “Hōōdō honzon tainai nōchi no bonji Amida daishō ju gachirin kō,” *Bijutsu kenkyū* 3, no 183 (September 1955): 29-34.

plates, *gachirin* were often found inside Buddhist sculptures and were employed to signify the spirit of the deity. The earliest extant example of the deposited *gachirin* is the one inside the Amida sculpture in the Phoenix Hall at Byōdōin. It consists of a lotus base and a circular panel inscribed with Sanskrit syllables.

When the four Buddha sculptures along with their attendants were consecrated at the Kasuga Western Pagoda in 1116, Tadazane placed two groups of deposits inside the central heart pillar of the building.¹²¹ The first group consisted of the sutras of *Konkōmyō saishōōkyō* 金光明最勝王經 (Sk. *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā sutra*) and *Kongō hannya kyō* 金剛般若經 (Skt. *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*). The second group contained relic, Amoghapāśa sutras copied by Tadazane himself, and papers printed/written with *dhāraṇī* spells. After the completion of the pagoda, the family continued to offer scriptures and hold sutra recitations there.¹²² Moreover in 1118 they initiated the ritual Yuishiki-e 唯識会, which was the lecture on the Consciousness-only doctrine, the fundamental teaching of Hossō Buddhism.¹²³ Through the erection of the pagoda and other concomitant ritual activities, the *sekkanke* demonstrated that they integrated Kōfukūji and Kasuga Shrine into their topography of power.

The worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon was not limited to the members of the *sekkanke*. In 1094 and 1113, the general clergy (*daishu* 大衆) at Kōfukuji commissioned images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon to pray for the prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara and to curse the family's political rival Minamoto Akifusa 源顕房 (1037-1094) and Emperor Shirakawa (1053-

¹²¹ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 4.3.3 (4: 231).

¹²² *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.1.8 (5: 4), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.1.20 (5: 7), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 4.1.17 (4: 215).

¹²³ *Hyakurensō* 百鍊抄, in *Kokushi taikai*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965). *Hyakurensō*, Gen'ei 2.3.15 (51).

1129).¹²⁴ Interestingly, the first leader of the Nara Sculptors, Raijo (1103-1119) was involved in one of these events and was questioned by Shirakawa for the construction of deity's image.¹²⁵ It is clear that by the twelfth century Fukūkenjaku Kannon had become a focus of communal worship of the Kōfukuji-Fujiwara community.

The worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon also became a site whereby other members of the Northern Fujiwara competed with the *sekkanke*. A descendant of the lesser known Kan'in branch of the clan, Fujiwara no Shōshi 藤原璋子 (1101-1145) enshrined a sculpture of the deity in the Tōendō (Eastern Round Hall) at Kōfukuji in 1124. Since the Tōendō was constructed as the replication of the Nan'endō as discussed in Chapter Three, this Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which Shōshi commissioned, should be also a copy of the one in the Nan'endō. Shōshi became the consort of Emperor Toba in 1118 and soon gave birth to Prince Akihito (1119-1164), who later ascended the throne as the Emperor Sutoku. Initially Shōshi's stepfather Emperor Shirakawa wanted to marry her to Tadazane's son Tadamichi.¹²⁶ However, as pointed out by scholars, Tadazane refused this marriage arrangement probably because of his dislike for Shōshi, who was described by him as a "strange and unusual consort" in *Denryaku*.¹²⁷ Furthermore, Tadazane rejected the proposal of marrying his daughter Taishi to Shirakawa's

¹²⁴ *Genkō ninen guchūreki uragaki*, in *Dai Nihon shiryō daisanhen no san* (Tokyo: Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku Bunkakubu Shiryō Hensansho, 1929), 61; *Chūyūki*, Kanji 7.10.29 (ZST, 1: 94); *Eikyū gannenki*, in *gunsho ruijū*, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960), 451-452.

¹²⁵ *Eikyū gannenki*, 451-452.

¹²⁶ For the study of Shōshi, see Tsunoda Bun'ei, *Taikenmonin Shōshi no shōgai: shōtei hishō* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1985).

¹²⁷ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.10.15 (5: 50), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 5.10.10 (5: 49); G. Cameron Hurst, III, "Insei," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2: Heian Japan*, ed. Donald H. Shiverly and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 603-604, 611; Motoki Yasuo, *Fujiwara no Tadazane* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000), 79-82.

grandson Toba for the same reason. Infuriated by these rejections, Shirkawa stripped Tadazane of his regent post in 1120. It was not until after Shirakawa's death in 1129 that Tadazane returned to the political realm. Seen from this political situation, Shōshi's creation of the Tōendō and enshrinement of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in 1124 were very likely to demonstrate that she was now the most powerful figure of the Northern Fujiwara clan.

Replications of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon

A few copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku are extant with dates spanning from the late eleventh to the fourteenth century. The following focuses on the copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon created from the late eleventh to late thirteenth century. I divide them into two groups: those created before the destruction and reconstruction of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon during 1181-1189, and those from after that period of time. I make this division in order to indicate that the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon that Kōkei 康慶 (act. 1152-1190s) restored in 1189 may have served as the model for the copies made after 1189, while the copies created prior to 1181 were clearly based upon the earlier icon or its variant.

Utsushi 写し is Japanese word for “copy” and can refer to copies of both paintings and sculptures. Its verb form “*utsusu*” means “to duplicate, to imitate, or to transcribe” and may have its etymological origin in other homonym (to move, to transfer, to project, and to reflect).¹²⁸ In traditional Japanese artistic practice, imitation and creation do not stand for two opposite

¹²⁸ For discussion on *utsushi* in Japanese art and culture, see Yoshiaki Shimizu, “Copying in Japanese Art: Calligraphy, Painting, and Architecture,” in *Bridges to Heaven: Essays on East Asian Art in Honor of Professor Wen C. Fong*, ed. Jerome Silbergeld (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 761-778; Rupert Cox, ed., *The Culture of Copying in Japan: Critical and Historical Perspectives* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007); Shimaō Arata, Kameda Kazuko, and Princess Akiko, ed., *Utsushi no chikara: sōzō to keishō no matorikusu* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2013).

concepts.¹²⁹ Making copies actually carries positive meanings, serving as ways of transmitting style, preserving tradition, and experimenting with ancient forms. In Buddhism, reproductions of Buddhist images and texts were valued as a means of religious practice and an expression of pious devotion. Faithful representations of forms and iconography drawn from the originals or their variants are essential for establishing the substitutability of copies and their religious efficacy. Nevertheless, this is not to say that making copies of Buddhist imagery was an act of slavish imitation. Cases show that artists had freedom to decide which elements from the originals should be included and eliminated in the process of reproduction.¹³⁰ Also, direct copying was not always possible because the originals may have been lost, destroyed, or off limits to artists. In these situations, artists would have to rely on sources such as other copies or their own recollection and knowledge of the originals. The intent behind the production of copies would also affect their function, meaning, and appearance. Given that multiple factors would affect the making of copies, variations in forms, style, and iconography invariably occurred. This is also the case with the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, whose copies show variations in certain iconographic features. To understand these variations, it is necessary to have a brief discussion of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the restored icon that Kōkei carved in 1189.

The Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon

By examining temple records and iconographic drawings, I show in Chapter Two that the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was probably seated with eight arms and three eyes

¹²⁹ Shimao Arata, “Utsushi no bunka—originaru shugi saikō,” in *Utsushi no chikara: sōzō to keishō no matorikusu*, ed. Shimao Arata, Kameda Kazuko, and Princess Akiko (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2013), 241-261; Shimizu, “Copying in Japanese Art,” 761-762.

¹³⁰ Shimao, “Utsushi no bunka,” 241-261; Donald McCallum, *Zenkōji and Its Icons*, 100-154.

with a third eye placed vertically on the forehead. Two sets of the hands would have performed mudras of reverence and wish-granting (Skt. *varada*; J. *yoganin* 予願印), while the other two sets have grasped various attributes such as a fly whisk, a lasso, a monk staff, and a lotus flower. The sculpture might have worn a crown with a small image of Amida Buddha in keeping with scriptural prescription. Its deer skin may have hung on the back and shoulder in a manner similar to that in the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which is made of a separate piece of dry lacquer and rests above the cape on the upper left arms.¹³¹ In an irregular shape with a smooth surface, the deer skin of the Hokkedō sculpture also hangs on the back with two strings encircling the waist tied in a knot in front of the abdomen. The platform (*daiza* 台座), upon which the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was seated, would have contained a lotus pedestal, a ball-like ornament called *shikinasu* 敷茄子, and a multi-tiered base. The mandorla (*kōhai* 光背) installed behind the sculpture would have consisted of several openwork panels crafted in sword-like shapes and radiating out around the body.

The iconography of the restored Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon closely follows that of the original in terms of gestures, postures, and hand-held attributes. The mandora and platform of the restored icon were also fashioned in the same manner as those of the original. Nevertheless, the deer skin of Kōkei's sculpture covers the upper left arms and shoulder, hanging diagonally across the back.¹³² While absent, a cape, made from a separate piece of wood, may have been worn by this sculpture, lying on top of the deer skin.¹³³ Also, a piece of cloth may have been

¹³¹ Itō Shirō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no rokuhie," in *Heian jidai chōkokushi no kenkyū* (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000), 285. For the photo image of this icon's deer skin, see Tōdaiji Myūjiamu, ed., *Nara jidai no Tōdaiji* (Nara: Tōdaiji, 2011), 72-75.

¹³² Itō Shirō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 288, 292.

¹³³ Itō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 292.

wrapped around the waist of this sculpture, but whether it served as part of the deer skin like that in the Hokkedō icon is unclear.¹³⁴ As discussed in Chapter Two, it is impossible to confirm the form—the volume, anatomy, and drapery carving—of the original Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon by looking at Kōkei’s work. Nevertheless, by this discussion of the original and restored icons, we know that they have commonalities in iconographical features such as gestures, postures, and attributes, and in ornamental details such as the mandorla and the platform.

Copies Made Prior to 1181

Two Sculptures and One Painting

The earliest known copy of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is a sculpture from Daitōji in Okayama Prefecture.¹³⁵ This copy is dated to 1099 by an ink inscription written on the wall of a cavity inside its head. The image was made using “split-and-join (*warihagi* 割矧ぎ)” method. The main body of this sculpture was carved from a single woodblock and was divided into two halves—front and back—behind the ears. The head was first separate from the torso, and then the interior of each piece was hollowed out in order to prevent the sculpture from cracking. Other parts of the statue such as the topknot, arms, legs, and hands were carved into separate pieces of wood and were joined to the main body.

The sculpture shows the deity with a slender body, slightly plump cheeks, and crescent eyes with a downcast gaze. While the shoulders are rounded, the torso is thin and lacks volume. The drapery was carved in shallow pleats, falling in a flat and abstract manner. These carvings of

¹³⁴ Itō, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 292.

¹³⁵ For the study of this sculpture, see Asai Kazuharu, “Okayama Daitōji no Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zazō,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 246 (September 1999): 69-85.

the body, face, and drapery connect this work with the sculptural style established by Jōchō 定朝 (d. 1057) in the mid-eleventh century, which is characterized by a slender modelling of body, thin drapery folds, and a tranquil facial expression with down-cast eyes.

The Daitsūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon is enshrined in the Kannon Hall along with two sculptures of Fudō Myōō and Bishamonten, both of which are dated to the late Heian period. Whether this is the original grouping of the icons is unknown. According to Asai Kazuharu, the temple was initially associated with Tōdaiji, even though it was affiliated with Tendai Buddhism in the Heian period and is now with Sōtō Zen.¹³⁶ Asai also points out that the temple is situated in an area close to Shikatanoshō 鹿田庄, which was the estate of the *sekkanke* in present-day Okayama Prefecture.¹³⁷ As discussed in Chapter Three, the revenue from the Shikatanoshō funded the performances of the Hokke-e and Chōkō-e rituals, which were held annually in the Nan'endō. Judging from this, Asai considers that the Daitsūji sculpture was likely based on a model that was used by family members of the Northern Fujiwara clan to worship Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ Asai, “Okayama Daitsūji,” 71-72.

¹³⁷ Asai, “Okayama Daitsūji,” 82.

¹³⁸ Asai, “Okayama Daitsūji,” 82. Asai considers that besides the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, the *danzō* in the Jizōdō at Kōfukuji might serve as a model for making this copy. Nevertheless, the Jizōdō *danzō* was probably destroyed by fire in 1046, and whether it was restored after the fire is unknown. Also, no record tells of the use of this icon after it was enshrined in the Jizōdō in 772. While this *danzō* was connected to the Northern Fujiwara family, it had no direct relationship with the lineage of the *sekkanke*. Given these, it is more likely that the Daitsūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon was made based on the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon or its copies.

Another copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is a sculpture dated to the first half of the twelfth century from Ōgenji, which is a small temple located in Nara City.¹³⁹ Like the Daitsūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon, this statue was also made in *warihagi* technique with one vertical woodblock that forms the main body and was divided into two halves. This construction manner is a characteristic of sculptures made around the twelfth century.

The Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon is shown with a stern facial expression and has eyes cast down in an unfocused gaze, which is common to sculptures from the mid-eleventh to the early twelfth century. The icon shows a sense of gentleness as indicated by slender arms and a flat chest. The skirt falls across the two legs in a rolling-waves pattern. The drapery folds consist of alternating one high and one low ridge, but are soft and shallow in keeping with gentle aesthetics prevalent in statues from the early twelfth century.

The provenance of the Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon is obscure. It was not originally from Ōgenji, but defunct temple Zenkonji 善根寺, also known as Narukawaji 鳴河寺 located in Yamato Province (present-day Nara).¹⁴⁰ Zenkonji was a place for praying (*kigansho* 祈願所) that belonged to Ichijōin 一条院, which was one of the cloistered temples at Kōfukuji. Moreover, Zenkonji was situated in the area, which was governed by Kōfukuji in the past and was close to Nakagawadera 中川寺, a temple founded by Kōfukuji monk Jippan 実範 (d. 1144) in the twelfth century. Therefore, the Ōgenji sculpture may have been commissioned by monks associated with Kōfukuji. One may link the Ōgenji sculpture to the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon through its *shikinasu* that was inserted underneath a lotus pedestal as part of the platform. *Shikinasu* are

¹³⁹ For the study of this statue, see Yamamoto Tsutomu, “Nara Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon zazō,” *Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan kenkyūshi* 388 (July 1983): 12-20.

¹⁴⁰ Yamamoto, “Nara Ōgenji,” 12.

mainly seen in statues from the Nara period and appear in the original as well as the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁴¹ Nevertheless, the Ōgenji *shikinasu* was probably made a century earlier than the Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon and was reused from another statue.¹⁴²

The Ōgenji and Daitsūji sculptures resemble to a drawing of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon from *Besson zakki* 別尊雜記, an iconographic manual compiled by the Shingon monk Shinkaku 心覺 (1117-1180) during the Shōan 承安 era (1171-1175).¹⁴³ Firstly, these three images show the deity seated with eight arms and three eyes. Second, in each of the works, one pair of hands is pressed in front of the chest to perform a mudra of reverence, while another pair is lowered with the palms facing upward in mudras of wish-granting. The rest of the hands hold various attributes.¹⁴⁴ An image of Amida Buddha appears on the crown of the deity in the *Besson zakki* drawing, while is absent in the Daitsūji and Ōgenji sculptures. Nevertheless, a tiny lotus pedestal is found attached to the diadem platform (*tenkandai* 天冠台) of the Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon, suggesting that it bore an effigy of Amida Buddha before. This iconographical feature was possibly lost from the Daitsūji sculpture, which wears an openwork

¹⁴¹ Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō shozō no saikō,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 262; Nishikawa Kyōtarō, “Kōkei to Unkei,” in *Nara no tera: Kōfukuji Hokuendō to Nan'endō no shozō*, ed. by Nishikawa Kyōtarō and Tsujimoto Yonesaburō (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1994), 8-9.

¹⁴² Yamamoto, “Nara Ōgenji,” 16. Made in one piece of wood, the *shikinasu* was hollowed in the interior. It looks disproportionately large in relation to the icon. The carving of the arabesque adornment on the surface is shallow and flat, which are found only in the works dated up to the early eleventh century. These formal qualities lead Yamamoto to suggest that the *shikinasu* was made earlier than the icon itself and was reused from other statues.

¹⁴³ *Besson zakki*, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978), 226.

¹⁴⁴ It should be noted that most of the attributes held by the Ōgenji and Daitsūji Fukūkenjaku Kannon are the restorations.

crown that is a later replacement. In both sculptures, the antelope skin hangs across the shoulders as well as the back, drapes on the abdomen, and knots in the front.¹⁴⁵ Because *Besson zakki* gives no back view of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, how the deer skin is represented is unclear. It is also obscure with regard to whether a cape covering across the deity's shoulders is meant to be this iconographic feature. Nevertheless, a piece of cloth with a tie in front of its belly might be an indication of a deer skin as in the case of the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Overall, as these two sculptures have much in common with the *Besson zakki* drawing in terms of iconography, they were probably produced as copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

As mentioned previously, Kōfukuji monks also worshipped Fukūkenjaku Kannon and performed rituals dedicated to the deity at residences of the *sekkanke* as well as the Nan'endō.¹⁴⁶ Taking this together with Daitsūji's and Zenkonji's associations with the *sekkanke* and Kōfukuji, it is not surprising why in places like these two temples, which are geographically removed from Kōfukuji, there are copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon: they were likely created to satisfy the need of those who were far away from Kōfukuji, but wanted to worship the icon.

Another copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is a painting from the National Nara Museum (hereafter NNM), dated to the last quarter of the twelfth century.¹⁴⁷ The painting shows the deity seated against a mandorla on a multi-tiered platform that contains a *shikinasu*. The mandorla is barely visible to the naked eye because its colors are darkened and have peeled off.

¹⁴⁵ Itō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 286-287, 293; Asai, "Okayama Daitsūji," 73-74. It should be noted that the deer skin wraps both sides of the waist in the Daitsūji work, while circles the right side of the waist in the Ōgenji sculpture.

¹⁴⁶ *Chūyūki*, Ten'ei 2.7.29 (ZST, 4: 61). *Denryaku*, Tennin 2.10.24 (3: 55), *Denryaku*, Ten'ei 1.5.21 (3: 89-90).

¹⁴⁷ For the study of this painting, see Taniguchi Kōsei, "Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō kenpon choshoku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō," *Rokuon zasshū* 4 (March 2002): 59-70.

Nevertheless, an x-ray image of this painting shows that the mandorla consists of several openwork panels each shaped like swords.¹⁴⁸ With pointed ends and arabesque patterns, these panels radiate out around the body of the icon. This rendition of the mandorla is only seen in the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and its copies, thereby serving as a signature feature of the icon. The mandora and *shikinasu* allow us to identify the NNM painting as a copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. The depiction of the Four Guardian Kings in the painting also supports this point. Rather than stand in the four corners, the Four Guardian Kings appear in front of and slightly behind the deity with two on each side in keeping with their actual positions in the Nan'endō.¹⁴⁹

The painting depicts an antelope skin hidden underneath a sash with only its end—a tiny deer head—revealed around the left side of the abdomen. Taniguchi Kōsei suggests that this illustration of the deer skin is derived from the image of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in *Jikkanshō*, which is the late-Heian iconographic manual compiled by the Shingon monk Yōgen (1075-1159).¹⁵⁰ A passage written next to the manual's image states that the Nan'endō

¹⁴⁸ For image of this, see Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō,” Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, <http://www.narahaku.go.jp/archives/kiyo/04/kiyo-04-kuchie-02.pdf> [accessed May 11, 2017]

¹⁴⁹ As indicated by *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, there were six monk sculptures seated behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the hall. The background of the NNM painting was probably left empty on purpose in order to indicate the presence of the six monk sculptures. *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, 50.

¹⁵⁰ Taniguchi, “Nara Kokuritsu,” 66-68, fig. 10. There are several extant copies of *Jikkanshō*. The image of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which Taniguchi discusses in this article, comes from the Daigōji version of *Jikkanshō*. Other versions of the text also show identical depictions of the icon. For these, see *Jikkanshō*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Zuzōbu*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1971), 284; *Zuzōshō*, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978), 29-30, fig. 68.

Fukūkenjaku Kannon does not wear a surplice (*kesa* 袈裟), but a deer skin.¹⁵¹ The *Jikkanshō* drawing gives an explicit depiction of the deer skin, showing it hanging like a sash on the torso diagonally from the left shoulder. Additionally, no other upper garment but the deer skin is shown on the torso. The depiction of the exposed torso sets the *Jikkanshō* drawing apart from the NNM painting, in which the deity wears a cape across the shoulders. In this regard, the NNM is similar to the drawing of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in *Besson zakki*, because both show the deity dressed in a cape over the shoulders and a sash across the torso.

The NNM painting bears other similarities to the *Jikkanshō* and *Besson zakki* drawings. All three show the deity seated with eight arms and three eyes, performing two kinds of mudras (*yoganin* and *gasshōin*) and holding the attributes of a lasso, a fly whisk, a lotus flower, and a monk staff. Moreover, in these three copies, there are images of Amida Buddha on the crowns of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Another similarity among these three works is that the right leg of the deity is placed over the left one, a position that is reversed in the Daitsūji and Ōgenji sculptures. Overall, the NNM painting is strikingly similar to the *Jikkanshō* and *Besson zakki* drawings. It is possible that the NNM painting was not directly modelled after the actual Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, but other sources such as its copies in the iconographical compendiums.

Meaning of Deer Skin

Tanguchi considers that the illustration of the deer skin in the NNM painting was to emphasize the connection of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon with Takemikazuchi no Mikoto, the *kami* of the first shrine at Kasuga, who reputedly traveled to the shrine on a deer.¹⁵² In

¹⁵¹ Taniguchi, "Nara Kokuritsu," fig. 10; *Jikkanshō*, 284.

¹⁵² Taniguchi, "Nara Kokuritsu," 67-68.

addition to serving as the deity's vehicle, deer was the clan emblem of the Fujiwara clan.¹⁵³

While Taniguchi's interpretation is surely valid, one should not overlook that Shingon teachings may have informed the construction of the NNM painting as the iconographic compendiums that contain images of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon were compiled by Shingon monks. I argue that the NNM painting was created in an environment associated with the Shingon Buddhist teachings, and that the representation of its antelope skin signals this association.

In Buddhist scriptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, the deer skin is described briefly as “covering on the left shoulder,”¹⁵⁴ “hanging on the shoulder(s),”¹⁵⁵ or “a scarf.”¹⁵⁶ The concise scriptural prescriptions leave some room for artists to render this iconographic feature on their own terms. As mentioned, the Ōgenji and Daitōji sculptures depict the antelope skin covering both shoulders as well as the back, and encircling the abdomens with a knot in the front. This rendition of the deer skin is similar to that in the Hokkedō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. While there are some differences in the exact positions of the deer skin, these three sculptures indicate a pattern of the way the deerskin drapes—across shoulder(s), back, and tie in front of the abdomen. The original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon may also have had this iconographical feature rendered in a similar manner hanging on the left shoulder and back.

In contrast, the deer skin wraps on the torso and hangs around the abdomen in the *Jikkanshō* drawing and NNM painting. These ways of draping the deer skin have prototypes found in Womb World mandalas in the Shingon tradition, which are paradigmatic of esoteric

¹⁵³ Susan Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through Its Art* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan, 1992), 141.

¹⁵⁴ *T.* 1093, 20: 0402a03.

¹⁵⁵ *T.* 1092, 20: 0232b07; *T.* 1097, 20: 0422b22-23.

¹⁵⁶ *T.* 1169, 20: 0685a07.

Buddhist imagery and are paired with Diamond World mandalas.¹⁵⁷ The Womb World mandalas from Jingōji and Saiin at Tōji are two *genzu* (original representations) mandalas that were modelled after those brought back from China by Kūkai in 806. The Jingōji and Tōji mandalas are respectively dated to the early ninth century and the second half of the ninth century. These two works contain images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, whose iconography is very different from that of the Nan’endō icon. Seated on a lotus pedestal, the deity in these two mandalas is shown without a third eye and has four arms and three heads. Also, in each work, the torso of the deity is draped in only one garment—an antelope skin with a deer head suspended on the abdomen—that crosses diagonally from the left shoulder to the waist. This depiction of the deer skin is strikingly similar to that in the *Jikkanshō* drawing. While the artist of the NNM painting represented the antelope skin in a relatively implicit way, the deer head is depicted hanging on the abdomen of the deity, a position that is identical with that in the two mandalas. Moreover, the entire shape of this iconographical feature in the mandalas resembles that of the sash plus deer skin in the NNM. It seems that the creators of the NNM painting and *Jikkanshō* drawing were familiar with the depiction of the deity’s deer skin in Womb World mandalas and modified the feature to different degrees.

What did this iconographical appropriation from Womb World mandalas mean? One explanation is that the creators were not familiar with how the deer skin was depicted in the actual Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Nevertheless, the section that features Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the *Jikkanshō* contains scriptural prescriptions of its iconography, one of which describes that the deer skin hangs on the left shoulder of the deity.¹⁵⁸ Therefore, the creators

¹⁵⁷ For the study of Womb World mandalas, see Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis, *Japanese Mandalas: Representations of Sacred Geography* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999), 58-77.

¹⁵⁸ *Jikkanshō*, 283.

could have shown the deer skin covering the shoulder, but instead choose to represent it wrapping the torso diagonally. This decision may be due to the association of this icon with Kūkai at the time. In *Jikkanshō*, one passage states that “This icon [Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon] is enshrined in the Kōfukuji Nan’endō. Kōbō Daishi treated it as the *honzon* (principal icon) [of the hall] and performed Fukūkenjaku rituals. 其像安置興福寺南円堂。弘法大師以是為本尊。修行不空羅索法。”¹⁵⁹ The same passage also appears in *Besson zakki*.¹⁶⁰ By the time that *Jikkanshō* and *Besson zakki* were compiled, the connection between the Nan’endō and Kūkai had been established. Such a connection appeared in the late eleventh century and is featured in several Nan’endō *setsuwa* stories. The creators of the NNM painting and *Jikkanshō* drawing may have felt that the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon should wear the deer skin in a manner similar to that in Womb World mandalas because of the icon’s connection to Kūkai. Moreover, since this icon had become important for Shingon monks to maintain their relationship with the *sekkanke* in the twelfth century as discussed below, this depiction of the deer skin likely had other meanings.

As Funata Jun’ichi’s study shows, Shingon monks occupied a prominent place in the *sekkanke*’s worship of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁶¹ This relationship began during the time of Fujiwara no Yorimichi 藤原頼通 (992-1074), became established under the chieftainship of Tadazane, and was further strengthened by Fujiwara (Kujō) Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207).

¹⁵⁹ *Jikkanshō*, 283.

¹⁶⁰ *Besson zakki*, 217.

¹⁶¹ To date Funata’s study on the relationship between Shingon esoteric teachings and the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is most thorough one. For his work, see Funata Jun’ichi, “Sekkanke no Nan’endō Kannon shinkō to Kasuga kami: hisetsu seisei to mikkyō girei o megutte,” in *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011), 433-484.

In *Kakuzenshō* 覺禪抄, the iconographic manual compiled by Kakuzen 覺禪 in 1217, a passage indicates that at the request of Yorimichi, the Shingon monk Seizon 成尊 (1012-1074) performed the ritual centered on Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁶² While this passage makes no mention of what the icon looked like and when the ritual was held, it shows that the altar of the ritual was “modelled after that of the Kōfukuji Nan’endō.”¹⁶³ In other words, the altar was probably fashioned in an octagonal form.

As courtier diaries show, Shingon monks frequently performed rituals centered on Fukūkenjaku Kannon for the *sekkanke* in the twelfth century.¹⁶⁴ For instance, an entry in *Denryaku*, the diary of Tadazane, indicates that in 1102 Raikyū 賴救 (dates unknown) performed an eye-opening ceremony for the sculptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Aizen Myōō.¹⁶⁵ It also specifies that the image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was made in the “Nara manner (*nara yō* 奈良様),” which probably refers to the style of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as no other images of this deity in Nara were as important to the family as this one. Another interesting aspect of this entry is that while Tadazane commissioned this copy of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, he did not ask Kōfukuji monks to preside over the dedication ceremony, but Raikyū,

¹⁶² *Kakuzenshō*, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 4 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1976), 504.

¹⁶³ *Kakuzenshō*, 504.

¹⁶⁴ *Denryaku*, Eikyū 1.5.18 (4: 36), *Denryaku*, Chōji 1.8.25 (2: 9), *Denryaku*, Chōji 2.12.19 (2: 111), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.8.19 (2: 150), *Denryaku*, Kashō 2.9.4 (2: 220), *Denryaku*, Kashō 2.9.13 (2: 223), *Denryaku*, Ten’ei 3.8.7 (3: 248). *Denryaku*, Kōwa 4.5.28 (1: 125), *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.10.3 (1: 240), *Denryaku*, Chōji 1.5.22 (1: 316).

¹⁶⁵ *Denryaku*, Kōwa 4.2.19 (1: 107-108).

who studied under Raikan 頼観 (1032-1102), a monk from Tōji.¹⁶⁶ Also worth noting is that Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Aizen Myōō were paired together as the focus of worship. This pairing was not surprising as Tadazane was also a devotee of Aizen Myōō. As Okuda Shizuyo's research shows, esoteric monks in charge of rituals centered on this deity also engaged with Tadazane's worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁶⁷

In *Shikuchi* 師口, an oral transmission compiled by Eizen 榮然 (1172-1259), a passage indicates that a ritual on Fukūkenjaku Kannon was performed for the Fujiwara family.¹⁶⁸ It also describes the iconography of the deity as having three eyes and eight arms, as well as wearing a crown with a *kebutsu* (manifestation Buddha) image.¹⁶⁹ The hand-held attributes of the deity mentioned in the text match those in the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁷⁰ The text specifies that this ritual of Fukūkenjaku Kannon was a teaching transmitted to Eizen's teacher Kōzen 興然 (1121-1204) from Jitsunin 実任 (1097-1169).¹⁷¹ Eizen, Kōzen, and Kakuzen belonged to a branch of Shingon teaching at Kajūji, whose patriarch was Kanjin 寛信 (1084-1153). According to *Kakuzenshō*, Kanjin performed a ritual of Fukūkenjaku Kannon for Tadazane.¹⁷² Given these records of Fukūkenjaku Kannon rituals by Shingon monks from the Kajūji lineage, Funata

¹⁶⁶ Okuda Shizuyo, "Denryaku kara miru Fujiwara no Tadazane no Aizen Myōō shinkō," *Kokubun ronsō* 34 (March 2004): 73.

¹⁶⁷ Okuda, "Denryaku," 72-75.

¹⁶⁸ *T.* 2501, 78: 78.0859c21.

¹⁶⁹ *T.* 2501, 78: 0859c29; *T.* 2501, 78: 0860a09-a13.

¹⁷⁰ *T.* 2501, 78: 0860a11-a13.

¹⁷¹ *T.* 2501, 78: 0859c26-27; Funata, "Sekkanke no," 449.

¹⁷² *Kakuzenshō*, 509; Funata, "Sekkanke no," 448.

suggests that Kanjin established a ritual performance centered on the “Nan’endō style” of the deity and passed this teaching to his successors.¹⁷³

This oral transmission is not the only example to show that Shingon monks took interest in Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the icon of the deity in the Nan’endō. Indeed, beginning in the twelfth century, a great number of esoteric texts emerged to illustrate and discuss the iconography, miraculous stories, secret teachings, oral transmissions, and ritual performances of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹⁷⁴ Funata Jun’ichi observes that it is rare for a specific image of Kannon to gain as much attention as this icon in Shingon esoteric texts.¹⁷⁵ One of the major themes of these esoteric texts is the icon’s iconography. For example, a passage from *Besson zakki* states that “Although [the iconography of] the image of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was not based on any teaching (scriptural prescriptions), there are reasons for this. One can look at oral transmission [for clues].”¹⁷⁶ Another passage in *Shōgoshū* 勝語集, written by Ejū 惠什 (1060-1144), says: “Three-eyed, eight armed images [of Fukūkenjaku Kannon]. I have not seen canonical sources [for this form of the divinity], but one can base [this form of the deity] on the

¹⁷³ Funata, “Sekkanke no,” 449. Funata does not specify what he means by “the Nan’endō style.” But we can presume that images of the deity made in this style, if not as copies, should follow generally the iconography of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. The aforementioned twelfth-century painting in the collection of the Tokyo National Museum shows a Kannon seated with eight arms and accompanied by the Four Guardian Kings. However, the mudras and attributes held in his hands do not match those in the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Asai identifies it as Juntei Kannon, while another scholar Takasaki Fuhiko considers it as Fukūkenjaku Kannon. While further research is needed to confirm its identity, it may be intended to be an image of the deity made in the Nan’endō style. Asai, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 75; Takasaki, “Tanakashi kizō,” 10-16.

¹⁷⁴ For scholarship on this, see Funata, “Sekkanke no,” 433-484.

¹⁷⁵ Funata, “Sekkanke no,” 470.

¹⁷⁶ *Besson zakki*, 228.

icon of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.”¹⁷⁷ As indicated by these texts, Shingon monks tried to reconcile the problem that the eight-armed form of the deity is inconsistent with scriptural prescriptions. In *Shoson yōshō* 諸尊要抄, which was written by the Daigōji monk Jitsuun 実運 (1105-1160), an account links the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon to Baozhi 宝誌 (J. Hōshi) (417-514), a miraculous monk who lived in fifth-century China and known for his supernatural transformation as Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. The account states that “the monk Baozhi manifested himself as Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which had eight arms. The image in the Nan'endō is in the same form.”¹⁷⁸ Another source tells that Kūkai saw an image of Baozhi in a form of three-eyed, eight-armed Fukūkenjaku Kannon in China and installed an icon based on this image in the Nan'endō after his return to Japan.¹⁷⁹ By linking the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon to Baozhi, Shingon monks justified its eight-armed representation.

Another type of discourse is concerned with the *kebutsu* of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. In *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, Chikamichi indicated that according to an oral transmission, “the *kebutsu* on the top [of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon] is a Jizō.”¹⁸⁰ Funata suggests that this identification was intended to demonstrate that the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon represents two Buddhist manifestations of two *kami* at Kasuga Shrine.¹⁸¹ According to the *honji suijaku* theory, in which *kami* are emanated from Buddhist deities, the *kami* of the first and third shrines at Kasuga were considered respectively as the incarnations of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon

¹⁷⁷ T. 2479, 78: 0210b01.

¹⁷⁸ T. 2484, 78: 0309a01-02.

¹⁷⁹ T. 2478, 78: 0203a08-10.

¹⁸⁰ *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, 50.

¹⁸¹ Funata, “Sekkanke no,” 450.

and Jizō Bosatsu.¹⁸² This correspondence between the *kami* at Kasuga Shrine and Buddhist deities at Kōfukuji emerged during the twelfth century, when these two religious institutions were amalgamated into a single complex. Nevertheless, Shingon monks explained the Jizō form of the *kebutsu* in their own way, for instance, claiming that the image represents the time when Amida Buddha was still a Bodhisattva.¹⁸³

Shingon monks also made commentaries on the religious meaning of the deer skin. In *Haku sōshi kuketsu* 薄草子口決, a passage explains why Fukūkenjaku Kannon wears an antelope skin: “Deer make more effort to take care of their children than any other animal. Fukūkenjaku Kannon surpasses other Bodhisattvas in showing compassion for sentient beings. In order to demonstrate this meaning, the deity wears a deerskin.”¹⁸⁴ Another discourse treats the deer skin functioning like a *kesa*, describing that Fukūkenjaku Kannon worn it while he conducted ascetic practices and cultivated Bodhisattvahood.¹⁸⁵

The above discussion shows that Shingon monks were deeply interested in the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and were probably familiar with its iconography. While the icon was

¹⁸² The earliest record of this *kami*-Buddha identification between the Kasuga Shrine and Kōfukuji is from *Ō Nakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha*, dated to 1175. Kanezane also indicated the same correspondence in his diary *Gyokuyō*. However, there are other versions of the correspondence between each *kami* of the Kasuga Shrine, and each Buddha or Bodhisattva of Kōfukuji. In one version, Fukūkenjaku Kannon is replaced with Shaka Nyorai. *Ō Nakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha*, in *Shinto taikai jinsha hen 13: Kasuga*, ed. Nagashima Fukutarō (Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985), 18; Fujiwara no Kanezane, *Gyokuyō*, vols. 1-3 (Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1988). *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 5.7.8 (3: 884). For various versions of the *kami*-Buddha correspondence, see Allan Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), 80-81; Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis, *Japanese Mandalas*, 146-147.

¹⁸³ Funata, “Sekkanke no,” 450-453; *T.* 2535, 79: 0227a05-23.

¹⁸⁴ *T.* 2535, 79: 0227a02-04.

¹⁸⁵ *Hakuhōkushō* 白宝口抄, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1977), 346.

situated in the religious environment of Kōfukuji, Shingon monks considered it intimately associated with esoteric teachings. The icon was likely significant for them to secure the patronage from the *sekkanke*. The ritual performance of the icon became the secret teachings passed from one master to another in the aforementioned Kajūji lineage of Shingon Buddhism. As such, it is very likely that the illustration of the icon's deer skin in the NNM painting and *Jikkanshō* drawing was intended to mark the presence of Shingon monks in the devotion of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Copies as Nexuses

In sum, an investigation of these copies unravels other “voices” and “agents”—Kōfukuji and Shingon monks—in the devotion of the deity and production of its images. The copies show the significance of visual imagery in establishing a network of worship as well as providing communal bonds to anchor the *sekkanke* with the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex, and the *sekkanke* with Shingon monks. This function of the copies reflects politics in the twelfth century that was marked by a drastically factionalized court, in which warriors, aristocrats, and emperors allied one another, and conflicts among them occurred frequently.¹⁸⁶ To cope with this political situation, the *sekkanke* formed alliances with powerful institutions and religious elites through the cult of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. These power constellations constructed a sociopolitical territory in the name of the divine.

Copies Made After 1189

¹⁸⁶ For this, see Takeuchi Rizō, “The Rise of the Warriors,” in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2: Heian Japan*, ed. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 644-709.

Three copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon were made after Kōkei restored the original icon in the Nan'endō in 1189. Dated to the mid-thirteenth century, the first copy (hereafter KNM) is a *danzō* carved from *kaya* and is currently stored at the Kyoto National Museum.¹⁸⁷ Nevertheless, different from typical sandalwood sculptures, it was made in the multi-block wood technique.¹⁸⁸ A piece of wood forms the torso and was joined by another horizontal block that was employed to make the legs. The ornaments such as a necklace, bracelets, and jewels are carved delicately on the body. The statue is only 12.4 centimeters tall, and its surface is left mostly unpainted. This chiseling style, miniature size, and plain surface are the characteristics of sandalwood images.

The KNM is strikingly similar to the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in terms of iconography and formal quality. Firstly, the deity has a plump face, a fleshy body, and drapery folds cut deeply on the surface. These formal elements lend this *danzō* a robust feeling typical of sculptures made in the Kamakura period. Second, like Kōkei's sculpture, the KNM is seated firmly with a solemn facial expression and has a mandorla, though a later replacement, fashioned as sword-shaped panels. The KNM sculpture has a third eye carved on the forehead and wears a crown with a standing image of Amida Buddha. The gestures of the KNM are identical to those in the current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku, showing two hands clasped in front of the chest, two performing a wish-granting mudra, and the rest of the four holding attributes. While not visible from the front, a deer skin hangs obliquely on the back of the torso and lies underneath a cape, a configuration that resembles that of the current Nan'endō icon.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷ Asai, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 61-62.

¹⁸⁸ Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Tokubetsuten Saigoku Sanjūsansho: Kannon reijō no inori to bi* (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2008), 272.

¹⁸⁹ Itō, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon," 292.

The provenance of the KNM sculpture is unknown, but its delicate execution indicates a prominent patron. Because the sculpture is small, it was probably used for personal devotion. Records show that three chieftains of the *sekkanke*—Morozane, Tadazane and Kanezane—commissioned sandalwood sculptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁹⁰ With the family’s growing belief in this deity, the interest in making its images as *danzō* seemed to make a comeback.

Another copy of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is a sculpture from Fukūin 不空院, a former *matsuji* 末寺 (branch temple) of Kōfukuji located in Nara City.¹⁹¹ Dated to the first half of the thirteenth century, this sculpture was previously enshrined in an octagonal hall that was built as a replication of the Nan’endō. The hall collapsed in the Ansei Earthquake in 1854 and was rebuilt as a rectangular structure in 1935. According to Muromachi-period temple records *Kankebon shoji engishū* 菅家本諸寺縁起集 and *Daijōin jisha zōjiki* 大乘院寺社雜事記 (1450-1508), written by the Kōfukuji monk Jinson (1430-1508), Fukūin initially served as the residence of Ganjin in the eighth century.¹⁹² Jinson also reported that Kūkai lived at Fukūin during the Kōnin era (810-824) in order to perform the earth-calming ritual for the Nan’endō. Also, while staying there, Kūkai commissioned an octagonal hall that was modelled after the Nan’endō and named the building as “Fukūin.” Another text *Nara bōmoku sekkai* 奈良坊目拙解, dated to the

¹⁹⁰ Fujiwara no Moromichi, *Gonijō moromichiki* 後二条師通記, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-3 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1956-1958). *Gonijō moromichiki*, Kanchi 6.3.14 (2: 232); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.10.7 (3: 732); *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.10.3 (1: 240).

¹⁹¹ *Kōfukuji matsuji chō*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 458. For discussion of Fukūin’s history, see Narashi Henshū Shingikai, ed., *Narashi shi*, 109-111.

¹⁹² *Kankebon shoji engishū*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 377; *Daijōin jisha zōjiki*, in *Zōho zoku shiryō taisei*, vol. 29 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1978), 235-236.

Edō period (1615-1868), tells a different story, describing that the Kōfukuji monk Ensei 円晴, a contemporary of the eminent priest Eison 叡尊 (1201-1290), constructed the octagonal hall at Fukūin as a copy of the Nan'endō.¹⁹³ Regardless of these conflicting accounts, the creation of this sculpture should have to do with the cult of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the area since Fukūin is associated with and in walking distance from Kōfukuji.

The Fukūin sculpture shares a sense of fleshiness with the current Nan'endō icon as indicated by its full lips, a plump face, and a rounded body. Both images are also similar in that they have tall topknots and open eyes, which are common in sculptures made in the Kamakura period. In addition, the Fukūin statue is seated with eight arms and three eyes, presenting the mudras of reverence and wish-granting, and holding the attributes of a lotus flower, a lasso, a monk staff, and a fly whisk. The rendition of the deer skin in the Fukūin Fukūkenjaku Kannon is, however, ambiguous. A piece of cloth covers the shoulders as well as the back with two ends lying ungainly across the upper arms. Whether this cloth represents a deer skin or a scarf is unclear. Also, on the back, a strip of fabric emerges from the cloth with an end hanging on the right waist. It is hard to determine whether this fabric indicates a sash or a deerskin as the front torso has a sash crossing diagonally from the left shoulder to the waist.

A painting currently stored in the cloister Kanchi'in 観智院 at Tōji is a copy of the Nan'endō Fukūenjaku Kannon dated to the thirteenth century. The Kannon is seated against a golden mandorla that contains several panels each fashioned like swords. The platform, on which the Kannon is seated, is inserted with a lotus pedestal, a *shikinasu*, and a multi-layered base. The deity is shown with three eyes and eight arms, and carrying an image of a standing monk figure on the crown. With the shaved head and dressed in the *kesa*, this image represents Jizō rather

¹⁹³ Murai Kodō, *Nara bōmoku sekkai* (Kyoto: Sōgeisha, 1977), 220-221.

than Amida in keeping with the aforementioned oral transmission. The same representation is also found in a fourteenth-century Kasuga-Nan'endō mandara painting from the Tokugawa Museum.¹⁹⁴ The mandara juxtaposes the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon along with the landscape of Kasuga and depicts the icon's *kebutsu* as a standing Jizō. Moreover, the mandara shows an antelope skin (with the head showing in front) hanging like a sash on the torso of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. This depiction of the deer skin is absent in the Tōji copy, in which the chest of the deity is exposed and hung with jewelry. It is not clear how the antelope skin is depicted in this work, but presumably covers one of the shoulders. Given its current enshrined location and the Jizō *kebutsu*, this copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon at Tōji was likely produced under the influence of Shingon teachings.

A Paradigm of Family Worship

The above analyses illuminate that the *sekkanke* under the leadership of Tadazane created a paradigm of family worship centered on the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon through the utilization of ritual performances (sermons, sutra-reading, consecration ceremony, etc.), bodily choreography (chanting, sutra-copying, image-stamping, deposit insertion), visual production (icon creation and replication), and spatial signification (architectural construction, on-site offerings). I refer to this multiplicity of religious practices as “family paradigm” and use the term to characterize the totality of the *sekkanke*'s worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Because the practice of the family paradigm was reiterable and took place within the context of the community, it became a field whereby the *sekkanke* fostered the shared belief and formulated a network of worship that connected themselves with large institutions—Kōfukuji and Kasuga

¹⁹⁴ For studies of this painting, see Watanabe Satoshi. “Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no egakareta Kasuga mandara zu—Tokugawa Bijutsukan hon Kasuga mandara zu ni tsuite,” *Kinko sōsho* 16 (1989): 297-321.

Shrine—as well as elite Shingon monks. The family paradigm can be also conceived as a means of power and a form of ruling since its operation required good command of resources to create a spectacular religious scene. Tadazane, who assumed the chieftain position at a young age and whose power was greatly eclipsed by the retired emperors, certainly needed this paradigm of worship to augment his authority, forge group cohesion, and strengthen ties with the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex.

Tadazane was not the only chieftain who created a religious program that involved multifarious practices of rituals and entailed participation of family members. There are parallels between *sekkanke*'s worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and their devotion to Zaō Gongen 蔵王権現, the guardian deity of Mt. Kinpu in Yamato Province.¹⁹⁵ The utilization of space, ritual, and texts seen in the worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon resonates with the religious performances involved in *sekkanke*'s pilgrimage to Mt. Kinpu. The family commissioned images of Zaō Gongen, copied sutras, made on-site offerings, buried sutras at Mt. Kinpu, and held ritual performances there. Also, like the pilgrimage to Mt. Kinpu, which was done by the chieftains from Fujiwara no Kane'ie (929-990) to Moromichi, the worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon continued from one generation of the regent to another. Tadazane's son Yoronaga as well as grandson Kanezane upheld the family paradigm, and the family continued to worship the icon until the nineteenth century.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁵ For research on the *sekkanke*'s devotion of Zaō Gongen and their pilgrimage to Mt. Kinpu, see Heather Blair, *Real and Imagined: The Peak of Gold in Heian Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2015).

¹⁹⁶ The current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon contains deposits that were inserted by Kōfukuji monks and members of the Northern Fujiwara when the sculpture underwent repair in 1905. One of the deposits is a wooden Kannon statue, the *nenjibutsu* (personal icon) of Kujō no Asako (1835-1897), who was a descendant of Kanezane. By the time this image of Kannon was inserted into the icon, Asako had already passed away. While no document tells us of why her *nenjibutsu* was placed inside, one may speculate that it was done for the purpose of commemorating her. Another piece of evidence that shows the family's

Heather Blair coined the term “ritual regime” to conceptualize ritual activities that revolved around the *sekkanke*’s pilgrimage to Mt. Kinpu.¹⁹⁷ According to her, ritual regimes were a complex and flexible system of religious practices that “were anchored in distinctive sets of sites, rites, and texts associated with specific patrons or lineage groups.”¹⁹⁸ She also outlines traits of ritual regimes, proposing that they were: “(1) distinctive, (2) proprietary and heritable, (3) rooted in precedent and preservation, (4) deeply compelling and (5) characterized by dynamics of emulation and competition.”¹⁹⁹ Her idea of ritual regimes inspired my delineation of the cult of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Nevertheless, I should point out that the *sekkanke* demonstrated their worship of the icon mainly to those in their circle—Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex and other lineages of the Northern Fujiwara—rather than their political rivals such as warriors and retired emperors. They did not use this icon to signify their political persona as legitimate rulers at court. Therefore, their devotion to it did not seem to engender emulation or competition from those outside the circle of the family. This is not to say that the worship of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon had no political consequences, but likely had more to do with the operation of family institution and construction of communal identity. While through the creation of the family paradigm, Tadazane reinforced his position as the head of the family and

longstanding belief in the icon is *Fukūkenjaku kanzeon reizōki* 不空羼索觀世音靈像記, a text written in 1717 by Konoe Iehiro 近衛家熙 (1667-1736), who was a descendant of the *sekkanke*. The text describes the relationship of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon to the Fujiwara clan, expresses the family’s faith in the icon and its efficacy. Suzuki Yoshihiro, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon bosatsu zō (Nan’endō anchi),” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 57-58; Midorikawa Akinori, “Konoeke Konoe Iehiro hitsu ‘Fukūkenjaku Kanzeon reizōki’ o megutte,” *Mita kokubun*, no. 53 (June 2011): 1-18.

¹⁹⁷ For Blair’s notion of the ritual regimes, see Heather Blair, “Rites and Rule: Kiyomori at Itsukushima and Fukuhara,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73, no. 1 (June, 2013): 1-42; Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 98-128.

¹⁹⁸ Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 6.

¹⁹⁹ Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 114-115.

exerted patriarchal authority, the effect of the paradigm got him nowhere near the dominance over the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex. Lastly, I also want to stress that the image of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and its replications were the very nexus of sites, rituals, texts, and people. Because of these nuances, I refrain from directly using the term of ritual regime here while it is significant and applicable for this study.

The commonalities between the worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and that of Zaō Gongen point to the broader cultural practice that supported and inspired the ritual regime and family paradigm. Tadazane's choice of the Nan'endō icon as the focus of family worship was in part rooted in the practice of precedents (*rei* 例) or what Blair called “traces (*ato*, *seki*, or *jaku*).”²⁰⁰ The underlying idea of the practice is that precedents should serve as principles to govern different aspects of lives such as political protocol, religious practice, and daily etiquette. Aristocratic courtiers and familial chieftains were expected to observe precedents and follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. Diaries were considered as references for *rei* and a means of preserving them.²⁰¹ Generations of regents read, copied, and studied diaries of their ancestors, and passed on their own journals to descendants.²⁰² Therefore, the practice of *rei* encouraged emulation and imitation. Nevertheless, as Blair points out, courtiers could interpret and follow *rei* in their own ways, and “a variation on an established theme could become a new precedent.”²⁰³ Viewed from the practice of *rei*, Tadazane's worship of the Nan'endō

²⁰⁰ For the importance of *rei* in the lives of courtiers in the Heian period, see Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 8-9, 108-110, 132-134.

²⁰¹ Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 132-134; Yoneda Yūsuke, *Fujiwara sekkanke no tanjō: Heian jidaishi no tobira* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 177-204.

²⁰² Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 133-134.

²⁰³ Blair, *Real and Imagined*, 108.

Fukūkenjaku Kannon can be interpreted as the appropriation of *rei* and utilization of family history.

On the one hand, prior to Tadazane, the Northern Fujiwara clan had worshipped Fukūkenjaku Kannon for a long period of time, thereby providing a precedent for him to adopt. On the other hand, their devotion of the deity was not as avid as that of Tadazane, who unprecedentedly formulated the link between the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin through various kinds of religious patronage. I should also point out that Tadazane initiated the practice of *yōhai* 遥拝 (worship from afar) toward Kasuga *kami*. One day in the summer of 1103, wearing courtier costume and holding an official tablet (*shaku* 笏), Tadazane worshipped Kasuga *kami* from afar perhaps at his residence in Kyoto.²⁰⁴ He indicated in his diary that there was “no precedent (先例)” for this kind of the worship, and that it was conducted for the upcoming consecration ceremony of the Chūkondō (Central Golden Hall) at Kōfukuji.²⁰⁵ His practice of *yōhai* later became the norm and prompted the production of Kasuga mandara paintings, some of which juxtapose the landscape of shrine with an image of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. The cultural practice of *rei* also likely contributed to the phenomenon of replicating the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon since it valued the acts of imitation and repetition.

The idea of the family paradigm allows us to identify the connection between the worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the maintenance of the family in pre-modern Japan. It sheds light on how Buddhist images constructed and signified social relations, facilitated familial interactions across generations, and formulated group cohesion as well as identity. Moreover, it provides a framework to explain the identification of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as the

²⁰⁴ *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.7.22 (1: 224). Tadazane did not speak of where he performed *yōhai*.

²⁰⁵ *Denryaku*, Kōwa 5.7.22 (1: 224).

protector of the Northern Fujiwara as well as the incarnation of Kasuga Daimyōjin in the twelfth century. Previous scholarship on the association between this icon and Kasuga Daimyōjin focuses on its symbolic aspect. Allan Grapard and Susan Tyler contend that Fukūkenjaku Kannon was chosen because its iconographic feature of the deer skin was associated with Takemikatsuchi, who arrived at Kasuga Shrine on a deer.²⁰⁶ Moreover, the deer was the emblem of the Fujiwara clan.²⁰⁷ Nevertheless, in considering why the Fukūkenjaku Kannon was selected to form a *kami*-Buddha association with Kasuga Daimyōjin, this symbolism should not take precedence over the fact that the family had worshipped the former divinity for hundreds of years. The family's long-term relationship with the icon should have occupied a central position in considering the association between the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin. We may also interpret that the symbolism between these two deities resulted from the process in which the family established the paradigm of communal worship centered on the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Conclusion

This study outlines the devotion history of Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Northern Fujiwara family from the eighth to twelfth century. It shows that the family's veneration of the deity in the eighth century was diverse in nature, connected to different Buddhist doctrines and practices such as the teachings of the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* and *Lotus Sutra*, incantation of *dhāraṇī* spells, and production of sandalwood images. Also, the clan members commissioned images of the deity in various forms for purposes ranging from national protection, afterlife salvation, to

²⁰⁶ Grapard, *The Protocol of*, 82-83; Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga*, 141.

²⁰⁷ Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga*, 141.

familial welfare. Although Fukūkenjaku Kannon was popular among the Northern Fujiwara clan in the eighth century, no images of the deity had yet obtained a personality that was embedded in the narratives of the family's history and was specifically tied to their prosperity. From the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century, the family had relatively little interest in the worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Production of deity's images also declined drastically. With the transformation of the Nan'endō into a miraculous site and family's loss of political dominance in the late eleventh century, the significance of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon grew during the time of Tadazane. The icon obtained new identities as the protector of the Northern Fujiwara and the incarnation of Kasuga Daimyōjin. These new identities were both a religious and social construct and were fashioned through the utilization of iconographical symbols, appropriation of the family's history, and performances of devotional activities.

Through an array of religious practices centered upon the icon, Tadazane created a paradigm of family worship to enhance his position as the chieftain of the *sekkanke*, strengthen the family's relationship with the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex, fostered group cohesion, and formulate communal identity—all of which had to do with the maintenance of family institution. By examining the copies of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, I reveal that they functioned as nexuses of power constellations and a vehicle to create a network of worship. This function reflected contemporary politics that was increasingly factionalized and prevailed upon alliances among warriors, aristocrats, and religious institutions. This paradigm of family worship perpetuated the identity of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as the protector of the Northern Fujiwara clan and turned the worship of the icon into a communal tradition.

Chapter Five

Restoring Family Heritage:

The Reconstruction of the Nan'endō and Its Buddhist Icons during 1181-1189

Introduction

On the twenty-seventh day of the twelfth month in Jishō 4 (1181), Taira no Shigehira (1158-1185) led his troops to Nara City, setting fire to Tōdaiji and Kōfukuji to punish their support of the Minamoto clan, who was his family's enemy.¹ The fires spread quickly, and within one night these two powerful temples burned to the ground. The Nan'endō was also destroyed by the fire along with all of its interior images. Hearing the news of this disaster, Kujō (Fujiwara) no Kanezane 九条兼実 (1149-1207), a descendant from the *sekkanke* (House of the Regents), states in his diary *Gyokuyō* 玉葉 (Jeweled Leaves): "The seven great temples were all turned into ashes. The Law of Buddhism and law of Emperors for people in this world also seem to perish. I find no words to describe this situation, nor can I write down anything to record it. ...At this moment, I see the destruction of our clan before my eyes."² This horrendous incident was part of the Genpei War, a power struggle between the two warrior families—Taira and Minamoto—that took place from 1180 to 1185. The war ended with the establishment of the military government (*bakufu*) by Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147-1199) in Kamakura and the restoration of the imperial court in Kyoto.

¹ Jishō 4 is equivalent of the year of 1180, but according to the current solar calendar, the fire took place in the first month of 1181.

² Fujiwara no Kanezane, *Gyokuyō*, vols. 1-3 (Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1988). *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 4. 12.29 (2: 455-456).

This chapter investigates the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its images during 1181-1189. Kanezane, the chieftain of the *sekkanke* at the time, and Kōkei 康慶 (act. 1152-1190s), the founder of the Kei school of sculptors, overtook the restoration work. The sculptures—Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Four Guardian Kings, and six Hossō monks—which Kōkei restored in 1189 still remain in good condition. These works as a whole have been considered to epitomize the beginning of the Kamakura-period sculptural style. Although much research has been done on the form, iconography, and material properties of these sculptures, discussion of how they are related to Kanezane is limited and lacks a critical analysis.³ This chapter thus focuses attention on Kanezane's patronage and engagement in the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist icons.

I show that the restoration of the Nan'endō was not merely a work to bring everything back to its previous state, but one that renewed the past according to the present vision of the project. Such a vision is manifested in Kanezane's enshrinement of deposits in the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the representation of the icon's *kebutsu* 化仏 (manifestation Buddha) image. I argue that these two elements transformed the icon into a repository of the sacred, a body of expedient response, and a nexus for rebirth in the Pure Land.

In the first part of this chapter, I discuss the reconstruction of Kōfukuji after the fire of 1181 and introduce the lives of Kanezane and Kōkei. This discussion sets up the historical context in which the Nan'endō was rebuilt. In the second part of this chapter, I outline the process of the hall's recreation and examine the form of the restored images. In the third part of

³ Kanezane gave a detailed account of the Nan'endō's restoration in *Gyokuyō*. Scholars generally follow his account while discussing his involvement in the project. Matsushima Ken, "Nan'endō kyū honzon to Kamakura saikōzō," in *Shinpen meihō Nihon no bijutsu 3: Kōfukuji*, ed. by Ōta Hirotarō, et al. (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1990), 130-132; Mōri Hisashi, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō shozō no saikō," in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 258-259.

the chapter, I analyze the *kebutsu* statue and examine the dedicatory deposits, connecting them to the idea of “living Buddhas (*shōjin butsu* 生身仏)” and Kanezane’s belief of Pure Land Buddhism.

Kōfukuji in the Aftermath of the 1181 Fire

The fire of 1181 destroyed numerous buildings in the compound of Kōfukuji and its outlying area. According to *Gyokuyō*, there were thirty-four buildings within the compound lost in the fire.⁴ The main buildings all burned to the ground, such as the Central Golden Hall, Lecture Hall, Eastern Golden Hall, Western Golden Hall, Southern Round Hall, Northern Round Hall, and Refectory, as well as noble cloisters including Sai-in, Ichijōin, Daijōin, Kanjizaiin, and Godai’in. Structures in the outlying area such as Kasuga Western Pagoda, Kasuga Eastern Pagoda, Bodai’in, and Isagawa Shrine 率川神社 were also destroyed by flames. Although the whole country was still in the midst of war, within the four months following the fire, the damage was assessed, surviving images were housed, and a rebuilding plan was under way.⁵ In the sixth month of 1181, Fujiwara no Kanemitsu 藤原兼光 (1145-1196) was appointed as Superintendent of Kōfukuji Construction (*Zō Kōfukuji chōkan* 造興福寺長官).⁶ In addition, the restoration work was distributed among three parties.⁷ The court took the responsibility for Central Golden Hall, Monastic Residences, Sutra Repository, Bell Tower, and Middle Gate. The

⁴ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.1.6 (2: 461).

⁵ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.1.24 (2: 466); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.1.26 (2: 467); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.1.30 (2: 470-471); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.2.2 (2: 472); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.3.12 (2: 493-494); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.3.18 (2: 496); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.3.21 (2: 496-497); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.3.23-24 (2: 497).

⁶ *Yōwa gannen ki* 養和元年記, in *Nara rokudaiji taikan 8: Kōfukuji 2*, ed. Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970). *Yōwa gannen ki*, 5.6.15 (83); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.6.15 (2: 506-508).

⁷ *Yōwa gannen ki*, 5.6.15/20 (83-84).

costs for reconstructing these buildings were apportioned and assumed by several provinces. The chieftain of the *sekkanke* undertook the reconstruction of the Lecture Hall, Nan'endō, and South Gate. Kōfukuji was in charge of the Refectory and Upper Monks' Quarters. This distribution of labor generally followed the precedent that was established after Kōfukuji was destroyed by fire in 1046.⁸

Buddhist sculptors (*busshi* 仏師) from both Kyoto and Nara received commissions for the restoration of sculptures at Kōfukuji. However, the In school sculptor Inson 院尊 (1120-1198) initially monopolized the commissions of sculptures for the two principal buildings Lecture Hall and Central Golden Hall at Kōfukuji.⁹ Dissatisfied with this arrangement, two sculptors Myōen 明円 (d. 1200) from the En school in Kyoto and Seichō 成朝 (d. ca. 1194) from the Nara school petitioned together to the retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa (1127-1192), calling for reassignment of the workload.¹⁰ In the end, Inson received the commission to restore the images of the Lecture Hall, Myōen the Central Golden Hall, and Seichō the Refectory.¹¹ In addition, Kōkei obtained the task of recreating the sculptures of the Nan'endō.

The reconstruction of Kōfukuji took around six decades to complete and can be divided into three phrases: (1) from 1181 to 1186; (2) from 1186 to 1196; (3) from 1196 to 1247.¹² In the

⁸ Nedachi Kensuke, *Nihon chūsei no busshi to shakai: Unkei to keiha, shichijō busshi o chūshin ni* (Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2006), 117; Ōkawa Naomi, "Kamakura shoki no Kōfukuji zōei to sono kōshō ni tsuite," *Kenchikushi kenkyū* 31-32 (August 1962): 11.

⁹ Fujiwara no Tsunefusa, *Kikki* 吉記, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). *Kikki*, Jishō 5.6.27 (1: 217-218). For the study of this, see Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 121-130.

¹⁰ *Kikki*, Jishō 5.6.27 (1: 217-218).

¹¹ *Yōwa gannen ki*, Jishō 5.7.8 (84).

¹² Ōta Hirotarō, *Nanto shichi daiji no rekishi to nenpyō* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1979), 160. For studies of Kōfukuji's reconstruction, see Takamatsu Momoka, "Kujō Kanezane no Kōfukuji saiken: chūsei sekkanke to Kamatari," *Jinmin no rekishigaku* 162 (December 2004): 1-11; Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki,"

first phrase, Kōfukuji rebuilt the Western Golden Hall, Eastern Golden Hall, and Refectory using the funds from its own estates (*shōen*).¹³ However, the recreation of Buddhist icons in these halls hardly proceeded. The construction of other buildings, for which the court and the *sekkanke* were responsible, also barely began. It was not until after the Genpei War ended in 1185 and Kanezane assumed the post of the regent in 1186 that significant progress was made.

Three months after Kanezane's appointment as the regent, Fujiwara no Mitsunaga 藤原光長 (1144-1195) replaced Kanemitsu as the new superintendent.¹⁴ Under their leadership, the Lecture Hall, Nan'endō, Central Golden Hall and its corridors, as well as the South Gate—which constituted the main part of the complex—were erected on the grounds of Kōfukuji. Although the court should have taken the responsibility for the recreation of the Central Golden Hall, it was Kanezane who funded and oversaw the project.¹⁵ It is not an exaggeration to say that the reconstruction of Kōfukuji in the second phrase relied primarily on Kanezane's political power and economic capacity.

After Kanezane stepped down from the post of the regent in 1196, Minamoto no Michichika 源通親 (1149-1202) overtook the reconstruction work.¹⁶ From this year to the mid-thirteenth century, many structures were rebuilt including the Five-Storied Pagoda, Monk Residences, Northern Round Hall, Kasuga Western Pagoda, and Kasuga Eastern Pagoda. It

1-13; Fujioka Yutaka, "Gedatsu Jōkei to Kōfukuji no Kamakura fukkō," *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan gakuō* 24 (May 2002): 9-42; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 7-14.

¹³ Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 12. It also should be mentioned that while the Refectory was consecrated in the ninth month of 1181, the building was only partially constructed; the reconstruction was not finished until sometime before 1187. Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 9.

¹⁴ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 2.6.28 (3: 219).

¹⁵ Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 12; Takamatsu, "Kujō Kanezane," 5-7.

¹⁶ Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 11.

would be a digression to discuss this in detail here, but it suffices to say that the reconstruction of Kōfukuji in this phrase could not be accomplished without the *combined* efforts of the *sekkanke*, court, and temple monks.¹⁷ Moreover, as the government offered much fewer resources to rebuild Kōfukuji than it did in the eleventh century, the responsibility on the part of the temple increased drastically, and *kanjin* 勧進 (fund-raising campaign) became an important means to finance the work.¹⁸

Patron and Artist

Kujō no Kanezane and His Worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon

Although before the Genpei War, Kanezane had risen to the position of Minister of the Right, he exerted limited influence over political policies.¹⁹ Since he was born as Tadamichi's third son, Kanezane had a lesser chance to become the chieftain of the *sekkanke* than his two half-brothers. However, as the Genpei War drew to the end, the political situation changed in his favor. Although the Retired Emperor Go-Shirakawa wanted Fujiwara no Motomichi 近衛基通 (1160-1233) to continue to serve as a regent, Yoritomo supported Kanezane instead, promoting him to the post of the regent in the third month of 1186. This appointment nonetheless marked the division of the *sekkanke* into two branches, which are the household of Kujō with Kanezane as the first patriarch, and the household of Konoe with Kanezane's brother Fujiwara (Konoe) no Motozane 近衛基実 (1143-1166) as the first patriarch. Kanezane named his lineage "Kujō" after the name of where his residence was located in Kyoto. Three more branches Ichijō 一条, Nijō 二

¹⁷ Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 13.

¹⁸ Ōkawa, "Kamakura shoki," 13; Fujioka, "Gedatsu Jōkei," 9-14.

¹⁹ For discussion of Kanezane's life, see Taga Munehaya, *Gyokuyō sakuin: Fujiwara no Kanezane no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974), 445-543.

条, and Takatsukasa 鷹司 further emerged from these two lines of the *sekkanke* in the first half of the thirteenth century. These five lineages altogether constituted *gosekke* 五撰家, the five households of the *sekkanke*.

During his life, Kanezane formed relationships with several prominent priests including Chōgen 重源 (1121-1206) who was in charge of the reconstruction of Tōdaiji, Jōkei 貞慶 (1155-1213) who was a monk from Kōfukuji and revivor of Hossō Buddhism, and Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212), who was the founder of the Pure Land Buddhist school. Kanezane was also close to Butsugon 仏巖 (dates unknown) and Jitsugon 実巖 (d. 1185) from the Shingon schools, who frequented Kanezane's residence to perform rituals for him and expounded Buddhist doctrines.²⁰ Kanezane's brothers Jien 慈円 (1155-1225) and Shin'en 信円 (1153-1224) were the abbots of Enryakuji and Kōfukuji, which were the headquarters of Tendai and Hossō Buddhism. As Taga Munehaya observes, Kanezane took interest in both esoteric and exoteric Buddhist teachings and pursued deep understandings of Buddhist doctrines.²¹

Kanezane's worship of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was not much different from that of his grandfather Tadazane. As *Gyokuyō* shows, Kanezane ordered the recitation of sutras at the Nan'endō, copied scriptures of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, and requested the performance of rituals centered on the deity.²² In addition, he made trips to the hall, chanted the name of the

²⁰ For his relationship with these monks, see Nakao Takashi, *Chūsei no kanjin hijiri to shari shinkō* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 182-186; Obara Hitoshi, "Kujōke no kitōsō: Chisen o chūshin ni," in *Chūsei no Bukkyō to shakai*, ed. Ōsumi Kazuo (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000), 2-27; Yoshii Katsunobu, "Kujō Kanezane no Bukkyō shinkō: gojisō Jitsugon to sonshō nenju, Aizenō kuyō," *Otani Daigaku Daigakuin kenkyū kiyō* 8 (December 1991): 189-215.

²¹ Taga, *Gyokuyō sakuin*, 548.

²² *Gyokuyō*, Angen 2.3.4 (1: 544); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 3.11.19 (2: 313); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.10.4 (3: 732); *Gyokuyō*, Genryaku 1.9.28 (3: 320); *Gyokuyō*, Genryaku 1.8.24 (3: 314). For discussion of Kanezane's

deity and its spells, and ordered the construction of its images.²³ Like Tadazane, Kanezane worshipped the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon along with Kasuga Daimyōjin.²⁴ By his time, the correspondence between these two divinities had been established and was based upon *honji suijaku* theory.²⁵ According to this theory, *kami* (local divinities) are emanations of Buddhist deities. In *Gyokuyō*, Kanezane indicated that the *kami* of the first shrine at Kasuga is the manifestation of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.²⁶ The combined worship of these two deities further gave rise to a new type of painting, known as Kasuga-Nan'endō mandara, which juxtaposes the image of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon along with the landscape of Kasuga Shrine.²⁷ The earliest known record about this type of imagery is dated to 1181, and the oldest extant work is from the early thirteenth century.²⁸ This type of imagery allowed devotees to conduct *yōhai* 遙拜

worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon, see Kameda Tsutomu, “Kujō Kanezane no Kasugasha to Nan'endō e no shinkō,” in *Nihon Bukkyō bijutsushi josetsu* (Tokyo: Gakugei Sholin, 1970), 356-362.

²³ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 3.12.1 (2: 318); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 1.10.3 (2: 575); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.10.7 (3: 732); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 4.4.29 (3: 842); *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 2.2.18 (3: 156); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.5.22 (3: 700); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 1.11.1 (2: 579).

²⁴ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 3.11.19 (2: 313); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 4.2.30 (2: 380); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 1.10.3 (2: 575); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 1.11.5 (2: 579).

²⁵ The earliest record about the *kami*-Buddha correspondence between Kasuga Shrine and Kōfukuji is from *Ō Nakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha*, dated to 1175. *Ō Nakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha*, in *Shinto taikai jinsha hen 13: Kasuga*, ed. Nagashima Fukutarō (Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985), 18. There are different versions of the correspondence between *kami* at Kasuga Shrine and Buddhist deities at Kōfukuji. For this, see Allan Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), 80-81; Elizabeth ten Grotenhuis, *Japanese Mandalas: Representations of Sacred Geography* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 146-147.

²⁶ *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 5.7.8 (3: 884).

²⁷ For scholarship on this type of paintings, see Watanabe Satoshi, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no egakareta Kasuga mandara zu—Tokugawa Bijutsukan hon Kasuga mandara zu ni tsuite,” *Kinko sōsho* 16 (1989): 297-321; Susan Tyler, *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through its Art* (Michigan: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992), 138-139.

²⁸ *Yuima-e narabini Tōji kanjō ki*, in *Nara rokudaiji taikan 7: Kōfukuji 1*, ed. Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 115; Karino Kayoko, “Kasuga Taisha shozō ‘Kasuga shaji mandara’ no butsumon hyōgen ni tsuite,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 336 (September 2014): 25.

(worship from afar), paying respect to both deities from a distance. Nevertheless, prior to the appearance of this imagery, *yōhai* may have been originally practiced in front of a copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and a painting of Kasuga Shrine.²⁹ While no records show that Kanezane venerated the two divinities in this way, he did worship Kasuga Daimyōjin in front of a painting of Kasuga Shrine as recorded in *Gyokuyō*.³⁰ The record tells that after purifying his body and getting dressed in court costume, Kanezane bowed toward the painting, recited the *Heart Sutra*, and made paper offerings. Another entry in *Gyokuyō* records that he ordered a painting that illustrated the five Buddhist manifestations (Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Yakushi, Jizō, and two Eleven-headed Kannon) of Kasuga Daimyōjin and offered them to Kasuga Shrine in 1191.³¹

Kōkei and Nara Sculptors

Kōkei was known as the founder of the Kei School sculptors, who dominated sculptural production in the Kamakura period.³² The character “kei 慶” came from Kōkei’s name, and artists from this school often had “kei” as part of their names. Kōkei’s life is obscure, but he may have been the son of a low-ranking monk at Kōfukuji. His son Unkei 運慶 (d. 1223) served as a

²⁹ Shirahara Yukiko, “Kasuga miya mandara kenkyū no genzai: sakuhin kenkyū no seika to shiron,” *Tetsugaku* 132 (March 2014): 207.

³⁰ *Gyokuyō*, Juei 3.5.17 (3: 22).

³¹ *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.9.27 (3: 730).

³² For information on Kōkei’s life and works, see Mōri Hisashi, “Kōkei no shiryō,” *Museum* 29 (August 1953): 22-23; Emura Masafumi, “Busshi nenpyō: Kōkei, Unkei, Tankei,” *Shiseki to bijutsu* 37, no. 8 (October 1967): 302-310; Oku Takeo, “Daibusshi Kōkei no zōzō,” Unkei: jikū o koeru katachi Issue of *Bessatsu Taiyō: Nihon no kokoro* 176 (December 2010): 42-49; Kobayashi Takeshi, “Daibusshi Kōkei jō,” *Kokka* 746 (May 1954): 157-161; Kobayashi Takeshi, “Daibusshi Kōkei ge,” *Kokka* 749 (August 1954): 227-228.

kōtō 勾當, a hereditary monastic post at Sōōin 相応院 of Kōfukuji.³³ Monks who assumed this position dealt with administrative works and other miscellaneous tasks. Kōkei may too have had held a similar monastic job that was passed down by his ancestors at Kōfukuji.

Kōkei was a disciple of either Kōjo 康助 (dates unknown) or Kōchō 康朝 (dates unknown), both of whom belonged to the lineage of the Nara Sculptors.³⁴ The Nara Sculptors traced their ancestry back to the artist Jōchō 定朝 (d. 1057), who was well known for the Amida image made in 1053 for the Phoenix Hall at Byōdōin. While originally from Kyoto, Jōchō's grandson Raijo 頼助 (1103-1119) established himself as a sculptor based on Kōfukuji and became the first patriarch of the Nara Sculptors. After restoring the images for the central compound of Kōfukuji, which burned down in 1196, Raijo was bestowed with the clerical rank “*hokkyō* 法橋 (bridge of the law)” in 1103.³⁵ Since Jōchō's time, sculptors were awarded with clerical ranks for their accomplishment of state commissioned projects. The highest rank was “*hōin* 法印 (seal of the law),” followed by “*hōgen* 法眼 (eye of the law)” and “*hokkyō*.” Raijo also undertook repair of Buddhist icons at Kōfukuji and at times received commissions from the *sekkanke*, for instance, the project of making images for the Kasuga Western Pagoda in 1113.³⁶ In addition, Raijo was engaged in the worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon at Kōfukuji and made a sculpture of the deity

³³ Mōri Hisashi, “Fujiwara jidai no Nara busshi,” in *Busshi Kaikei ron* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987), 223; Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 171, 176-178.

³⁴ Mōri, “Fujiwara jidai,” 219. For discussion of the Nara Sculptors, see Mōri, “Fujiwara jidai,” 217-239; Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 115-159; Itō Shirō, “Inseiki no busshi to butszō,” in *Insei no butszō: Jōchō kara Unkei e*, ed. Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1991): 6-27.

³⁵ *Honchō seiki* 本朝世紀, in *Kokushi taikai*, vol. 9 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1933). *Honchō seiki*, Kōwa 5.7.25 (336-337).

³⁶ Fujiwara no Tadazane, *Denryaku*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-1970); Fujiwara no Tametaka, *Eishōki* 永昌記, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vol. 8 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). *Denryaku*, Eikyū 3.2.28 (4: 152); *Eishōki*, Ten'ei 1.6.21 (1: 122).

for putting a curse on the temple's rival Retired Emperor Shirakawa.³⁷ By the early twelfth century, Raijo had held the title of the “Mitera Busshi 御寺仏師 (Sculptors of Kōfukuji)” and ran a workshop located on the grounds of Kōfukuji.³⁸ The title “Mitera Busshi” was conferred by the government to indicate and ensure Raijo's working relationship with the temple.³⁹ The word “*mitera*” was an appellation that the *sekkanke* used to refer to Kōfukuji beginning during the time of Fujiwara no Moromichi (1062-1099).⁴⁰

After Raijo's death, his son Kōjo took over the workshop and worked on projects for Kōfukuji as well as the *sekkanke*.⁴¹ He also received commissions from the retired emperors, for instance, the 1,000 images of the Thousand-Armed Kannon in 1164 for Go-Shirakawa at Rengeōin (also known as Sanjūsangendō) in Kyoto. Kōjo was recognized by his contemporaries as “Nankyō (South Capital; another name for Nara) Busshi Kōjo Hokkyō 南京仏師豪助,” “Nara Busshi Kōjo 奈良仏師康助,” or “Yamashinadera (another name for Kōfukuji) Kōjo 山階寺豪助.”⁴² Kōjo's next successor Kōchō seemed to have been short-lived as we do not know his

³⁷ *Eikyū gannenki* 永久元年記, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 25 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1958). *Eikyū gannenki*, Eikyū 1.6.7 (451-452).

³⁸ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 145.

³⁹ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 143. How this title emerged, worked, and became obsolete is a rather complicated issue. For this, see Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 115-159; Nedachi Kensuke, “Inseiki Kōfukuji ni kakawaru daibusshi o meguru horon,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 296 (January 2008): 57-72; Asaki Shūhei, “Inseiki no Kōfukuji daibusshi to daibusshi shoku ni tsuite,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 293 (July 2007): 13-32.

⁴⁰ Kusaka Sakiko, “Heian makki no Kōfukuji—mitera kannen no seiritsu,” *Shimado* 28, (1970): 91.

⁴¹ For discussion of Kōjo's life and works, see Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 134-140; Mizuno Keizaburō, “Busshi Kōjo shiryō,” *Bijutsu kenkyū* 206 (September 1959): 36-43.

⁴² Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993-2014); Fujiwara no Munetada, *Chūyūki*, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-7 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965); Minamoto Morotoki, *Chōshūki* 長秋記, in *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965). There are two editions of *Chūyūki*. One is published in *Dai Nihon kokiroku*. The other is published in *Zōho shiryō taisei*. The *DNK* edition is more reliable, but is not complete yet. I mainly use the *DNK* version, but cite the *ZST* edition if needed. When doing this, I put the abbreviation *ZST* before the volume

activities after his engagement with the Rengeōin project in 1164.⁴³ Kōchō's son Seichō was the next head of the Nara Sculptors. While protesting the assignment of commissions for Kōfukuji's restoration in 1181, Seichō referred himself as “Nankyō Daibusshi 南京大仏師 (great sculptor of Nara)” and traced the use of this title to the previous six generations of the Nara Sculptors.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, Nedachi Kensuke points out that the title “Nankyō Daibusshi” by this time probably meant little to the court, serving merely as a name.⁴⁵ Moreover, the workshop, which Kōjo inherited from Raijo, probably barely functioned when Seichō submitted the petition.⁴⁶ This explains why Kōkei and his disciples bear no such a title associated with Kōfukuji even though they had a close relationship with the temple.

Kōkei was active from the mid-twelfth to early thirteenth century. One of his earliest works, though no longer in existence, was a Kichijōten 吉祥天 statue made in 1152 for the Hall of Kichijō at Uchiyama Eikyūji 内山永久寺 in Nara Prefecture.⁴⁷ Kōkei also carved a Tamonten figure for the Main Hall at Eikyūji.⁴⁸ Whether this Tamonten image is the one that is currently held at Tōdaiji but was from Eikyūji is unclear.⁴⁹ In 1175-1176, Kōkei engaged in the

number. *Chūyūki*, Daiji 4.8.16 (ZST, 6: 104); *Chūyūki*, Daiji 4.10.5 (ZST, 6: 116); *Chōshūki*, Chōshō 1.5.23 (2: 148).

⁴³ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 132-133, 137-138.

⁴⁴ *Kikki*, Jishō 5.6.27 (1: 218).

⁴⁵ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 147-149.

⁴⁶ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 148.

⁴⁷ *Uchiyama Eikyūji okibumi*, in *Uchiyama Eikyūji no rekishi to bijutsu (shiryō hen): Chōsa kenkyū hōkokusho*, ed. Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994), 15; Adachi Naoya, “Kaidai,” in *Uchiyama Eikyūji no rekishi to bijutsu (shiryō hen): Chōsa kenkyū hōkokusho*, ed. Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994), 7.

⁴⁸ *Uchiyama Eikyūji okibumi*, 14.

⁴⁹ According to Tanabe Saburōsuke this Tamonten sculpture should be dated no earlier than the period of time from 1135 to 1140. In addition, he notes that the gesture and posture of the sculpture are identical

construction of a Dainichi sculpture for Enjōji in Nara Prefecture. This Dainichi is nonetheless known as the first work of Unkei, as indicated by his ink signature written inside the image's pedestal: "Daibusshi Kōkei Jitsu Deshi Unkei 大佛師康慶實弟子運慶 (Unkei the true disciple of the great sculptor Kōkei)." ⁵⁰ Unkei signed his name along with that of his father probably to indicate his lineage and show that Kōkei was the supervisor of the project. ⁵¹ It is commonly held that while Unkei worked on this sculpture under the auspices of Kōkei, he carved it mostly on his own. ⁵²

A Jizō sculpture at Zuirinji 瑞林寺 in Shizuoka Prefecture is arguably a work of Kōkei. ⁵³ An ink inscription, written on the interior of this sculpture, shows the artist's name as follows: "Daibusshi hokkyō []kei (the Great Sculptor []kei in the Rank of Bridge of Law)." It is unclear what character is written prior to "kei," but an x-ray examination suggests that it is very likely to be "kō," and therefore two words together form the name of Kōkei. ⁵⁴ The inscription contains a date equivalent to the eighth month of 1177 that probably indicates the start of this work's

with those in other Tamonten statues at Kōfukuji. Tanabe Saburōsuke, "Uchiyama Eikyūji kiroku ni miru busshi jiseki," in *Uchiyama Eikyūji no rekishi to bijutsu (shiryō hen): Chōsa kenkyū hōkokusho*, ed. Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994), 101.

⁵⁰ For the photo image of the signature, see Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Unkei: Kōfukuji Chūkondō saiken kinnen tokubetsuten* (Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2017), 259

⁵¹ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 164.

⁵² Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 162-165; Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Unkei*, 259. The Enjōji Dainichi measures only 98.2 centimeters, but unusually took eleventh months to complete. The lengthy period of its production suggests that Unkei, who was a young artist then, undertook the work on his own.

⁵³ Makino Akisa, "Zuirinji Jizō Bosatsu zazō no meibun to busshi Kōkei," *Bigaku bijutsu shigaku gahō* 8 (March 2000): 51-69; Tanaka Tsuguhito, "Jishō gannen zaimai no Zuirinji Jizō Bosatsu zazō: busshi Kōkei no jiseki ni yosete," in *Nihon kodai busshi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1983), 313-328.

⁵⁴ For the analysis of the writing of this character, see Makino, "Zuirinji Jizō," 53-56.

construction.⁵⁵ The inscription also shows a list of sculptors' names written after the artist's signature, many of their names including the character "kei." According to the inscription, this group of people wanted to form karmic bonds (*kechien* 結縁) with Jizō through the creation of this image. Another inscription written on the interior of the sculpture shows another list of names, the first line of which shows the names of []jo 助 and Kōchō 康朝. While the writing of the first name is obscure, the two names may refer to the two leaders of the Nara Sculptors prior to Kōkei. Also recorded in the list are the names of nuns, laity, and people who were associated with Yoritomo and warriors in his circle.⁵⁶ Because the word "hōto 奉渡," which indicates the act of passing sculptures from artists to patrons, does not appear in the inscription, Makino Akisa suggests that Kōkei himself was the chief patron of the Zuirinji Jizō.⁵⁷

This sculpture exudes a strong feeling of stability and volume, showing the deity seated steadily with the broad shoulders and a firm chest. The eyes were constructed using *gyokugan* 玉眼 (crystal eyes), which were inserted from the interior of the sculpture. The *gyokugan* infuses a sense of life into the sculpture. The Jizō wears a robe that naturally hangs over the torso, leaving the chest exposed. The drapery folds cascade in a regular and circular pattern around the abdomen. Overall, this sculpture has fleshy and realistic qualities that are also seen in the Enjōji Dainichi. The Zuirinji Jizō and Enjōji Dainichi are different in that the latter reveals more undulations in bodily modeling and has a softer contour of the torso than the former. However,

⁵⁵ Makino, "Zuirinji Jizō," 53-54; Satō Akio, "Jishō gannen zaimai no Jizō Bosatsu zazō ni tsuite," *Kokka* 1041 (April 1981): 19. Two characters in this part of the inscription are obscure, but they may indicate "shizō 始造," meaning "begin to construct." Also, as Kōkei did not obtain the rank of *hokkyō* until the twelfth month of 1177, the inscription should be written after this time.

⁵⁶ Makino, "Zuirinji Jizō," 58-62.

⁵⁷ Makino, "Zuirinji Jizō," 58.

the formal qualities of both sculptures show a departure from the style of Jōchō, which is characterized by a slender modelling of body, thin drapery folds, and a tranquil facial expression with down-cast eyes.

Not long after the completion of the Zuirinjin Jizō, Kōkei was awarded with the rank of *hokkyō* in the twelfth month of 1177 for his creation of the sculptures in the Five-stored Pagoda at Rengōin. Makino speculates that Kōkei may have become the central figure of the Nara Sculptors at this time because Kōchō may have died.⁵⁸ In the late twelfth century, there were two other sculptor lineages besides the Kei School: The In School, which was headed by Inson, and the En School, which was headed by Myōen.⁵⁹ Both schools were based in Kyoto and traced their lineages to Jōchō. The sculptural styles of the In and En schools were actually similar, following that of Jōchō. Because In and En sculptors easily obtained commissions from Kyoto aristocrats, they usually earned clerical ranks earlier in their career and enjoyed higher statuses than Nara Sculptors.⁶⁰ This explains why initially Kyoto Sculptors received major commissions for the restoration of Kōfukuji. Also, by 1181, Inson already achieved the highest rank of *hōin*, and Myōen *hōgen*.⁶¹ In comparison, Kōkei acquired only the lowest rank of *hokkyō*. Why did the *sekkanke* appoint Kōkei rather than other Kyoto sculptors to recreate the images of the Nan'endō?

⁵⁸ Makino, “Zuirinji Jizō,” 63-64. It should be noted that Kōchō's son Seichō was still young at the time and did not obtain the rank of *hokkyō* until 1194. Mōri, “Fujiwara jidai,” 219; Sanjō Sanefusa, *Gumaiki* 愚昧記, in *Dai Nihon shiryō daishihen hoi* (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1973). *Gumaiki*, Kenkyū 5. 9.22 (132).

⁵⁹ For information about these two schools, see Itō, “Inseiki no,” 6-27; Itō Shirō, “Go-Shirakawa inseiki no butszō,” in *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butszō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, ed. Fujisawa Norio (Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991), 1-5; Shimizu Masumi, “Inson to Myōen,” in *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butszō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, ed. Fujisawa Norio (Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991), 6-8.

⁶⁰ Mōri, “Fujiwara jidai,” 223.

⁶¹ *Yōwa gannen ki*, Jishō 5.7.8 (84).

Matsushima Ken and Asaki Shūhei speculate that Kōkei obtained this appointment because of the support of temple priests.⁶² Given that Kōfukuji was a powerful religious institution with military force, the chieftain of the *sekkanke* may have felt inclined to give the project to a sculptor favored by the temple. Matsushima also hypothesizes that Kōkei was possibly appointed because he was conversant with the form and iconography of the original sculptures of the Nan'endō.⁶³ While these opinions are well taken, Nedachi Kensuke contends that it was Kanemitsu rather than temple monks that determined the commissions of sculptural restoration.⁶⁴ Another explanation for Kōkei's appointment is that Kanemitsu made the decision based on precedents. As discussed above, Raijo worked for the *sekkanke* and Kōfukuji on projects related to their worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon. It is possible that Kōkei received the commission because the Nara Sculptors had long worked on images of the deity for the Fujiwara-Kōfukuji community.

Kōkei obtained the rank of *hōgen* in 1194 for his recreation of the Nan'endō's sculptures and continued to work in the 1190s. For example, he made a Fudō Myōō triad for Go-Shirakawa, which was consecrated at the Rengōin in 1193. Kōkei may also have created the Niō 仁王 (Benevolent Kings; Skt. Vajradhara) at the South Gate of Kōfukuji.⁶⁵ The most important works he made at this time were the now lost Kōkuzō Bosatsu 虚空藏菩薩 (Skt. Ākāśagarbha

⁶² Asaki Shūhei, "Kanezane to Kōkei—Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no zōryū o megutte," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 138 (September 1981): 87; Matsushima, "Nan'endō," 130.

⁶³ Matsushima, "Nan'endō," 130.

⁶⁴ Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 124-130.

⁶⁵ *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.9.8 (3: 726). Originally this task was given to Inson's son Injitsu 院実. However, in 1191, Kōfukuji priests petitioned to Kanezane, hoping that Kōkei could replace Injitsu for this work. Whether Kanezane agreed with their request is unknown, but this incident shows Kōkei's good reputation among Kōfukuji monks.

Bodhisattva) and Zōjōten 增長天 (Skt. Virūdhaka; Guardian King of the South) in the Great Buddha Hall at Tōdaiji. Made in 1196, these two sculptures served as the attendants of the Birushana Buddha, also known as the Daibutsu (Great Buddha), in the building. In addition, Kōkei made *gigaku* dance masks for the temple, and two of them are extant.⁶⁶ After finishing these works for Tōdaiji, Kōkei seemed to stop working and may have passed away in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.

Reconstruction Process

Two years after Kanezane assumed the chieftain position, the reconstruction of the Nan'endō finally began: the ridgepole of the hall was erected on the twenty-ninth of the first month in 1188.⁶⁷ Nevertheless, the construction of the hall's images did not start until after the performance of the ritual *misogi kaji* 御衣木加持 (empowerment of the wood), which took place on the eighteenth of the sixth month in 1188.⁶⁸ Marking the first phase of sculptural carving, the ritual was to pacify wood materials and elicit its Buddhist nature since raw wood were considered to possess spirits and could cause calamities.⁶⁹ Kanezane held the ritual at Saishōkongōin 最勝金剛院, a cloister temple built by his father Fujiwara no Tadamichi 藤原忠

⁶⁶ Kobayashi, "Daibusshi," 160.

⁶⁷ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 4.1.29 (3: 488).

⁶⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 4.6.18 (3: 520-521).

⁶⁹ For discussion of *misogi kaji* ritual, see Nedachi Kensuke, "Misogi kaji o meguru shōron," in *Shidai (chi sui ka fu) no kanseiron: Shisō, ato, shizen kagaku no kakawari ni tsuite no kiban kenkyū*, ed. Iwaki Kenichi, et al., (Kyoto: Kabushiki Kaisha Nakata Purinto, 2005), 157-166; Tani Shin'ichi, "Butsuzō zōken sakuhō kō jō: rekisei moku busshi kenkyū no issetsu toshite," *Bijutsu Kenkyū* 54 (June 1936): 7-10; Tani Shin'ichi, "Butsuzō zōken sakuhō kō chū: rekisei moku busshi kenkyū no issetsu toshite," *Bijutsu kenkyū* 54 (July 1936): 13-18.

通 (1097-1164) in 1148 on the grounds of Hosshōji 法性寺 in Kyoto.⁷⁰ When Kanezane arrived at Saishōkongōin early in the morning on this day, he saw that Kōkei was still preparing *misogi*, cutting out parts of the wood at a length appropriate for the size of each image. Unhappy with this scene, Kanezane criticized Kōkei in his diary of being “lazy” since the artist should have been already done with this work.⁷¹ The *misogi* for the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings were later moved to the front of the hall while those for the six Hossō monks were placed elsewhere. The *misogi kaji* ritual began at noon and was performed by the priest Shunshō 俊証 (1106-1192) from Tōji. Kōkei, dressed in a surplice (*kesa* 袈裟) and his disciples in purified clothes (*jōe* 淨衣), attended the ritual along with Kanezane and other courtiers. Shunshō first conferred the eight precepts (*hassaikai* 八齋戒) on Kōkei and then empowered the *misogi* by chanting spells. Upon the conclusion of the incantation, Kōkei dipped a brush in ink, drawing the images of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings on the *misogi*. He then made the first cut to the wood, a performance that was called “*chōna hajime* 手斧始 (first axe).”⁷² The ritual ended with all of Kōkei’s disciples marking their first cuts to the *misogi*. Kanezane did not stay to see *chōna hajime* for the sculptures of the six Hossō monks, which took place later the same day.

Kanezane established a *bussho* 仏所 (sculpture workshop) within Saishōkongōin, where Kōkei and his apprentices carved the sculptures.⁷³ In the eighth month of 1189, Kanezane

⁷⁰ For information of Saishōkongōin, see Sugiyama Nobuzō, *Inge kenchiku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981), 350-351.

⁷¹ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 4.6.18 (3: 520).

⁷² For information of *chōna hajime*, see Tani Shin’ichi, “Butsuzō zōken sakuhō kō chū,” 18-22.

⁷³ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 4.6.18 (3: 521).

travelled to Nara to venerate and inspect the sculpture of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which by then had been moved to Ichijōin 一乘院, a sub-temple at Kōfukuji.⁷⁴ During his stay, Kanezane inquired about the appearance of this work and commented that it looked “strange (*fushin* 不審).” The next day, he visited Ichijōin again and was still unconvinced with the “*sōgō* 相毫 (auspicious marks of a transcendental being)” of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁷⁵ He then called on Kōkei, telling him which aspects were problematic. It is unclear about how this issue was resolved as Kanezane offered no detail about his conversation with Kōkei and only vaguely reported that “I generally agreed with his opinions 大略承伏歟.”⁷⁶

Kanezane’s reaction to the sculpture is intriguing. Asaki Shūhei suggests that the word “*sōgō*” probably refers to the form of the icon rather than its iconography because Kōkei, who was based at Kōfukuji, should have had been familiar with the iconography of the original Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁷⁷ The word might also simply mean the icon’s overall appearance.

⁷⁴ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.8.22 (3: 553-554).

⁷⁵ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.8.23 (3: 555).

⁷⁶ The passage of how Kōkei responded to Kanezane’s query can be interpreted differently. The whole account in *Gyokuyō* states: “I visited the atelier at Ichijōin again. I thought that the auspicious marks (forms, iconography, or both) of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon still looked strange so I went to the atelier. After viewing the icon again, I pointed out aspects that were problematic and asked the sculptor Kōkei about this. I generally agreed with his opinions (or he generally agreed with my opinions). I then returned to the capital. 重向佛所。一乘院。相毫猶有不審。仍所參向也。重見出其難。仰佛師康慶。大略承伏歟。即歸京。” As shown in this translation, the subject of the sentence ([I or Kōkei] generally agreed with [his or my] opinions 大略承伏歟) could be either Kanezane or Kōkei. I am inclined to think of it as Kanezane. *Gyokuyō* records the interactions between Kanezane and Kōkei on the day that the ritual *omisogi kaji* was held at Saishōkongōin. Kanezane asked Kōkei two questions, one during and the other after the ritual. In both times, we do see in *Gyokuyō* that Kanezane indicated Kōkei’s name or the title “*bussshi*” before narrating the artist’s responses to his queries. On the contrary, there is no mention of the artist’s name in the current case, and therefore, the sentence is more likely to refer to Kanezane’s agreement with Kōkei than the opposite way.

⁷⁷ Asaki, “Kanezane,” 89.

On the twenty-seventh day of the following month, Kanezane visited the Nan'endō and venerated the Fukūkenjaku Kannon at Ichijōin.⁷⁸ At the time he “secretly (*mitsu mitsu* 密々)” dotted the eyes of the sculpture with a brush in his hand even though this act was usually performed by monks as part of the eye-opening ceremony, which was to animate and consecrate Buddhist icons before they were enshrined in altar spaces. The consecration ceremony of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon took place the following day and was performed by Shūnshō.⁷⁹ Prior to the start of the ceremony, Kanezane visited Kasuga Shrine to pay respect to Kasuga Daimyōjin. He then went to Ichijōin to watch the transfer of the icon to the Nan'endō. During the course of the ceremony, Kanezane placed several objects and his *ganmon* 願文 (votive texts) inside the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.⁸⁰

It seems that the construction of the Nan'endō was not complete until 1194.⁸¹ In the eighth month of this year, Kanezane “moved soils and constructed the foundation” of the hall along with other courtiers and Kōfukuji monks.⁸² This performance calls to mind *setsuwa* tales in

⁷⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.9.27 (3: 556).

⁷⁹ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.9.28 (3: 556-557).

⁸⁰ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.9.28 (3: 557); Suzuki Yoshihiro, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zō (Nan'endō anchi),” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 50-51.

⁸¹ In *Gyokuyō*, Kanezane told that he “repaired and constructed 修造” the Nan'endō. However, another document *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri senrei* 南円堂御本尊以下御修理先例 (Records of the Previous Repairs of the Nan'endō's Main Icon) indicates that he constructed the foundation of the hall. As only five years had passed since the consecration of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in 1189, it would have had been unreasonable that the foundation of the hall needed repair. For this reason, Mōri Hisashi considers that the Nan'endō was probably still under construction up to this point. The date of this document is unclear, but it was originally stored at Daijōin, a cloister temple at Kōfukuji. The document records events regarding the Nan'endō from the fire of 1181 to the repair of the hall's sculptures in 1277. *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 5.8.25 (3: 890); *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri zenrei*, in *Bijutsu Kenkyū* 128 (January, 1943): 41; Mōri Hisashi, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō,” 260.

⁸² *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 5.8.25 (3: 890).

which Kasuga Daimyōjin disguises himself as a corvée laborer for the construction of the Nan'endō and foretells the future prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara clan. As discussed in Chapter Three this *setsuwa* narrative was likely derived from the anecdotes of Empress Kōmyō (701-760) and Fujiwara no Michinaga (966-1028), who were also physically involved in the construction of Buddhist buildings' foundation. As such, we may consider that through the physical engagement with the construction of the Nan'endō, Kanezane aligned himself with Kasuga Daimyōjin as well as his ancestors, thereby demonstrating his legitimacy and authority as the leader of the *sekkanke*.

Recreated Images

Fukūkenjaku Kannon

The image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon measures 336 centimeters and is 739 centimeters tall including the mandorla and the base.⁸³ The sculpture was carved out of cypress (*hinoki*) using multi-block wood construction (寄木造 *yosegi-zukuri*). Two vertical woodblocks form the front of the image from its hair through the torso; two vertical blocks are used for the central section of the torso, and one horizontal block is set upon them; three vertical blocks form the back of the image from the torso to the bottom; two vertical blocks are used for the back of the head; three horizontal blocks are used for the legs. Other auxiliary pieces of wood form small sections of the body such as arms, hands, knees, hairs, and the edges of the thigh. The extensive hollowing was done on the interior including the areas of the head, torso, and legs in order to prevent the image from cracking. *Yosegi-zukuri* was a standard method of making sculptures at

⁸³ For discussion of this sculpture, see Suzuki, “Fukūkenjaku,” 50-79; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 30-33; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō,” 260-263; Nishikawa Kyōtarō, “Kōkei to Unkei,” in *Nara no tera: Kōfukuji Hokuendō to Nan'endō no shozō*, ed. Nishikawa Kyōtarō and Tsujimoto Yonesaburō (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1947), 7-9.

the time, and allowed artists to create large-scale sculptures within a short period of time since workload could be distributed among several sculptors.

The image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon shows a rounded face with plump cheeks and thick lips. The bridge of the nose is raised with a sharp ridge. The jowls are rotund, ending in a double chin. A crystal between the eyebrows represents *byakugō* 白毫 (Skt. *ūrṇā*), which is a curl of three white hairs and one of the thirty-two marks of a transcendental being. Above the *byakugō*, an opening is cut into the forehead to represent a third eye. Its pupil is made of a crystal, which is a later replacement. This representation of the eye is called “*dōgannyū* 瞳嵌入 (pupil insertion),” which was transmitted from China in the eighth century and continued to be used in the Heian period.⁸⁴ The technique of *dōgannyū* is different from that of *gyokugan* in that the former uses crystals or gems only for the pupils, while the latter fills the whole eye with a piece of crystal quartz. The two main eyes of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon were also made using the *dōgannyū* technique.⁸⁵ Kōkei inserted black stones to represent the pupils of the two eyes from the interior of the sculpture. This technique must have been considered anachronistic at this time as it is rarely seen in sculptures from the late Heian period.⁸⁶ As scholars point out, Kōkei probably modeled the three eyes after those of the former destroyed sculpture.⁸⁷

The eyes of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon are wide open, staring downward with a strict gaze. This rendition of the eyes gives the image a powerful look. The wide-open eyes are considered to

⁸⁴ For discussion of this technique, see Itō Shirō, “Daigōji Enmaten zazō to dōgannyū,” *Museum* 474 (September 1990): 7-11; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 261.

⁸⁵ Nishikawa, “Kōkei,” 8-9; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 261; Suzuki, “Fukūkenjaku,” 54.

⁸⁶ Itō, “Daigōji,” 10.

⁸⁷ Nishikawa, “Kōkei,” 8-9; Mōri, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō,” 261.

have been adopted from sculptures dated to the eighth and early ninth centuries.⁸⁸ They indicate a departure from standard crescent eyes with unfocused gazes in statues made in the style of Jōchō. The strands of the hair are pulled up into a tall and massive topknot and are tied in a floral pattern with five petals. This rendition of the topknot is drawn from sculptures dated to the early Heian period.⁸⁹

The image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon has a massive and rotund body. The torso is broad with a bare chest, and the abdomen is rounded and protudes forward. The eight arms are thick and plump. While slightly taut and lacking movement, the shoulders are rounded and robust. The overall modelling of the form is fleshy and voluminous, creating an impression of force.

The Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon wears a skirt and a piece of fabric that wraps around the waist in the back. The drapery folds of the skirt naturally hang across the legs. Each circular fold is spaced in a reasonable manner and is cut with naturalistic depth. The hems of the skirt are pulled around the ankles, ending in creases. The handling of the drapery folds reveals the form underneath and emphasizes the mass of the legs.

As many scholars point out and the above discusses, the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon shows the recreation of archaic visual idioms and appropriation of formal elements from sculptures dated in the eighth and early ninth centuries.⁹⁰ The result of this experimentation with sculptural forms is a new sense of energetic realism as evidenced by a balanced proportion of the body, a fleshy modeling of the form, and naturalistic rendering of the drapery folds. Therefore,

⁸⁸ Matsushima, "Nan'endō," 142; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 9.

⁸⁹ Asaki Shūhei, "Kamakura chōkoku ni okeru kōkei wa sōfū ka," *Shiseki to bijutsu* 41, no. 5 (June 1971): 182-195; Asaki Shūhei, "Shoki keiha yōshiki no keisei to kodai chōkoku jō," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 184 (May 1989): 23; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 9.

⁹⁰ Asaki Shūhei, "Shoki keiha yōshiki no keisei to kodai chōkoku ge," *Bukkyō geijutsu* 186 (September 1989): 53-54; Nishikawa, "Kōkei," 8; Matsushima, "Nan'endō," 142-144; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 9.

the formal qualities of this work probably differ from those of the original Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon to some degree. Nevertheless, one should remember that because the original icon was possibly made in 746, it may have had a fleshy presence similar to the current sculpture. Also, the iconography of the current Fukūkenjaku Kannon, its platform, and mandorla were made to resemble those of the original as discussed in Chapter Two. Therefore, the overall appearance of the current sculpture demonstrates a fusion of familial and unfamiliar elements and may have struck viewers of the twelfth century as being both similar to and different from the original icon. This may explain why Kanezane initially felt that Kōkei's recreated Fukūkenjaku Kannon looked "strange."

Four Guardian Kings

The Four Guardian Kings (Shitennō 四天王) stand around the Fukūkenjaku Kannon in the Nan'endō with the Jikokuten 持国天 (Skt. Dhṛtarāṣṭra; Guardian King of the East) and Zōjōten in the front, and Kōmokuten 広目天 (Skt. Virūpākṣa; Guardian King of the West) and Tamonten 多聞天 (Skt. Vaiśravaṇa; Guardian King of the North) in the back.⁹¹ These four sculptures were once enshrined in the Karikondō 仮金堂 (Temporary Golden Hall) at Kōfukuji for a long period of time and were moved to the Nan'endō in 2017. By analyzing their iconography and stylistic qualities, Fujioka Yutaka convincingly argues that these four sculptures of the Shitennō should have served as the attendants of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and were created by Kōkei

⁹¹ *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri senrei* records that Kōkei's brother Jitsugen 實眼 (dates unknown) recreated the Nan'endō Four Guardian Kings. As Kōkei supervised the whole work, we should think of Jitsugen as an apprentice working under his supervision. *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri zenrei*, 41.

in 1189.⁹² He also proposes that another set of the Shitennō, installed in the Nan'endō prior to 2017, was possibly carved by Unkei.⁹³

The current Nan'endō Shitennō were carved from cypress utilizing multi-block wood construction.⁹⁴ Each of the four figures steps on demon figures, bears flaming halos (part of them are replacements), and wears armor covered in polychrome and gold. The eyes of the Shitennō were made in the *dōgannyū* technique, and the pupils were inserted with crystal stones. The Jikokuten wields a sword in the left hand and holds a jewel on the right palm. The Tamonten grasps a two-pointed spear in his left hand and holds a small stupa in the right hand. The Zōjōten shows a sword in the left hand and a two-pronged spear in the right hand. His right leg bends, and the hip moves toward the left, forming a hip-slung posture. The Kōmokuten holds a lasso in his right hand and a two-pronged spear in the left hand. He stands with two legs straight like the Tamonten, while facing slightly to the right. As pointed out by Fujioka, the gestures of these four Shitennō and their hand-held attributes are consistent with those prescribed in *Darani jikkyō* 陀羅尼集經 (Skt. *Dhāraṇī-samuccaya-sūtra*), translated by Atigupta 阿地瞿多在 645.⁹⁵

There are paintings dated after the twelfth century that illustrate the images of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon along with the Four Guardian Kings.⁹⁶ Fujioka finds that except

⁹² Fujioka Yutaka, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite jō,” *Kokka* 1137 (August 1990): 19-34; Fujioka Yutaka, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite ge,” *Kokka* 1138 (September 1990): 7-19.

⁹³ Fujioka Yutaka, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō zō no saikentō: aratana Unkei imeji no kōchiku,” *Osaka daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka geijutsugaku geijutsushi kōza* 30 (March 2013): 95-139.

⁹⁴ For studies of the Four Guardian Kings, see Nedachi Kensuke, “Shitennōzō (Chūkondō anchi),” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 65-73; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 69-71.

⁹⁵ Fujioka, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite jō,” 20-21.

⁹⁶ Most of these paintings are Kasuga-Nan'endō mandara paintings.

one work, the iconography of the Four Guardian Kings in these paintings is also based on *Darani jikkyō*.⁹⁷ The gestures of the Shitennō sculptures and their attributes are identical to those illustrated in a painting of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the Nara National Museum.⁹⁸ Dated to the last quarter of the twelfth century (Heian period), this painting shows the Four Guardian Kings standing on both sides of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. In light of these comparisons, it is clear that Kōkei recreated the iconography of the Shitennō closely following that of the original.

The Shitennō look ferocious with staring eyes and open or down-turned mouths. The muscles of their faces are strained and intense. The bodies are heavy and voluminous. The carvings of the armor are deep and delicate, bestowing the surfaces with rich textures. Arm sleeves rise up, and scarves hanging down from the waists fly in the air. These depictions of the garments instill movement and drama to the statues. Overall, these four sculptures show dramatic representations of the Four Guardian Kings with feelings of force and liveliness.

Six Hossō Monks

The six Hossō monk sculptures represent six eminent priests from Hossō Buddhist school.⁹⁹ Various theories have been proposed regarding their identities.¹⁰⁰ In the following,

⁹⁷ Fujioka, “Kōfukuji Nan'endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite jō,” 23.

⁹⁸ For the study of this work, see see Taniguchi Kōsei, “Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō kenpon choshoku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō,” *Rokuon zasshū* 4 (March 2002), 59-70.

⁹⁹ For discussion of these six sculptures, see Yamamoto Tsutomu, “Hossō rokuso zō (Nan'endō anchi),” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 74-79; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 35-39. To date the most comprehensive study on these sculptures is done by Ono Kayo. For her work, see Ono Kayo, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō to Hossō rokuso zō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2008).

Kōfukuji's attributions of the monks' names are marked with brackets. Scholars have reached consensus over the identities of the three monks, Zenju 善珠 (Zenju), Genpin 玄賓 (Genbō 玄昉), and Gyōga 行賀 (Jōtō 常騰). Papers written with their names were found inside their platforms (*raiban* 礼盤) while they were examined in 1952.¹⁰¹ These identifications are further confirmed by the depictions of these three monks in the Hossō mandara painting from Kōfukuji dated to the Muromachi period (1392-1573). The illustrations of their gestures and facial features in the painting resemble those in the sculptures of the Zenju, Genpin, and Gyōga.

Zenju is seated with his legs crossed and held an attribute, now missing in his left hand. The index finger of his right hand is shown pointing down. Genpin kneels and crosses ten fingers together to form the mudra of *gebakuin* 外縛印, which signifies the womb world and a moon disc (*gachirin* 月輪).¹⁰² Gyōga is seated in a meditation posture and turns his head slightly toward the right. He rests his right hand on one knee and raises the left hand in front of the chest. Kōkei represented these three monks with varying degrees of aging, with Zenju the youngest as a middle-aged man and Genpin the oldest as indicated by his deeply creased face. While having some wrinkles on the forehead, Gyōga appears to be at an age between that of Genpin and of Zenju. Since Zenju and Gyōga respectively hold a rosary and an incense burner in the Hossō

¹⁰⁰ As indicated by *Kōfukuji ruki* and scholars, originally only two among the six sculptures represented actual monk figures while the rest four figures were offertory images. However, by the early twelfth century, all of the six sculptures came to represent specific monks associated with Hossō Buddhism. The identities of these six figures have been a subject of scholarly debates. For an overview of scholarship on this issue, see Kobayashi Yūko, "Hossō rokuso zō," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 189-192. For the study of the identities of the six monk sculptures when they were first created in the early ninth century, see Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 24-28, 93-180.

¹⁰¹ Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 38-39.

¹⁰² Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 36; Akiyama Masami, *Butsuzō inzō daijiten* (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1985), 219-220. It should be noted that *gebakuin* shows the ten fingers outside of the palms, while *naibakuin* 内縛印 hides the ten fingers inside the palms.

mandara painting, the sculptures of these two figures might also have had carried these attributes in the past.

While there are different identifications of the other three Hossō monks, Seya Takayuki and Asami Ryūsuke convincingly contend that they are Shin'ei 神叡¹⁰³ (Gyōga), Jōtō (Genpin), and Zensō 善操¹⁰⁴ (Shin'ei).¹⁰⁵ Their argument is based on the examination of the Kōfukuji Hossō mandara painting, which illustrates monks associated with Hossō Buddhism along with their names written in the cartouches.¹⁰⁶ In this painting, Kisō 基操 (another name for Zensō) is shown as a young monk holding an incense burner in the left hand and raising his left leg on the seat. Shin'ei is also seated in the same posture and carries the same attribute in the left hand, but looks much older than Kisō. These depictions of Kisō and Shin'ei are identical with those of (Shin'ei and Gyōga) of the six Hossō monk sculptures.

In the Hossō mandara, a monk illustrated to the right of Shin'ei has an obscure identity because the calligraphy written in the cartouch next to the monk is faded and rubbed off.¹⁰⁷ This

¹⁰³ The name is also written as Shin'ei 信叡. Seya Takayuki, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Hossō rokuozō o meguru shomondai: zōmei hitei to sono sōi o chūshin ni," *Bijutsu shigaku* 22 (2001): 53, n. 31.

¹⁰⁴ According to Seya Takayuki, Zensō is probably the correct name as recorded in the historical texts. The name Zensō has been written as Kisō 基操 or Kasō 嘉操 in some historical texts. Seya, "Kōfukuji," 53 (n. 32).

¹⁰⁵ Seya, "Kōfukuji," 38-42; Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Kōfukuji kokuhōten: Nan'endō Heisei daishūri rakkei kinen* (Tokyo: Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1997), 195.

¹⁰⁶ It should be noted that the names of the six Hossō monk sculptures are recorded in the Daitōkyū 大東急 version of *Kenkyū gojunrei ki* 建久御巡礼記, a travel diary of Fujiwara no Masaruko 藤原多子 (1140-1202) written by the Kōfukuji monk Jitsuei 實叡 in 1191. Their names were written in the cartouches pasted on the text, and according to Asami and Seya, were added in the later period. Therefore, the identities of the six monks given in the diary are not reliable. Seya, "Kōfukuji," 40-41; Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Kōfukuji kokuhōten*, 195.

¹⁰⁷ Itō Shirō identifies this figure as Genbō. However, Seya points out that in other Hossō mandara paintings, Genbō is depicted holding the ritual instrument *nyoi* 如意 in one hand, or in some cases, a sutra and a rosary in the two hands. Itō Shirō, "Kōfukuji mandara to gensonzō," in *Kyoto Kokuritsu*

monk figure raises two hands in front of his chest with the left one holding an incense burner and seems to kneel on both knees. The gesture and posture are similar to those of (Genpin) in the six Hossō monk sculptures. The statue of (Genpin) probably represents Jōtō, whose name is recorded in *Kōfukuji ruki*, compiled in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, written in 1140 by Ōe Chikamichi (d. 1151).¹⁰⁸ In sum, the six Hossō sculptures represent the eminent monks Zenju, Genpin, Gyōga, Shin'ei, Jōtō, and Zensō who lived in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries.¹⁰⁹

Kōkei carved these six sculptures of the Hossō monks in the multi-block wood technique using cypress. The six Hossō monks all have eyes made from crystal quartz that was inserted into the eye sockets from their interior cavities. Parts of the quartz were painted in black to indicate pupils. The technique of *gyokugan* appeared in the mid-twelfth century and became common in the Kamakura period.¹¹⁰ Although we do not know where this technique originated, it was first applied by Nara Sculptors and may have been invented by them.¹¹¹ Because *gyokugan* was relatively new at the time, its uses suggest that Kōkei had more freedom to create the six Hossō monks than the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Four Guardian Kings, whose eyes were made in the archaic *dōgannyū* technique.

Hakubutsukan zō Kōfukuji mandara zu, ed. Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Kyoto: Benridō, 1995): 74-75, 79 (n. 5); Seya, “Kōfukuji,” 41-42.

¹⁰⁸ *Kōfukuji ruki*, in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123 (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978), 28; Ōe Chikamichi, *Shichi daiji junrei shiki*, in *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972), 50.

¹⁰⁹ Seya, “Kōfukuji,” 50, 53; no. 1, 32.

¹¹⁰ Itō, “Daigōji,” 10; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 31. The earliest known sculpture that has crystal eyes is the Amida triad made in 1151 at Chōgakuji 長岳寺 in Nara Prefecture. It is commonly held that the triad was made by an artist in the lineage of the Nara Sculptors.

¹¹¹ Itō, “Go-Shirakawa,” 4.

The crystal eyes give these six sculptures a lifelike quality. The sense of realism is also indicated by their vividly carved wrinkles and veins in relief. Descriptive details such as staring eyes, furrowed foreheads, and downturned mouths bestow the figures with serious expressions. The representations of the six figures are individualized, showing them at different ages and with different physiques. They are in three kinds of the postures: *chōki* 長跪, *tatehiza* 立膝, and *fuza* 趺坐, each of which are displayed by two monks. *Chōki* is to kneel on both legs; *tatehiza* is to sit with one leg placed flat on the seat and the other raised up; *fuza* is to sit with both legs crossed.

The six sculptures are dressed in formal costume with layers of clothes. While not every figure has the same configuration of the costume, the layers of the clothes in general consist of undergarment(s), *sōgishi* 僧祇支 (Sk. *samkāsikā*), and surplices from bottom to top.¹¹² *Sōgishi* is a long rectangular piece of fabric worn by monks to cover two shoulders or left shoulder. Some of these six monk figures also wear *ōhi* 横被, which is a long rectangular piece of cloth draped over right shoulders or right arms and is usually shorter than *sōgishi*.¹¹³ The *ōhi* worn by Genpin, Gyōga, and Shin'ei cascade down from the right shoulders to the seats, while those by Zenju and Zensō hang over the right arms. Also serving as part of the costume are braided cords that are utilized to secure the surplices and are shown in some of the sculptures. The drapery folds hang

¹¹² Seya, “Kōfukuji,” 45-47; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 37-38; Yoshimura Rei, “Nihon kodai butszō no chakui to sono meishō: kesa, sōgishi, kun, utansan, oyobi hensan, jikitotsu, ōhi,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 305 (July 2009): 28-29.

¹¹³ By comparing the six Hossō monk sculptures with their representations in the Kōfukuji Hossō mandara, Seya recognizes that *ōhi* are depicted on the sculptures, but does not explain how they are draped on each monk figure. He also points out that the way how these six figures are dressed and decorative details of their vestments reflect the costume worn by monks in the late twelfth century. However, Yoshimura Rei does not indicate that *ōhi* are dressed in these six sculptures. Since Yoshimura does not compare them with the Kōfukuji Hossō mandara, I am inclined to follow Seya's judgment. But further research is required, and my understanding of the draping manner of *ōhi* in these six sculptures is tentative. Seya, “Kōfukuji,” 45-47; Yoshimura, “Nihon kodai,” 28-29.

in a complicated pattern with a strong sense of motion. The carving of the folds is sharp and deep, lending the costume a compelling appearance.

While the colors of the vestments have mostly peeled off, a close investigation reveals that the fabric designs encompass a variety of motifs, such as lotus flowers, Chinese arabesques, flowing water, and tree leaves.¹¹⁴ To give an example, the hems of Jōtō's (Genpin) outfit are decorated with cut gold (*kirikane* 切金) fashioned in the pattern of hail stones (*araremon* 霰文).¹¹⁵ The hair, mustaches, and eyebrows are painted in black ink, and the lips in dark red colors. In all, these six monk sculptures have a conspicuous presence and a human quality. They must have looked splendid in the past.

When Chikamichi visited the Nan'endō in 1140, he noted that these six Hossō monk sculptures were seated behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon.¹¹⁶ Considering the limited space of the altar, these figures were probably placed in the same location when they were restored in the Nan'endō in 1189. This observation is evidenced by the depictions of these six monks in the Kōfukuji mandara painting dated to the early thirteenth century from the Kyoto National Museum.¹¹⁷ The painting depicts the Buddhist icons of various halls at Kōfukuji along with the landscape of Kasuga Shrine. The appearances of these Buddhist icons in general follow those that were destroyed in the fire of 1181, but some of their illustrations are identical to the

¹¹⁴ Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 37-38.

¹¹⁵ Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 37. It is not clear which parts, the surplice or *ōhi* of the outfit are decorated with cut gold.

¹¹⁶ *Shichi daiji*, 50.

¹¹⁷ Izumi Takeo, "Kōfukuji mandara no zuyō to hyōgen," in *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō Kōfukuji mandara zu*, ed. Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Kyoto: Benridō, 1995), 59-62. Scholars have different opinions on the date of this painting. For an overview of scholarship on it, see Morishita Wakiko, "Kōfukuji mandara zu," in *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki (Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011), 259-273.

sculptures that were recreated in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.¹¹⁸ In other words, the Kōfukuji mandara painting contains a mixture of depictions of both destroyed and restored Buddhist icons.

In the mandara painting, the Buddhist images of the Nan'endō are shown in the bottom left corner, corresponding with the hall's actual location in the temple compound. The six Hossō monk sculptures are illustrated seated behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon with three on one side and the other three on the other side. Their layout on the altar is symmetrical and circular. Nevertheless, there have been different opinions on the exact positions of each figure when they were restored at the Nan'endō in 1189. Mōri Hisashi contends they should have been displayed showing three kinds of postures on each side.¹¹⁹ Moreover, the order of the postures would be *tatehiza*, *chōki*, and *fusa* on the two sides. Differing from Mōri's view, Seya argues that the positions of these six monk sculptures were arranged according to their monastic ranks.¹²⁰ Ono Kayo considers that we should base the placement of the six Hossō monk sculptures on their illustrations in the Kōfukuji mandara.¹²¹ If one accepts her proposition, their placement in the Nan'endō would be: Genpin (directly behind the main icon), followed by Gyōga and Shin'ei on the north; Zenju (directly behind the main icon), followed by Zensō, and Jōtō on the south. This way, the postures of the *tatehiza*, *fusa*, and *chōki* are shown on both sides. I find Ono's proposition convincing, and the reasons for this are twofold. First, the delineations of the

¹¹⁸ Izumi, "Kōfukuji," 54-57.

¹¹⁹ Mōri, "Kōfukuji Nan'endō," 271-272.

¹²⁰ Seya, "Kōfukuji," 43-44. If this was the case, Zenju would have been directly behind the Fukūkenjaku Kannon on the north side (corresponding to the left side of the icon), followed by Gyōga and Shin'ei, and that Genpin would be directly behind the icon on the south (corresponding to the right side of the icon), followed by Jōtō and Zensō.

¹²¹ Ono, *Kōfukuji Nan'endō*, 279-297.

Nan'endō Shitennō in this painting are strikingly similar to those of the Nan'endō Shitennō sculptures. We may then speculate that the depictions of other Nan'endō images in the painting also follow closely those of the restored sculptures. Second, by the twelfth century, probably only very few people would have been familiar with the monastic ranks of these six monks, who lived hundreds of years before. Moreover, these six monk sculptures served as the attendants of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and were mainly to signify the lineage of Hossō Buddhism rather than the eminence of individual monks. Given this situation, it is hard to think that Kōkei and Kanezane would have paid attention to the monastic ranks of each priest.

Eight Patriarch Paintings

According to *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri senrei* 南円堂御本尊以下御修理先例 (Records of the Previous Repairs of the Nan'endō's Main Icon), Iyo Nyūdō 伊豫入道 recreated the eight patriarch paintings for the Nan'endō.¹²² Iyo Nyūdō might have been the son of Fujiwara no Takayoshi 藤原隆能 (dates unknown), a Kyoto-based artist, and if so, his official name was Fujiwara no Takashige 藤原隆成 (dates unknown; also known as Fujiwara no Takachika 藤原隆親).¹²³ Because of the colors of these paintings have mostly worn off, it is extremely difficult to determine their dates through a formal analysis. However, a dendrochronological test on two of the planks suggests that at least some of the paintings were recreated around the same time when the hall was rebuilt in 1189.¹²⁴

¹²² *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri zenrei*, 41.

¹²³ *Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri zenrei*, 40.

¹²⁴ Naraken Kyōiku Inkaï, ed. *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho* (The Report of the Repair and Restoration of the Important Cultural Property Kōfukuji Nan'endō) (Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Inkaï, 1996), 75.

Constructing the Sacred Body in the ‘Flesh’

Manifestation Buddha and Kanezane’s Nenbutsu Practice

A standing Amida statue in the crown of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon represents the *kebutsu*, manifestation Buddha, which corresponds to the transformation body of the Buddha (J. *keshin* 化身; Skt. *Nirmāṇakāya*).¹²⁵ The head and main body of the statue were made from a single-block of cypress. Except for the toes, cranial protuberance (*nikkei* 肉髻; Skt. *ushinisha*), and hem of the back garment, most parts of the statue are original.¹²⁶ The statue is covered in *shippaku* 漆箔 (gold foil applied with layers of lacquer), exuding a resplendent ambience. The hair is painted in black ink, and the lips are painted in red. The eyes, *byakugō*, eyebrows, and mustache are finely painted in black ink. Because the statue is miniature (29.4 centimeters) and is located close to the top of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, one cannot see it clearly with the naked eye from a distance. Nevertheless, the construction of the statue is delicate, and its formal features are novel for its time.

The Amida *kebutsu* wears a robe in a style of dress called “*tsūken* 通肩.” The robe drapes across the body, covers both shoulders, and its upper hem hangs slightly below the neck. While this dress style usually hides the entire torso, the chest is revealed in this work. According to Oku Takeo, the “*tsūken*” mode of dress appeared as early as the seventh century, but is rarely seen in Buddhist images dated from the eleventh century to the late Heian period.¹²⁷ The hair of the statue is carved in spiral forms, and every lock (except those on the *ushinisha*) is aligned

¹²⁵ Suzuki, “Fukūkenjaku,” 51-52, 54.

¹²⁶ Suzuki, “Fukūkenjaku,” 58.

¹²⁷ Oku Takeo, “Nyorai no kamigata ni okeru Heian matsu Kamakura shoki no ichi dōkō: hajōhatsu no shiyō o megutte,” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 256 (May 2005): 94.

vertically one after another like rippling waves. This hairstyle is called “*hajōhatsu* 波状髪 (wavy hair)” and did not appear in Buddhist images until after the second half of the twelfth century.¹²⁸ Oku contends that the *tsūken* robe and wavy hair were intended to endow the Amida statue with the qualities of a “living body (*shōjin* 生身)” and were drawn from the sculpture of the Seiryōji Shaka.¹²⁹ Known as a “living Buddha (*shōjin butsu*),” the Seiryōji Shaka was reputedly modelled after the actual portrait of the Buddha Shaka, and the cult of this statue became prominent in the twelfth century.¹³⁰ The wavy hair, *tsūken* robe, and a silver *byakugō* incised with an image of Buddha are distinctive features of the Seiryōji Shaka.

The Amida *kebutsu* joins two hands in front of the chest to form a mudra of reverence, a hand gesture that is rarely seen in *kebutsu* and Amida images. Images of Amida *kebutsu* are usually shown with hands either hidden inside clothes or respectively performing fear-not (J. *semuin* 施無畏印; Skt. *abhaya*) and wish-granting mudras. This unusual detail of the *kebutsu* sculpture was derived from Buddhist paintings in Song China.¹³¹ Made in 1180, a Song Buddhist painting from Chion-in in Kyoto depicts the Pure Land of Amida along with two groups of Buddhist figures in the upper left and right corners.¹³² Each group contains five Buddhas, ten

¹²⁸ Oku, “Nyorai no,” 89-93.

¹²⁹ Oku, “Nyorai no,” 89-111.

¹³⁰ Donald McCallum, “The Replication of Miraculous Icons: The Zenkōji Amida and the Seiryōji Shaka,” in *Images, Miracles, and Authority in Asian Religious Traditions*, ed. Richard Davis (Boulder: Westview Press, 1998), 211-213.

¹³¹ Jinno Yūta, “Kōfukuji Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no kebutsu ni tsuite,” *Seisen joshi daigaku daigakuin kagaku kenkyūka ronshū* 19 (October 2013): 30-31; Fujioka Yutaka, “Butsuzō to honyō: Kamakura jidai zenki no Nyorai ryūzō ni okeru Sō butsuga no juyō o chūshin ni,” in *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi 2: Keitai no denshō*, ed. Itakura Masaaki (Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2005), 151.

¹³² For discussion of this painting, see Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Seichi Ninpō (Ninpō): Nihon Bukkyō 1300-nen no genryū: subete wa koko kara yatte kita* (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2009), 294, fig. 57.

Bodhisattvas, and seven monks, who stand on the clouds and face the central Amida. Like the Nan'endō *kebutsu*, three of the five Buddhas in the left corner press their hands together in front of the chests. In addition, the Amida *kebutsu* and these three Buddhas have commonality in the rendition of their garments. First, their robes cover both shoulders and hang down below the knees with the hems ending in an inverted triangular shape. Second, their sleeves fall in a flattened pattern with undulated edges. These depictions of the garments are common in Song dynasty Buddhist paintings.¹³³

There had been trade between Japan and China in the late twelfth century.¹³⁴ Because of the Taira's interest in trade with Song China, Kyoto nobles had access to Chinese goods.¹³⁵ As a prominent courtier, Kanezane had contacts with images and objects imported from China. It is also common to see that Kei-school sculptors incorporated Song visual idioms into their works.¹³⁶ Therefore, the forms of the Amida *kebutsu* reflect the impact of Song Buddhist visual culture.

The representation of the Amida *kebutsu* in a reverence gesture may also have had to do with Kanezane's religious beliefs. As his diary *Gyokuyō* shows, Kanezane was a devout practitioner of *nenbutsu* invocation, which was a practice of chanting Amida's name, "Namu Amida Butsu." In 1176, Kanezane initiated the performance of *nenbutsu* incantation that lasted

¹³³ For discussion of this, see Fujioka, "Butsuzō," 139-156.

¹³⁴ Hurst, "Insei," 632-637.

¹³⁵ Hurst, "Insei," 635.

¹³⁶ For studies of this, see Asai Kazuharu, "Kōkei to Unkei: iwayuru 'sōfū' to Tenpyō (Heian shoki) fukkō ni tsuite," in *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butsuzō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, ed. Fujisawa Norio (Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991), 10-15; Nedachi, *Nihon chūsei*, 205-232; Mizuno Keizaburō, "Sōdai bijutsu to Kamakura chōkoku," *Kokka* 1000 (May 1977): 53-61.

for several days.¹³⁷ Beginning on the eighth day of the ninth month of that year, Kanezane chanted Amida’s name thousands of times each day until he reached one million times in total on the eighteenth of the same month.¹³⁸ He conducted the same performance the following year and vowed to “practice *nenbutsu* for seven days each year without stop throughout my life.”¹³⁹ In addition, while chanting *nenbutsu* loudly, he performed prostrations assiduously until his legs felt uncomfortable.¹⁴⁰ In doing so, he showed his pious devotion: “for the sake of the Buddhist Law, I could sacrifice my body and life.”¹⁴¹ Kanezane also expressed his desire to be reborn in the Pure Land of Amida in *Gyokuyō*, stating that “I dare not to desire for a long life. My goal only lies in going to the Western (Pure) Land.”¹⁴²

Kanezane had contacts with several monks known for Pure Land teachings such as the mentioned Shingon monk Butsugon, who wrote “*Jūnen gokuraku iō shū* 十念極樂易往集 (Passages on Quick Rebirth in the Land of Ultimate Bliss through Ten Contemplations)” and was close to Kanezane for twenty-five years; the Tendai monk 湛敷 Tangō, also known as Ōhara Shōnin 大原上人, who was a *nenbutsu* chanting devotee; Hōnen, who wrote *Senchaku hongan nenbutsushū* 選択本願念仏集 (Passages on the Selection of the *Nenbutsu* in the Original Vow) in 1198 to explicate his *senchaku* (exclusive selection) doctrine that only through exclusive

¹³⁷ *Gyokuyō*, Angen 2.9.8 (1: 604). Although this entry does not mention that this was the first time Kanezane practiced *nenbutsu* chanting for seven days in a row, another entry in *Gyokuyō* does indicate that he made a vow to conduct this performance a year later. For this, see *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 1.9.8 (2: 99).

¹³⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Angen 2.9.8-18 (1: 604-608).

¹³⁹ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 1.9.9 (2: 99).

¹⁴⁰ *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2.9.15 (2: 628).

¹⁴¹ *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2.9.15 (2: 628).

¹⁴² *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 1.9.8 (2: 99).

practice of *nenbutsu* invocation can one attain rebirth in the Pure Land.¹⁴³ These monks discussed Buddhist doctrines with Kanezane, took part in his practices of seven-day *nenbutsu* incantation at different points of his life, and performed precept rituals for him.¹⁴⁴ Although Kanezane was known for his support of Hōnen, their relationship did not begin until 1189.¹⁴⁵ Therefore, Kanezane’s understanding of Pure Land teachings prior to this year cannot be considered only in Hōnen’s terms. From *Gyokuyō*, we know that Kanezane copied *Ōjō yōshū* (Essentials for Pure Land Rebirth), written in 985 by the monk Genshin (942-1017).¹⁴⁶ This text made tremendous impact on the development of Pure Land Buddhism and espouses the practices of visualizing the Amida and his Pure Land as paths to salvation. It is clear that Kanezane took interest in various types of Pure Land teachings and practices.

The teachings of Shandao (J. Zendō) (613-681), a well-known Chinese preacher of Pure Land beliefs, are featured in Genshin’s *Ōjō yōshū* and served as a basis for Hōnen to formulate his *senchaku* doctrine.¹⁴⁷ Portraits of Shandao emerged as a focus of worship in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.¹⁴⁸ In his portraits, it is common to see the monk in a gesture of

¹⁴³ For Kanezane’s interactions with these priests, see Nakao Takashi, *Chūsei no kanjin hijiri to shari shinkō* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002), 181-199; Shigematsu Akihisa, *Nihon jōdokyō seiritsu katei no kenkyū: Shinran no shisō to sono genryū* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1964), 440-499.

¹⁴⁴ Nakao, *Chūsei*, 182-197. For example, with Butsugon, see *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 1.9.9 (2: 99); *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 4.9.8 (2: 433); *Gyokuyō*, Angen 2.9.13 (1: 604); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2.9.8 (2: 628); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2.10.11 (2: 635). With Tankyō, see *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 4.2.19 (3: 499); *Gyokuyō*, Yōwa 2.2.8 (2: 552); *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2.2.18 (2: 596); *Gyokuyō*, Genryaku 2.9.8 (3: 98). With Hōnen, see *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.8.8 (3: 551); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.8.21 (3: 723); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 3.8.8 (3: 808); *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.8.1 (3: 550); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 1.7.23 (3: 620).

¹⁴⁵ Shigematsu, *Nihon jōdokyō*, 442.

¹⁴⁶ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 1.10.16 (2: 102).

¹⁴⁷ Kanda Fusae, “Hōnen’s Senchaku Doctrine and His Artistic Agenda,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 31, no. 1 (2004): 10.

¹⁴⁸ Ono Kayo, “Nara Raigōji no Zendō Daishi zazō no kenkyū—sono katachi ga imisuru mono,” *Waseda Daigaku kōtō kenkyūjo kiyō* 2 (2010): 5-11.

prayer chanting *nenbutsu* with an open mouth, from which images of *kebutsu* appear. For example, a portrait painting of Shandao, dated to the thirteenth century, from Chionji in Kyoto depicts him performing the *nenbutsu* invocation besides a balcony.¹⁴⁹ In the painting, Shandao joins two hands in front of the chest and raises his head toward the sky. Five golden *kebutsu* manifesting from his mouth are illustrated on the upper right corner. The cartouche on the top of this painting contains an eulogy composed by a Chinese monk named Siming 四明 (dates unknown) in 1161, who was from Ningbo 寧波, Zhejiang Province in the Song dynasty.¹⁵⁰ Two passages in the eulogy states: “When Shandao chanted the name of Buddha, Buddhas came out of his mouth. Believers all saw this and knew that this was not sorcery 善導念佛。佛從口出。信者皆見。知非幻術。”¹⁵¹ Buddhist believers seemed to imagine and desire to see the same scene while doing *nenbutsu* invocation. A passage in *Song gaoseng chuan* 宋高僧傳 (Biographies of Song Eminent Monks), written in 987, describes that while the monk Shaokang 少康 recited the name of Buddha, an image of Buddha came out of his mouth.¹⁵² Shaokang then commented that Shandao also had the same experience.

An entry in *Gyokuyō* hints at Kanezane’s familiarity with the theme that *kebutsu* came out of practitioners’ mouths while they chanted the name of Amida. On the eighth day of the ninth month in 1185, Kanezane reported that his daughter-in-law had a dream, in which she saw

¹⁴⁹ For discussion of this painting, see Takama Yukari, “Chionji shozō jūyō bunkazai Zendō Daishi zō ni tsuite,” *Geijutsu kenkyū* 24 (2011): 1-18; Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Kaikei: Nihonjin o miryōshita hotoke no katachi: tokubetsuten* (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2017), 109, 239 (fig. 60).

¹⁵⁰ Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Seichi Ninpō*, 60, 293.

¹⁵¹ Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Seichi Ninpō*, 60.

¹⁵² *T.* 2061, 50: 0867c25-26.

golden light emanating from his mouth while he practiced *nenbutsu* chanting.¹⁵³ It is said that in 1205 when Hōnen was ill, Kanezane commissioned a painting of Shandao to pray for Hōnen’s recovery.¹⁵⁴ Hōnen venerated Shandao and regarded him as a manifestation of Amida Buddha.¹⁵⁵ Although Kanezane’s relationship with Hōnen did not begin until 1189, his devotion to Pure Land belief and connections with various Pure Land monks suggest that he might have admired Shandao and have learned about his teachings prior to this year. This is not to say that the Nan’endō *kebutsu* was modelled after Shandao’s portrait, but it is very likely that Kanezane’s aspiration for being reborn in the Pure Land of Amida informed the iconography of this image.

As discussed in Chapter Four, the *kebutsu* of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was identified as a Jizō rather than an Amida in some Shingon texts as early as the twelfth century.¹⁵⁶ No evidence indicates that the *kebutsu* destroyed in the fire of 1181 was an image of Jizō.¹⁵⁷ In iconographic manual *Besson zakki*, compiled by the Shingon monk Shinkaku 心覺 (1117-1180)

¹⁵³ *Gyokuyō*, Genryaku 2.9.8 (3: 98).

¹⁵⁴ Shinzui 信瑞, *Myōgi shingyō shū* 明義進行集, in *Hōnen shōnin zenshū*, ed. Ikawa Jōkei (Kyoto: Ikawa Jōkei, 1952), 1018.

¹⁵⁵ Hōnen, *Senchaku hongan nenbutsushū*, in *Jōdoshū zensho 7* (Tokyo: Jōdoshū Kanshū Happyakunen Kinen Kyōsan Junbikyoku, 1970), 74.

¹⁵⁶ It should be mentioned that *Kōshinshō* 幸心抄, written by the Shingon monk Shinkai 親快 (1215-1276) contains a conversation between Shinkai’s teacher Kenjin 憲深 (1192-1263) and “Hosshōji Zenjō Tenka 法性寺禪定殿下 (Meditation Master of Hosshōji).” In the conversation, Hosshōji Zenjō Tenka states that the *kebutsu* of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon is “actually a Jizō Bosatsu.” Some scholars have identified “Hosshōji Zenjō Tenka” as Kanezane. However, Funata convincingly argues that Hosshōji Zenjō Tenka should be Kanezane’s grandson Kujō no Michi’ie 九条道家 (1193-1252). Also, he considers that Kenjin probably fabricated this conversation about the *kebutsu* of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon in order to legitimize the teachings of his own Shingon lineage. *T.* 2498, 78: 0719a21-26; Asai Kazuharu, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Juntei Kannon zō,” *Nihon no bijutsu* 382 (1998): 66; Watanabe, “Fukūkenjaku Kannon,” 304; Funata Jun’ichi, “Sekkanke no Nan’endō Kannon shinkō to Kasuga kami: hisetsu seisei to mikkyō girei o megutte,” in *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011), 451-452, 477-478, n. 46.

¹⁵⁷ For the study of the *kebutsu*’s identity, see Jinno, “Kōfukuji,” 21-28.

during the Shōan 承安 era (1171-1175), the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon wears a crown with an image of Buddha seated with the hands hidden in the robe.¹⁵⁸ However, the aforementioned painting of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon from the Nara National Museum shows the *kebutsu* as a Buddha in a standing posture. On the basis of these sources, the original *kebutsu* statue should have represented Amida Buddha in either a seated or standing form.

A Perfect Body and Deposited Objects

As mentioned previously, Kanezane placed objects and his *ganmon* inside the body of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. No evidence indicates that he did this because the original icon contained deposits. Rather, his insertion of the deposits reflected the growing popularity of this practice in the late twelfth century.¹⁵⁹ The deposits are unfortunately missing, but the *ganmon* remains in a private collection.¹⁶⁰ Furthermore, the content of the *ganmon* (hereafter, *Ganmon*) is

¹⁵⁸ *Besson zakki*, in *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978), 226.

¹⁵⁹ Although the practice of inserting deposits in Buddhist sculptures already existed in the Nara period, it did not become frequent until the later half of the Heian period. Moreover, it was not until the Kamakura period that deposits came in great numbers and a variety of items. For the survey of this practice in the Heian and Kamakura periods, see Pei-Jung Wu, "The Manjusri Statues and Buddhist Practice of Saidaiji" (PhD diss. University of California, Los Angeles, 2002), 138-223. The meaning of sculptural deposits has attracted scholarly attention. For critical discussion of scholarship on this, see Robert Sharf, review of *Secrets of the Sacred: Empowering Buddhist Images in Clear, in Code, and in Cache*, by Helmut Brinker, *The Art Bulletin* 95, no. 1 (March, 2013): 166-167; Bernard Faure, "Buddhism's Black Holes: From Ontology to Hauntology," *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 27, no. 2 (December 2017): 89-121.

¹⁶⁰ Fujiwara no Kanezane, *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon Kōfukuji Nan'endō honzon Kōkei saku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō dainai monjo* 藤原兼実願文興福寺南円堂本尊康慶作不空羼索觀音像胎内文書), in *Heian ibun komonjo hen daihachikan*, ed. Takeuchi Rizō, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Tokyodō, 1971), 338; Suzuki, "Fukūkenjaku," 50-51; Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji*, 30. *Ganmon* is in the collection of Kure Fumiaki 吳文炳, who nonetheless already passed away. It is unclear who owns *Ganmon* now. Haruna Yoshishige studies the calligraphy of the *ganmon* and considers that the text was very likely to be brushed by Kanezane. As far as I know, no scholars have doubted the veracity of this text. For Haruna's study, see Haruna Yoshishige, *Heian jidai shodōshi* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan,

strikingly similar to that of an inventory text recorded in *Gyokuyō* on the day of the Nan'endō's consecration.¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, *Ganmon* postdates and is shorter than the inventory text, suggesting that the latter might have served as a draft of the former.

Ganmon is written in gold ink on indigo paper and describes the content of the deposits including a lotus pedestal,¹⁶² a five-ring pagoda (*gorintō* 五輪塔), and objects of golden seed letters, a silver lasso, five-ring seed letters, and three relic grains that were put inside the *gorintō*. In addition, the deposits contained one scroll of each of the following scriptures: *Hōkyōin darani kyō* 寶篋印陀羅尼經 (Skt. *Sarvatathāgata-adhiṣṭhāna-hṛdaya-guhyadhātu karaṇḍa-mudrā-dhāraṇī*), *Kannon bōn* 觀音品 (another name for *Kannon kyō*) of the *Lotus Sutra*, *Fukūkenjaku Kannon kyō* 不空羂索經, and *Hannya shingyō* 般若心經 (Skt. *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya*) as well as *Kongō hannya kyō* 金剛般若經 (Skt. *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*) (the last two sutras combined in a single bundle). *Ganmon* indicates that these sutras, written in gold ink on indigo paper, stood against the four corners of the *gorintō*. Taken together, the *gorintō* and the scriptures constituted a single object and were further set upon the lotus pedestal.¹⁶³ A deposit

1993), 240. For the photo image of *Ganmon*, see Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 30.

¹⁶¹ *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.9.28 (3: 557).

¹⁶² The inventory text in *Gyokuyō* records a stalk of lotus flower, not a lotus pedestal. Since the inventory text may have served as the draft of *Ganmon*, I am inclined to think that it was the lotus pedestal that was inserted into the icon. Also, it is more common to see lotus pedestals as deposits of sculptures than stalks of lotus flowers.

¹⁶³ *Ganmon* states, “I placed a lotus pedestal in the body of [of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon] and inserted a five-ring pagoda into the lotus pedestal. 仍御身之中，奉籠蓮華一基，其中奉納五輪塔一基。” However, to my knowledge, no known deposits contain a five-ring pagoda that was placed in a lotus pedestal. Also, it is common to see in the composition of deposits that sutras or other objects stand on lotus pedestals. As the below will show, the *gorintō*, its inserted objects, and sutras signify the three bodies of the Buddha. As such, it would have been reasonable that the *gorintō* rested on the lotus pedestal. One may also interpret that the compound “sono naka 其中” in the account of *Ganmon* means “the

inside the Miroku Buddha, created by Unkei in 1212 for the Hokuendō at Kōfukuji, also shows a similar way of combining *gorintō* and sutras.¹⁶⁴ This deposit contains a tabernacle (*zushi* 厨子) that is sandwiched by two wooden plaques fashioned in the form of a five-ring pagoda. Moreover, a scroll of *Hōkyōin darani kyō* is attached to one of the wooden plaques.

Gorintō represents the five constituents of the universe through its five geometric shapes: from bottom to top, a cubic base represents the earth (J. *jirin* 地輪); a sphere embodies water (J. *suirin* 水輪); a triangle indicates the fire (J. *karin* 火輪); a hemisphere stands for the air or wind (J. *fūrin* 風輪); a jewel form at the top designates space or the void (J. *kūrin* 空輪).¹⁶⁵ The five elements (*gorin* 五輪) correspond to the five syllables (*a-vi-ra-hum-kham*), five physical parts of a body (*gotai* 五体), and five colors (*goshiki* 五色). The five physical parts of a body include the head, two arms, and two legs, and five colors include yellow, white, blue, red, and black. *Gorintō* manifests the entire universe and represents Birushana Buddha.¹⁶⁶ In addition, it was utilized in the performance of *gorinkan* 五輪觀 (five-ring contemplation), in which practitioners identified the five parts of their bodies with the five elements of *gorintō*. In doing so, practitioners attained

interior of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.” This way, the *gorintō* would have been placed directly inside the Fukūkenjaku Kannon. While giving no reasons, Jinnō Yūta also considers that the *gorintō* was placed upon the lotus pedestal. For this, see Jinno Yūta, “Kujō Kanazane no busshari hōnō ganmon ni miru Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō saikō no igi,” *Mikkyō zūzō* 33 (December 2014): 22-23.

¹⁶⁴ For discussion of the deposit, see Nara Rokudaiji Kankōkai, ed., *Nara rokudaiji taikan* 8, 40-41. For the image of the deposit, see Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, *Unkei*, 256-257.

¹⁶⁵ For discussion of *gorintō*, see Helmut Brinker, *Secrets of the Sacred: Empowering Buddhist Images in Clear, in Code, and in Cache* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011), 60-63; John Rosenfield, *Portraits of Chōgen: The Transformation of Buddhist Art in Early Medieval Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 186-188; Mochizuki Shinkō, ed., *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Seikai Seiten Kankō Kyokai, 1988), 1388-1390; Natō Sakae, “Chōgen no shari hōju shinkō: sankaku gorintō no genryū o megutte,” in *Daikanjin Chōgen: Tōdaiji no Kamakura fukkō to arata na bi no sōshutsu: Goonki 800-nen kinen tokubetsuten*, ed. Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan (Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2006), 32-33.

¹⁶⁶ Natō, “Chōgen,” 32.

“the complete body of five-rings (*gorin jōshin* 五輪成身)” that unified Buddhas and human bodies. Although *gorintō* was already in use in the second half of the eleventh century, it was Chōgen that developed it as relic containers and icon deposits.¹⁶⁷ His version of *gorintō*, called “*sankaku gorintō* 三角五輪塔 (triangular five-ring pagoda),” shows that the *karin* is a triangular pyramid with each facet shaped as an equilateral triangle. Therefore, this form of *gorintō* has a *karin* with three sides rather than the four sides. *Gyokuyō* records that in 1185 Kanazane gave Chōgen three grains of relics to be enshrined inside the restored Tōdaiji Daibutsu, and that these relics were placed in a five-colored *gorintō*.¹⁶⁸ We may speculate that the five-ring pagoda inserted into the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was also of Chōgen’s version having a three-sided *karin*.

I contend that the entire deposit of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon symbolized the three bodies of the Buddha (J. *sanjin* 三身; Skt. *trikāya*) through its three components—relics, sutras, and five-ring pagoda. The theory of the Buddha’s bodies is rather complicated, and each body can have various meanings.¹⁶⁹ Briefly speaking, the three bodies of the Buddha are the Dharma body (J. *hōshin* 法身; Skt. *dharmakāya*), reward or enjoyment body (J. *hōshin* 報身 or *juyūshin* 受用身; Skt. *sambhoga-kāya*), and transformation or manifestation body (J. *keshin* 化身 or *ōjin* 応身;

¹⁶⁷ Natō, “Chōgen,” 31-34; Natō Sakae, “Chōgen no sankaku gorintō to Ninpō Ashokaōji,” in *Nara nanto Bukkyō no dentō to kakushin*, ed. Nemoto Seiji and Samueru Mosu (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010), 189-215.

¹⁶⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Genryaku 2.4.27 (3: 80).

¹⁶⁹ For discussion of the three-body theory, see Paul Williams, *Mahayana Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 172-186; Nagao Gadjin, “On the Theory of Buddha-body: *Buddha-kāya*,” trans. Hirano Umeyo, *Eastern Buddhist* 6 (1973): 25-53; Ruben L. F. Habito, “Buddha-body Theory and the Lotus Sutra: Implications for Praxis,” in *A Buddhist Kaleidoscope: Essays on the Lotus Sutra*, ed. Gene Reeves (Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Company, 2002), 305-317; Malcolm Eckel, *To See the Buddha: A Philosopher’s Quest for the Meaning of Emptiness* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 115-128.

Skt. *nirmāṇakāya*). In early Buddhist texts the term of the Dharma body is referred as “the true nature of things,” “the collection of pure *dharmas*” or “the collection of Buddha’s sutras,” through which sentient beings can find teachings of the Buddha after his passing into *nirvana*.¹⁷⁰ The Dharma body is also conceived as formless, transcendental, and permanent. It is synonymous with the true nature of the Buddha and the essence of the Dharma. In contrast to the Dharma body, the manifestation body and reward body have physical forms and therefore are impermanent. The reward body of the Buddha is the one that experiences enlightenment and dwells in his Pure Land. Hence, only those who have enlightened capacity can see this form of the Buddha and share the enjoyment of enlightenment. Amida Buddha, Birushana Buddha, and Miroku Buddha epitomize the reward body of the Buddha and are not visible to human beings.¹⁷¹ The manifestation body manifests in different forms depending on the needs of sentient beings and is for the purpose of saving them from suffering. As such, the manifestation body is understood as “skillful means” and therefore cannot embody the essence of the Buddha. The Buddha Shaka, who lived, attained enlightenment, and passed into *nirvana* in India, is considered as the Buddha of the manifestation body.

Viewed in light of the three-body doctrine, the relics in the Nan’endō deposits represented the transformation body; the *gorintō* signified Birushana Buddha in the reward body; the five scriptures embodied the Dharma body. Although in *Ganmon*, Kanazane did not indicate that these deposits had this symbolic meaning, he was familiar with the three-body doctrine as evidenced in a votive text (*ganmon*) he composed in 1183 for the dedication of relic inside the

¹⁷⁰ Williams, *Mahayana*, 176-177.

¹⁷¹ In *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, Birushana Buddha is regarded as the Dharma body of the Buddha. However, in the same sutra and Tendai Buddhism, Birushana is also considered as the reward body of the Buddha. In this case, the Buddha is called as Rushana. Robert Buswell Jr. and Donald Lopez Jr., ed., *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 949; Mochizuki Shinkō, ed., *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Seikai Seiten Kankō Kyokai, 1988), 4367-4369.

Tōdaiji Daibutsu. In this text, Kanezane states “Today I enshrine the bodily remains of the Shaka inside the miraculous icon of Birushana. The two, reward and manifestation bodies, are merged into one. 今以釋迦之遺體，奉籠盧遮那之靈像，報應兩身混一。”¹⁷² In addition, he copied three passages from the *Lotus Sutra*, and one of the passages states that “there is no need to install relic in the pagoda. What is the reason? Inside this [pagoda], there is already a whole body of Nyorai. 不須復安舍利，所以者何，此中已有如來全身。”¹⁷³ This passage is part of the section in the *Lotus Sutra* that promulgates worship of the sutra and addresses its sanctity.¹⁷⁴ Kanezane also brushed the mantra of the three bodies (*sanjin shingon* 三身真言) and wrote down his twenty vows and wishes in the votive text.¹⁷⁵ Taken together, the Tōdaiji Daibutsu, its relic deposit, and votive text (including the writing of the mantra and passages of the *Lotus Sutra*) symbolically corresponded to the three bodies of the Buddha.

It is clear that Kanezane took interest in the three-body doctrine, perceived the relic as the manifestation body of the Buddha, and regarded the Tōdaiji Daibutsu as the reward body of Birushana Buddha. In view of this case, we can argue that he also applied this doctrine to construct the deposits of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and endowed the icon with a complete body, one that manifested manifold appearances of the deity and his omnipotent power.

In addition to this meaning, the deposits demonstrated Kanezane’s devotion to Kasuga Daimyōjin. Jinno Yūta contends that by inserting the sutras of *Hannya shingyō* and *Kongō*

¹⁷² Fujiwara no Kanezane, *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon*, in *Heian ibun komonjo hen daihachikan*, ed. Takeuchi Rizō, vol. 8 (Tokyo: Tokyodō, 1965), 3095.

¹⁷³ *Fujiwara no Kanezane*, 3095.

¹⁷⁴ The preceding sentences of this passage in the *Lotus Sutra* describes that wherever the sutra was preached, recited, copied, and stored, one should erect a pagoda of the seven treasures, make the building as tall and spacious as possible, and adorn it with splendid ornaments. *T. 0262*, 09: 0031b27-28.

¹⁷⁵ *Fujiwara no Kanezane*, 3096.

hannya kyō into the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Kanezane marked the Buddha-*kami* relationship between the icon and Kasuga Daimyōjin.¹⁷⁶ *Hannya shingyō* had been offered to or had been recited at the Nan'endō and Kasuga Shrine since Tadazane's time.¹⁷⁷ An entry in *Gyokuyō* also tells that Kanezane regularly transcribed *Hannya shingyō* and offered the sutra to Kasuga Daimyōjin.¹⁷⁸ Another entry in *Gyokuyō* records that the monk Kakujō 覺乘 visited Kanezane one day, explaining that according to the Kōfukuji monk Zōshun 藏俊 (1104-1180), *Kongō hannya kyō* was the “*goshotai* 御正体 (true body)” of Kasuga Daimyōjin.¹⁷⁹ Therefore, in addition to representing the Dharma body of the Buddha, the sutra deposit of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon indicated the presence of Kasuga Daimyōjin.

Deposited Ganmon

In *Ganmon*, Kanezane explains why he wanted to insert deposits inside the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon: “I remember that my causal connection [with the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon] is by no means tenuous, and my faith [in it] is getting much deeper 情憶機緣之不淺，彌有信心之甚深.”¹⁸⁰ As indicated here, he inserted the deposits because of his deep karmic connection with the Nan'endō Fukūenjaku Kannon and his devout belief in the icon. Kanezane then goes on to tell of the items inserted into the icon and indicates that the deposited sutras were

¹⁷⁶ Jinno, “Kujō Kanezane,” 22-26.

¹⁷⁷ *Denryaku*, Chōji 1.7.2 (2: 2), *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.7.13 (2: 147), *Denryaku*, Tennin 3.7.5 (3: 95), *Denryaku*, Eikyū 3.1.11 (4: 146); *Chūyūki*, Kashō 1.4.29 (6: 174); *Denryaku*, Kashō 1.7.13 (2: 147); *Denryaku*, Kōwa 4.5.18 (1: 123).

¹⁷⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Juei 2. 12.22 (2: 664).

¹⁷⁹ *Gyokuyō*, Jishō 5.2.26 (2: 490-491).

¹⁸⁰ *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon Kōfukuji*, 338.

copied according to Buddhist Law and after the purification of scribes' bodies. After this, he states:

What are my prayers? They are the twenty vows and wishes I made in my request to Butsugen (another name for Butsugen Butsumo, Buddha's eye, Buddha's mother; Skt. Buddhhalocanī) the previous year. Beyond those vows and wishes, I limited myself to make [another] three wishes,¹⁸¹ which may seem for the sake of myself, but are still for this world. The deity (Fukūkenjaku Kannon) surely has the insight [to know this]. In general, I have two kinds of wishes, the extent of which is that a spiritual response be manifest soon, followed by rebirth among the nine grades [of the Pure Land]. I invoke and pray to Fukūkenjaku Kannon 所願之趣何者，先年所祈請佛眼尊之廿種誓願是也，其外限一身有三望，雖似為身，猶是為世也，本尊定有知見歟，然則廣略二種之願望，玄應忽顯，順次九品之往生，請祈不空者也。”¹⁸²

This passage then ends with *Ganmon*'s date and Kanezane's signature. As Obara Hitoshi points out, the twenty vows and wishes written in *Ganmon* possibly refer to those listed in the Tōdaji votive text that Kanezane composed in 1183.¹⁸³ The twenty vows and wishes listed are for various purposes, such as the protection of the nation, salvation of sentient beings, welfare of Kanezane's family, and flourishing of Buddhism.¹⁸⁴ They also express a strong desire for good government.

Scholars interpret the three wishes mentioned in *Ganmon* differently. Yamamoto Nobuyoshi considers that two wishes were for the well-being of the nation and the *sekkanke*, and

¹⁸¹ This sentence might also mean that “Beyond these vows and wishes, I, who is limited to this lifetime, have three wishes 其外限一身有三望.” I thank Professor Amy McNair for suggesting this meaning to me. I also thank Professors Maya Stiller and Daniel Stevenson for giving me comments on the translation of this passage.

¹⁸² *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon Kōfukuji*, 338. It should be noted that Kanezane stated the two wishes slightly different in the inventory text recorded in *Gyokuyō*: “There are in general two kinds of the wishes. [Spiritual response] will surely manifest soon, followed by the rebirth among the nine grades of the Pure Land 然則廣略二種之願望。定應早垂。順次九品之往生。” The meaning of this passage is the same as the one in *Ganmon*. *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 5.9.28 (3: 556-557).

¹⁸³ Obara Hitoshi, “Kujō Kanezane no ganmon o meguru notto,” in *Gyokuyō o yomu: Kujō Kanezane to sono jidai*, ed. Obara Hitoshi (Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2013), 22-23.

¹⁸⁴ *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon*, 3096.

the remaining one wish is that Kanezane's daughter Kujō no Taeko 九条任子 (1173-1238) could become the empress of Go Toba.¹⁸⁵ Jinno considers that Kanezane may also have made a wish for the salvation of his son Fujiwara no Yoshimichi 九条良通 (1167-1188), who died abruptly in 1188.¹⁸⁶ By the twelfth century, the Northern Fujiwara family had regarded the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon as their protector that gave rise to their success in politics for centuries. Kanezane must have felt that the family could regain its political power through the reconstruction of this icon.¹⁸⁷ In 1192, he states in *Gyokuyō* that: "I reconstructed the sculpture of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Therefore, the resurgence of the Fujiwara family and flourishing of Hossō teachings should come at this time 南圓堂不空羂索，余又造之，藤家之中興，法相之紹隆，竊在此時者歟。"¹⁸⁸

Deposits and Shōjin Butsu

As the above discusses, the *kebutsu* of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and its deposits were intended to bestow the icon with qualities of living Buddha and a complete body, one that symbolizes multifarious existences of the deity. This preoccupation with physical and material forms of sacred power was not limited to Kanezane alone, but was shared by Buddhists in his day. By the end of the twelfth century, the practice of installing deposits was tied to the belief of

¹⁸⁵ Yamamoto Nobuyoshi, "Fujiwara no Kanezane," in *Sho to jinbutsu: Seijika*, ed. Haruna Yoshishige (Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha, 1978), 36.

¹⁸⁶ Jinno, "Kujō Kanezane," 19-22.

¹⁸⁷ The power of the *sekkanke* declined drastically beginning in the early twelfth century. The family faced challenges from both the retired emperors and rising warrior clans. For the history of the *sekkanke* in the twelfth century, see Chapter One.

¹⁸⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 3.1.10 (3: 781).

shōjin butsu and production of its images.¹⁸⁹ The term “*shōjin butsu* 生身仏” can be translated as “living Buddhas,” “icons of living Buddhas,” “living icons,” and “Buddhas in the flesh.” In Buddhist scriptures, *shōjin butsu* is equivalent to the manifestation body of the Buddha and is often described in relation to the Dharma body of the Buddha. For example, the *Dai nehan kyō* 大涅槃經 (Skt. *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*) states that “I [the Buddha] preach in the sutra that the body of Nyorai has two kinds. One is the flesh body, and the other is the Dharma body. The said flesh body is the very manifestation body of skillful means. 我於經中說如來身凡有二種。一者生身。二者法身。言生身者。即是方便應化之身。”¹⁹⁰ Similarly, the commentary *Daichidōron* 大智度論 (Great Wisdom Treatise), attributed to Nāgārjuna (c. 100-200) (J. Ryūju), describes that in addition to the Dharma body, the Buddha has “the flesh body that was born from parents 父母生身,” which has thirty-two marks as opposed to the Dharma body that has no forms.¹⁹¹ Moreover, the commentary tells that the possession of the thirty-two marks was for the purpose of guiding sentient beings.¹⁹² To sum up, *shōjin butsu* is considered as the physical form of the Buddha and as skillful means in response to the needs of sentient beings. As such, *shōjin butsu* is equivalent of the manifestation body of the Buddha and therefore, is impermanent and

¹⁸⁹ For discussion of *shōjin butsu* and its images, see Oku Takeo, “Shōjin shinkō to Kamakura chōkoku,” in *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 7: Unkei, Kaikei to chūsei jin*, ed. Yamamoto Tsutomu (Tokyo: Kabushiki Kaisha Shōgakukan, 2013), 188-196; Nagaoka Ryūsaku, “Kodai Nihon no shōjin kan to zōzō,” *Bijutsu shigaku* 29 (2008): 35-60; Sarah Horton, *Living Buddhist Statues in Early Medieval and Modern Japan* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Nedachi Kensuke, ed., “Tokushū: Bukkyō chōkoku no reigensei to chōkokushi,” *Bijutsu forum* 21, no. 22 (2010); Nakao, *Chūsei*, 110-131. For the definition of *shōjin*, see Mochizuki Shinkō, ed., *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten*, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Seikai Seiten Kankō Kyokai, 1988), 2629.

¹⁹⁰ *T.* 374, 12: 0567a02-04.

¹⁹¹ *T.* 1509, 25: 0274a12.

¹⁹² *T.* 1509, 25: 0274a16-17.

temporary. Nevertheless, from the perspective of devotees, this form of the Buddha can be a miraculous one as it is the only existence visible and sensible for human beings.

References to *shōjin butsu* can be traced to as early as the first half of the eleventh century.¹⁹³ Nagaoka Ryūsaku observes that during the Heian period, *shōjin butsu* usually meant a manifestation of Buddha in the world rather than a living being who acted like humans.¹⁹⁴ His study also shows that images that were referred as living Buddhas at this time were often perceived as “tools” through which devotees made offerings to and felt the presence of divinities. Holding a similar view, Oku Takeo considers that images of living Buddhas were surrogates for the actual manifestation of divinities, allowing devotees to feel the corporeal presence of the sacred.¹⁹⁵ In addition, Oku connects the belief of *shōjin butsu* to the desire of believers to encounter Buddhas in this world. This aspect of *shōjin butsu* is often found in Buddhist literature from the late Heian period that revolves around rebirth in pure lands.

For example, in *Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集, a monk made a wish of seeing a “living” Jizō in his life so that he would be guided to the pure land of a Buddha. Because of his devotion to the deity, the monk encountered Jizō who disguised himself as a boy who fed cows.¹⁹⁶ Another story from *Zoku honchō ōjōden* 続本朝往生伝 (Continuous Japanese Biography of Those Reborn in the Pure Land) records that the priest Shin-en 真縁 saw a *shōjin*

¹⁹³ Nagaoka, “Kodai Nihon,” 42.

¹⁹⁴ Nagaoka, “Kodai Nihon,” 39-41.

¹⁹⁵ Oku, “Shōjin shinkō,” 188-192.

¹⁹⁶ *Konjaku monogatari shū*, in *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai*, ed. Kuroita Katsumi and Kokushi Taikai Henshūkai, vol. 17 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan), 384-386.

butsu of Hachiman Bosatsu in his dream and considered that this vision was a sign of rebirth in the Pure Land.¹⁹⁷

In the late twelfth century, one increasingly sees that the idea of *shōjin butsu* was connected to the veneration of relics. In the aforementioned Tōdaiji votive text, Kanezane states that “the relic of Nyorai is the flesh body of the Buddha that [accumulated] ten thousands of benevolent deeds and [experienced] karmic fruits 夫如來之舍利者，万善感果之生身。”¹⁹⁸ He also indicates in the text that by inserting the relic of the Buddha in the Tōdaiji Daibutsu, the Law of the Buddha and Law of Emperors, which had been declining, would revive again.¹⁹⁹

A passage from *Tōdaiji zōritsu kuyō ki* 東大寺造立供養記 (Records of the Construction and Dedication of Tōdaiji) also shows the link between living icons and relic veneration:

I (the Tōji monk Katsunori 勝憲) enshrined the remaining approximate eighty relics into the Daibutsu (the one at Tōdaiji) to simulate it as a living Buddha. Because of this, miraculous signs have appeared at times, and more than one strange thing have occurred. For instance, people who were blind suddenly obtained clear eyes so that they could worship the Daibutsu. There were also people who saw a rock rather than the Daibutsu. There were people who saw beams of light. There were people who saw the face of the Daibutsu with a length of approximately three suns (nine centimeters). 所殘舍利八十餘粒，同奉納大佛擬生身佛也，是故靈瑞間現，奇特非一。或盲者忽得明眼以拜佛。或有見崗形而不見佛者。或有見光明之赫奕者。或有見佛面三寸許者矣。”²⁰⁰

Some observations can be made from this passage. Firstly, the icon of the living Buddha was constructed through the enshrinement of relics. Second, the production of the sculpture in this way further leads to miraculous signs, strange things, and manifestations of Daibutsu in various physical forms. Third, this passage implies that there is a distinction between the

¹⁹⁷ *Zoku honchō ōjōden*, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960), 421.

¹⁹⁸ *Fujiwara no Kanazane*, 3095.

¹⁹⁹ *Fujiwara no Kanazane*, 3095.

²⁰⁰ *Tōdaiji zōritsu kuyō ki*, in *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 24 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960), 404.

Daibutsu as a sculpture and the Daibutsu as a living icon. This is suggested by the use of the word “to simulate 擬 (*nazoraeru*)” to indicate the act of transforming the sculpture of the Daibutsu into a simulacrum of a living Buddha.

The pronouncement (*keihaku* 敬白) text written by Chōgen in 1185 also connects the enshrinement of relics in the Tōdaiji Daibutsu with the divine manifestation. In this text, Chōgen describes that it was said that when “corporeal relics 生身之舍利” were placed in the Tōdaiji Daibutsu, bright light suddenly emanated from the sculpture, and miraculous signs frequently appeared.²⁰¹ *Gyokuyō* also records various accounts of people who saw light radiating from the Tōdaiji Daibutsu.²⁰²

Written by Hōnen’s disciple Nenbutsubō 念佛房, *Saga Nenbutsubō o ōjōin shūzen mon* 嵯峨念佛房於往生院修善文 (The Accounts of Making Good Deeds Written by Saga Nenbutsubō at Ōjōin) contains similar narratives—the construction of living Buddhas through the installment of relics and association of relic worship with wondrous occurrences. The text states, “Those who made offerings to [the relics of the Shaka] were all astounded at their miraculous transformations 供養之者皆驚神變.”²⁰³ Furthermore, Nenbutsubō vowed to make a sculpture of Nyorai and “enshrined the relics in it in order to simulate the sculpture as a Buddha in the flesh 又為擬生身奉納舍利.”²⁰⁴ Interestingly, in the text, the monk told that relics were “the skillful

²⁰¹ *Tōdaiji zoku yōroku: kuyō hen*, in *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1985), 209.

²⁰² *Gyokuyō*, Bunji 2.7.27 (3: 247-248).

²⁰³ *Saga Nenbutsubō o ōjōin shūzen mon*, in *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 28 (jō) (Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1983), 537.

²⁰⁴ *Saga Nenbutsubō*, 538.

means to convert and direct sentient beings in the degenerate age of the Buddhist Law 末世之衆生化導之方便.”²⁰⁵

Another account about the construction of living Buddhas is from the *Honchō shinshū ōjōden* 本朝新修往生伝 (New Japanese Biography of Those Reborn in the Pure Land), written by Fujiwara no Munetomo in 1151. The account tells that the courtier Ōe Chikamichi placed six grains of relics in front of an image and frequently offered flowers to them.²⁰⁶ The number of the relics gradually increased and one day emitted rays of light. A nun had a dream in which a person ordered Chikamichi to distribute his relics so that other people could also obtain benefits through worship of the relics. After hearing the nun’s dream, Chikamichi with other people created a golden statue of Shaka and installed his relics in it, making the sculpture “the whole body of the Buddha 以為佛全身.”²⁰⁷ The story ends that Amida and his retinue came to escort Chikamichi to the Pure Land at the end of his life.

While this account only mentions “the whole body of the Buddha,” the words probably refer to *shōjin butsu* as well since the way this sculpture was constructed is the same as the Tōdaiji Daibutsu and those described in aforementioned stories. Another important aspect of this account is that it links the veneration of relics to rebirth in the Pure Land. As Brian Ruppert points out, this link is featured prominently in various types of Buddhist literature associated with different social groups, laity and clerics alike, in the late Heian period.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁵ *Saga Nenbutsubō*, 537.

²⁰⁶ *Honchō shinshū ōjōden*, in *Nihon shisō taikēi*, vol. 7 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974), 693-694.

²⁰⁷ *Honchō shinshū*, 694.

²⁰⁸ Brian O. Ruppert, “Beyond Death and the Afterlife: Considering Relic Veneration in Medieval Japan,” in *Death and Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Jacqueline Stone (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008), 108-111.

Another account in *Honchō shinshū ōjōden* tells that a monk called Shinkai 深戒 received relics that appeared while he was chanting sutras.²⁰⁹ He then installed the relics inside a sculpture and made offering to them. When Shinkai was dying, a strange fragrance filled his room, and auspicious clouds rose in the sky. While not mentioned, this sculpture, which contained relics, was also possibly regarded as a living icon.

As indicated by the word “simulate” in these votive texts and Pure Land stories, images installed with relics were considered as the simulacrum of living Buddhas. Moreover, the accounts place less emphases on the images themselves than the effects of their production—spiritual manifestations and rebirth in the Pure Land. It seems that the meaning of living icons in these cases is akin to skillful means rather than actual living beings.

Nevertheless, as Nagaoka and Oku point out, there are images that were recognized as “living Buddhas” in a literal sense that they possess human qualities and act like human beings.²¹⁰ One of the prime examples of this is the Seiryōji Shaka. The legend of this sculpture has to do with the King Udayana of Vatsa in India, who lived at the time when the historical Buddha Shaka was still alive.²¹¹ According to a legend, at one point during his life, Shaka left earth, ascended to the paradise where his mother dwelt, and preached the Buddhist Law to her. Lamenting Shaka’s absence, King Udayana decided to make an image of Shaka. The sculptor who was asked to carve the image miraculously ascended to the paradise where he created a portrait directly after Shaka’s appearance out of sandalwood. After the portrait was made, it was brought back to King Udayana, who worshipped it piously.

²⁰⁹ *Honchō shinshū*, 683-684.

²¹⁰ Nagaoka, “Kodai Nihon,” 52-54; Oku, “Shōjin shinkō,” 188-189.

²¹¹ McCallum, “The Replication,” 211.

The legend of the Udayana Shaka was transmitted to China as early as the Six Dynasties (220-589).²¹² When Chōnen 喬然 (d. 1016) studied in China, he realized the significance of the Udayana Shaka and asked to make its copy in 985. He brought back the icon to Japan in 986, which was later enshrined at Seiryōji in Kyoto. A considerable number of deposits including scriptures, jewels, coins, statues, relics, mirrors, and “internal organs” made out of silk, were placed inside this statue at the time of its creation. It is also said that after a tooth of the Buddha was placed inside the statue on the part of its face, a drop of blood came out from its back.²¹³ The cult of the Seiryōji Shaka became prominent in the Kamakura period, and subsequently several copies of the statue were made during this time.²¹⁴

Another example of *shōjin butsu* in the literal sense is the Amida triad at Zenkōji in Nagano City, Nagano Prefecture. While the triad is a secret icon (*hibutsu* 秘仏) never shown to the public, it was regarded as a living Buddha, and belief in it grew considerably in the Kamakura period.²¹⁵ The legend of the Zenkōji Amida, like that of the Seiryōji Shaka, took place when Shaka was still alive.²¹⁶ A wealthy man Gakkai-choja had a daughter called Nyoze-hime, who was infected by a deadly plague and was dying. Following his friend’s advice, Gakkai went to see Shaka, begging to rescue his daughter. Shaka told Gakkai that if he prayed to Amida Buddha, his daughter would surely recover from illness. Gakkai then prayed to Amida and while

²¹² McCallum, “The Replication,” 212.

²¹³ This legend is recorded in a text deposited inside the statue. For the text and its photo copy, see Mōri Hisashi and Maruo Shōzaburō, “Shaka Nyorai zō,” in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Zōzō meiki hen 1*, ed. Maruo Shōzaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1966), 48-49; Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed., *Shaka shinkō to Seiryōji* (Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1982), 91.

²¹⁴ McCallum, “The Replication,” 211.

²¹⁵ For a comprehensive study of the cult of this icon, see Donald F. McCallum, *Zenkōji and Its Icon: A Study in Medieval Japanese Religious Art* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994).

²¹⁶ McCallum, “The Replication,” 208-210.

doing so, Amida along with his attendants Kannon and Seishi miraculously appeared in front of him and cured his daughter and other sufferers. When Amida and his attendants were about to leave earth, Gakkai begged Amida and Shaka for an image of the triad. The two Buddhas then created the replica of the triad out of bright light that radiated from their *urna*. The legend continues to tell that the triad flew to the Korean peninsula and came to Japan at the time when Buddhism was introduced to Japan in the sixth century.

A Japanese man named Honda Yoshimitsu from Shinano Province was the reincarnation of Gakkai. One day when he was on the way home, the Amida triad suddenly appeared, jumped on to his back, and asked him to carry them to Shinano. Yoshimitsu then took the triad back to his home and later enshrined it in a chapel. However, every night the triad left the chapel and returned to their original place in his house. Another miraculous event occurred after Yoshimitsu told the Amida triad of his misfortune that his son Yoshisuke tragically died early. At the request of Amida, Kannon went to Hell and brought Yoshisuke back to earth.

The Seiryōji Shaka and the Zenkōji Amida have commonalities in their origins—both were allegedly carved during the lifetime of the historical Buddha. Probably because of their miraculous origins, these two icons were recognized as living Buddhas, and many of their copies were produced in the Kamakura period. Their “living” quality was understood in the sense that they were able to act like *living* beings and engage in lives of human beings. No clear line seems to be drawn between living icons and divinities themselves in these two cases.

Fostering a Nexus for Rebirth in the Pure Land

Which meaning of *shōjin butsu* was intended in the case of the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon? As Nagaoka observes, whether a Buddhist image was regarded as a living Buddha

depends on how its devotees reacted to it.²¹⁷ Therefore, to answer this question, we should look at activities that Kanezane conducted around the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Revisiting these activities that are introduced above, one however finds no clues for the answer. Another way to deal with the inquiry is to consider what motivated Kanezane to place deposits in the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

According to *Ganmon*, Kanezane installed the deposits with the hope that he would encounter spiritual responses and would achieve rebirth in the Pure Land. It appears that he did obtain such a response from the divinity. Two years after the reconstruction of the Nan'endō in 1191, Kanezane reported in his diary that rays of light emanated from a sandalwood sculpture of Fukūkenjaku Kannon that was made at his request and was likely to be a copy of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon.²¹⁸ We see the parallel between Kanezane's practice of inserting the deposits and the stories of making living icons as discussed previously. As cases narrated in the stories, his practice contained the following elements: construction of living icons through the enshrinement of relics, the occurrence of spiritual responses, and rebirth in the Pure Land. Additionally, like most of the devotees described in the stories, Kanezane was a believer of Pure Land Buddhism. It seems that Pure Land devotees shared the idea of what making living icons through enshrinement of relics would do—spiritual responses (such as dreams, visions, radiant light, strange fragrance, auspicious clouds, a descent of Amida and his retinue, or other wondrous occurrences) and rebirth in the Pure Land.

²¹⁷ Nagaoka, “Kodai Nihon,” 56.

²¹⁸ *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.10.7 (3: 732); *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 2.10.15 (3: 733). In the same entry, right before Kanezane told this miraculous vision, he described his devotion of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin. Give this way of recounting the vision, we can speculate that this sandalwood sculpture was a copy of the Nan'endō icon.

This way of thinking is commonly seen in stories of *ōjōnin*, those who were reborn in the Pure Land even though it is usually deathbed practices rather than the construction of living icons that trigger these spiritual responses.²¹⁹ Also, spiritual responses in these stories function as divine signs or confirmation of rebirth and are usually described to take place at the moment of dying and soon after death. These signs, according to Jacqueline Stone, serve as the benchmark for living Pure Land practitioners to determine whether they should form karmic bonds (*kechien*) with a dying person or his bodily remains, who may be linked to the “nexus for salvation.”²²⁰ The term *kechien* generally means the forming of karmic bonds with Buddhas or Buddhist teachings for the purpose of one’s spiritual pursuit.²²¹ However, the term in some *ōjōnin* accounts, Stone observes, “is something almost physical that, like the charisma inherent in contact relics, could be transferred by proximity to an *ōjōnin*’s person or possessions.”²²² This observation may shed light on the logic underlying the veneration of relics and construction of *shōjin butsu*, and explains why stories of *shōjin butsu* are often associated with Pure Land belief. As relics are the remains of enlightened beings, icons with relics inside were surely taken as the nexuses for salvation. Images with the physical features of *shōjin butsu* would be likewise considered in the same way. Therefore, making living icons may have been viewed as equally efficient as forging karmic bonds with *ōjōnin* for one to achieve Pure Land rebirth. Also, in contrast to a dying person who was not necessarily to be qualified as an *ōjōnin*, images that

²¹⁹ For discussion of deathbed practices described in *ōjōnin* literature, see Jacqueline Stone, *Right Thoughts at the Last Moment: Buddhism and Deathbed Practices in Early Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2016), 160-181.

²²⁰ Stone, *Right Thoughts*, 193-195.

²²¹ For the meaning of *kechien*, see Chieko Nakano, “Kechien as Religious Praxis in Medieval Japan: Picture Scrolls as the Means and Sites of Salvation” PhD. Diss. (The University of Arizona, 2009), 41-47.

²²² Stone, *Right Thoughts*, 195.

contained relics or bear features of *shōjin butsu* would have been a more secure subject of *kechien*.

This discussion of *kechien* and signs of rebirth is instrumental in considering the meaning of the deposits in the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon. We can interpret that by dedicating the relics of the Buddha and his Dharma body (sutras) in this icon, Kanezane transformed it into an object of *kechien* on the one hand and forged “a connection or nexus of conditions that would bring rebirth in the Pure Land” on the other hand.²²³ Therefore, for Kanezane, the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon was akin to a divine body of expedient means and a repository of the sacred through which he cultivated a pathway to salvific rebirth. The icon was surely for him a *shōjin butsu*, but not in its literal sense a sacred *living* being with human qualities. In other words, his understanding of the icon should have been in line with the doctrinal meaning of Buddha's three bodies, which he was familiar with. Also, no known stories describe the icon as a living being and show that the deity manifests himself in a human form to engage with believers' lives. Instead, as illustrated in Nan'endō *setsuwa* tales, it is Kasuga Daimyōjin, the local incarnation of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, that manifests in the human world. In the tales, the deity disguises himself as a corvée worker for the construction of the hall and foretells the future prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara family.

²²³ Daniel Stevenson, “Deathbed Testimonials of the Pure Land Faithful,” in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. Donald Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 593. The quotation is Daniel Stevenson's translation of the notion of *jingyuan* 淨緣, which served as the underpinning ideology for deathbed rituals in the circles of Pure Land believers in China. The notion of *jingyuan* adds an extra dimension to that of *jiyuan* 結緣 (forming karmic or causal connections) in that the former specifies that by worship of Amida, recitation of his names, contemplation of his physical features, and other activities, devotees establish personal karmic connections with Amida that will assure their rebirth in the Pure Land. In other words, *jingyuan* were specifically aimed at rebirth in the Pure Land. Moreover, because Pure Land practices were often conducted collectively by groups of people, *jingyuan* can also mean the forming of karmic bonds among living practitioners. I find that this notion accurately illustrates Kanezane's act of dedicating the deposits. The term “*kechien*” or phrase “nexus for salvation” certainly works in this case, but falls short of the intent behind this act—attainment of rebirth in the Pure Land. I am grateful for Professor Daniel Stevenson to explain this notion in detail to me.

Other factors may also have propelled Kanezane to place deposits in the icon. By the twelfth century, this image of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon had been regarded as the protector of the Northern Fujiwara family that gave rise to their longstanding prosperity. Recognizing the close relationship of this image with his family, Kanezane states in *Ganmon* that he dedicated the deposits into the icon because his “causal connection [with the Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon] is by no means tenuous.”²²⁴ He may have felt that because his karmic connection with the icon was deep, and because it was particularly efficacious, the dedication of deposits would have readily elicited miraculous manifestation and increased his chances to achieve rebirth in the Pure Land. This expectation had its basis in the idea of stimulus and response or what is known as “sympathetic resonance (J. *kannō* 感応).”

The idea is pivotal to understand how miracles work in Buddhism. According to this idea, miracles result from the interactions between devout aspirants and sacred power. Miraculous manifestation or responses (*nō* 応; Ch. *ying*) can be any wondrous occurrences such as strange dreams, auspicious omens, visions of divinities, and so on. As Daniel Stevenson remarks, these responses are “effected by the devotee coming into sympathetic accord or tally with the hidden power order and forging a ‘causal impetus or nexus’ (Ch. *ji* 機, *jiyuan* 機緣; J. *ki* 機, *kien* 機緣) that ‘stimulates’ (Ch. *gan*; J. *kan* 感) a flow or manifestation of sacred power.”²²⁵ The notion of sympathetic resonance, Stevenson points out, is the underlying theme for miracle tales of the

²²⁴ *Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon Kōfukuji*, 338.

²²⁵ Daniel Stevenson, “Tales of the *Lotus Sutra*,” in *Buddhism in Practice*, ed. Donald Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 429. For more discussion on “stimulus” and “response” in Buddhism, see Robert Sharf, *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002), 77-133.

Lotus Sutra, which was deemed a focus of worship and repository of the sacred.²²⁶ Through a variety of devotional practices, devotees would be able to forge a causal connection with the sutra that stimulates (*kan*) its sacred power and further causes a spiritual response (*nō*).

Seen from the notion of sympathetic resonance, Kanezane's dedication of the deposits may be interpreted as a means to create a causal connection that would stimulate the power of the deity and cause it to manifest a response to his religious aspiration. Such a response, for Kanezane, may have served as confirmation of his rebirth in the Pure Land. To put it another way, the dedication turned the icon into "a body of expedient response"²²⁷ and a field of sympathetic resonance whereby he initiated interactions with Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

Conclusion

This chapter examines the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its Buddhist images during 1181-1189 with a focus on the patronage of Kanezane. The study discusses that the iconography of the recreated sculptures closely follows that of the originals, while their forms demonstrate a fresh sense of fleshiness. By analyzing the Amida *kebutsu* statue standing in the crown of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon, we know that this miniature image bears the features of living Buddha—wavy hair and *tsūken* dress style—both of which were derived from the Seiryōji Shaka. The unusual depiction of this *kebutsu* in a gesture of reverence was appropriated from Song Buddhist painting. However, the gesture—seen in the portrait of Shandao and associated with the practice of *nenbutsu* chanting—may too have had to do with Kanezane's Pure Land devotion.

²²⁶ Stevenson, "Tales," 429; Daniel Stevenson, "Buddhist Practice and the *Lotus Sutra* in China," in *Readings of the Lotus Sutra*, ed. Stephen Teiser and Jacqueline Stone (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 134-136.

²²⁷ I borrow this word from Sharf's study of Chinese cosmology of sympathetic resonance. For this, see Sharf, *Coming to*, 106.

The deposits of the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon symbolized the three bodies of the Buddha and manifested the manifold existences of deity's sacred power. The practice of inserting the deposits and the iconography of the *kebutsu* statue show Kanezane's engagement with contemporary religious practices and were intended to transform the icon into a *shōjin butsu*. By analyzing stories of *shōjin butsu* along with Kanezane's *Ganmon* and religious belief, we know that his dedication of the deposits was aimed to forge a karmic connection that would bring out rebirth in the Pure Land and turn the Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon into an object of *kechien*. The icon was therefore akin to a repository of the sacred and a divine body of expedient means rather than a *shōjin butsu* in the literal sense. Moreover, because the icon was considered particularly efficacious and had a long relationship with the *sekkanke*, the deposits may have served as a means to initiate a sympathetic resonance between Kanezane and Fukūkenjaku Kannon.

From *Gyokuyō*, we know that Kanezane was deeply engaged with the reconstruction of the Nan'endō and in doing so, demonstrated his authority as the chieftain of the *sekkanke*. He secretly dotted the pupils of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, physically involved in the construction of the hall's foundation, and actively took part in the *misogi kaji* and consecration ceremonies. The restoration work of the Nan'endō allowed him to re-engage in the family's past, while meanwhile express his present religious aspiration.

Conclusion

The Cult of Remembrance

The cult of remembrance of loved ones, absent or dead, offers a last refuge for the cult value of the picture. For the last time the aura emanates from the early photographs in the fleeting expression of a human face. This is what constitutes their melancholy, incomparable beauty.¹

—Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.”

At present, the Nan’endō is open only once a year on the seventeenth of October. Visitors who come to the building on this day will receive a leaflet from temple staff members at the entrance.² The handout offers a brief introduction to the history of the Nan’endō and its Buddhist icons, describing their relationship with the Northern Fujiwara clan. This description seems to have been inscribed onto the minds of those who have visited or have been familiar with the Nan’endō. Upon hearing the topic on which I have been researching, Japanese colleagues often immediately utter the name of the Fujiwara in response. Their reaction to hearing about the Nan’endō suggests that, similar to portrait photographs discussed by Walter Benjamin, the building is imprinted with the “face” of the Northern Fujiwara clan, who are, however, no longer present on the site. The family probably did not foresee their “disappearance” today, but might have envisaged that by constructing the Nan’endō, their memory could exist in perpetuity as long as the building stands on the grounds of Kōfukuji. As seen in this case, memory persists because of its attachment to a visual space. Nevertheless, this reciprocal relationship between memory

¹ Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 226.

² I was able to enter the Nan’endō every year on October 17 from 2015 to 2017 and each time, I received handouts that give a brief introduction to the hall’s history.

and monument is by no means a priori, but is established in time and action.

This dissertation illuminates the process in which memory of the Northern Fujiwara clan became identified with the Nan'endō, and was reshaped and transformed along with the history of the hall from the ninth through the twelfth centuries. This diachronic study of the Nan'endō and its images sheds light on the connections between various metamorphoses of the building. After its inception as a Buddhist memorial in 813, the Nan'endō became a miraculous site in the mid-eleventh century that reputedly generated the prosperity of the Northern Fujiwara, and a place for the worship of Fukūkenjaku Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin in the twelfth century. At first glance, these transformations seem to be two historical episodes that were separate from the hall's initial designation as a memorial. However, as demonstrated in Chapters Three and Four, these transformations were actually the interrelated events that resulted from a process of remembering, forgetting, and forming family memories. This process was embedded in a network of social relationships and in the interactions among generations of the Northern Fujiwara clan and those in their circles. The multiple metamorphoses of the Nan'endō manifest an ever-changing familial “memoryscape” that was framed in and embodied by the hall and its images.

Other factors such as institutional affiliation, geographic location, familial structure, and political circumstances also contributed to the transformations of the Nan'endō and the changing perception of its main icon Fukūkenjaku Kannon. Nevertheless, visual, discursive, and religious practices that revolved around the building likewise shaped and reshaped the family's perception of and relationship with the Nan'endō: (1) memorial rituals such as Hokke-e and Chōkō-e; (2) replications of the Nan'endō and Fukūkenjaku Kannon; (3) discursive practices of narrating the hall's origin as manifested in *setsuwa* tales; (4) the combined worship of the Fukūkenjaku

Kannon and Kasuga Daimyōjin; (5) reconstruction of the Nan'endō and its images during 1046-1048 and 1181-1189. These activities reveal that the sanctuary became a point of reference, a source of imagination, and a mnemonic edifice that tied the family to a place in both real and imagined ways.

This dissertation manifests how the destruction of the Nan'endō in 1046 may have propelled the Northern Fujiwara clan to see the building in a new light, discovering its significance as an edifice of the family's past. As such, I show that the material form of the Nan'endō had an evocative power, bringing to mind people and events of the past. In addition to examining the construction of the Nan'endō in 813, I also investigate the reconstruction of the hall during 1181-1189. Chapter Five reveals that the project of recreating the Nan'endō allowed the patron Fujiwara no Kanezane (1149-1207) to re-engage in the past of the building and articulate his vision of the present. Such a vision is manifested in the deposits he inserted in the Fukūkenjaku Kannon and the iconographical features of the *kebutsu* (manifestation Buddha) image. These two aspects of the Fukūkenjaku Kannon reflected contemporary belief in *shōjin butsu* and expressed Kanezane's aspiration for rebirth in the Pure Land. In all, the restoration of the Nan'endō was a work of both restoring familial heritage and creating personal memory.

This research on the Nan'endō unravels the complex dynamics between material forms and cognitive activities. The physical space of the hall and its visual images functioned as an engine for believing, remembering, and imagining. The Nan'endō was important for the Northern Fujiwara clan not only because it provided salvific techniques and a source of merit, but also because it safeguarded familial memory and communal heritage through the power of the divine.

After the twelfth century, the Nan'endō gradually became one of the sites on the route of

the Saigoku Thirty-Three Kannon Pilgrimage. While people from all walks of life visited the hall and venerated the Fukūkenjaku Kannon, which is on-going today, the tie between the Nan'endō and the Northern Fujiwara continued at least into the twentieth century. The current Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon contains deposits that were inserted by Kōfukuji priests and the Northern Fujiwara family when the sculpture underwent repair in 1905.³ One of the deposits is a wooden Kannon statue, the *nenjibutsu* (personal icon) of Kujō no Asako (1835-1897), who was a descendant of Kanezane and the stepmother of the Meiji Emperor (1852-1912). By the time this image of Kannon was inserted into the icon, Asako had already passed away. While no document tells why her *nenjibutsu* was placed inside, we may speculate that it was done in the memory of her departed spirit. We should not forget that hundreds of years earlier in 1189, Kanezane enshrined objects inside the same icon. It seems that even though many centuries had passed, the Northern Fujiwara clan still remembered their ties to the Nan'endō and commemorated the departed family member at the hall. Therefore, for the family, the significance of the sanctuary did not lie in what Walter Benjamin says is an aura of a cult, but in its capability to immortalize death, preserve memories, and provide a refuge to cope with the fleeting impermanent world. In other words, the Nan'endō was itself a cult of remembrance.

³ Suzuki Yoshihiro, "Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zō (Nan'endō anchi)," in *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, ed. Mizuno Keizaburō (Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003), 57-58.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Amida keka shiryōchō* 阿弥陀悔過資料帳. In *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 5. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1955.
- Anshōji shizaichō* 安祥寺資材帳. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: jishibu I*, vol. 83. Tokyo: Zaidanhōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972.
- Asabashō* 阿娑縛抄. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 58. Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidai, 1971.
- Besson zakki* 別尊雜記. By Shinkaku (1117-1180). In *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978.
- Bussetsu Fukūkenjaku darani gikikyō* 佛說不空羼索陀羅尼儀軌經. T. 1098, no. 20.
- Bussetsu jimyōzō yuga daikyōson na Bosatsu daimyō jōju giki kyō* 仏說持明藏瑜伽大教尊那菩薩大明成就儀軌經. T. 1169, no. 20.
- Bussetsu shō Kanjizai Bosatsu Fukūō himitsu shin daranikyō* 佛說聖觀自在菩薩不空王秘密心陀羅尼經. T. 1099, no. 20.
- Chōshūki* 長秋記. By Minamoto Morotoki (1077-1136). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965).
- Chūyūki* 中右記. By Fujiwara no Munetada (1062-1141). In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-7. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993-2014.
- Chūyūki* 中右記. By Fujiwara no Munetada (1062-1141). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-7. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Dai nehan kyō* 大涅槃經. T. 374, no. 12.
- Dai Nihon komonjo* 大日本古文書. Vol. 25. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1940.
- Daichido ron* 大智度論. T. 1509, no. 25.
- Daihō kōbutsu kegon kyō* 大方廣佛華嚴經. T. 278, no. 9.
- Daijōin jisha zōjiki* 大乘院寺社雜事記. In *Zōho zoku shiryō taisei*, vol. 29. Kyoto: Rinsen

- Shoten, 1978.
- Daishi gogyōjō shūki* 大師御行狀集記. In *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 8. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1983.
- Denryaku* 殿曆. By Fujiwara no Tadazane (1079-1162). In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-5. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960-1970.
- Eikyū gannenki* 永久元年記. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 25. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960.
- Eishōki* 永昌記. By Fujiwara no Tametaka (1070-1130). *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vo. 8. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Engishiki* 延喜式. In *Shinto taikei kotenhen*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Shinto Taikei Hensankai, 1991.
- Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon (Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon Kōfukuji Nan'endō honzon Kōkei saku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō dainai monjo* 藤原兼実願文興福寺南円堂本尊康慶作不空羂索觀音像胎内文書). Fujiwara no Kanezane. In *Heian ibun komonjo hen daihachikan*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Tokyodō, 1971.
- Fujiwara no Kanezane ganmon* 藤原兼実願文. Fujiwara no Kanezane (1149-1207). In *Heian ibun komonjo hen daihachikan*, vol. 8. Tokyo: Tokyodō, 1965.
- Fukūkenjaku Birushana butsu daikanjō kōshingon* 不空羂索毘盧遮那佛大灌頂光真言. *T.* 1002, no. 19.
- Fukūkenjaku darani jizaiō jukyō* 不空羂索陀羅尼自在王呪經. *T.* 1097, no. 20.
- Fukūkenjaku daranikyō*. 不空羂索陀羅尼經. *T.* 1096, no. 20.
- Fukūkenjaku jukyō* 不空羂索呪經. *T.* 1093, no. 20.
- Fukūkenjaku Kannon ju shinkyō* 不空羂索呪心經. *T.* 1095, no. 20.
- Fukūkenjaku shinju shinkyō* 不空羂索神呪心經. *T.* 1094, no. 20.
- Fukūkenjaku shinpen shingonkyō* 不空羂索神變真言經. *T.* 1092, no. 20.
- Fukuro zōshi* 袋草子. Compiled by Fujiwara no Kiyosuke (1104-1177). In *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei*, vol. 29. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1995.
- Fusō ryakki* 扶桑略記. In *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 12. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Ganjin wajō saniji* 鑑真和上三異事. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Shidenbu*, vol. 72. Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1972.

- Genkō ninen guchūreki uragaki* 元亨二年具注曆裏書. In *Dai Nihon shiryō daisanhen no san*. Tokyo: Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku Bunkakubu Shiryō Hensansho, 1929.
- Gōdanshō* 江談抄. In By Ōe Masafusa (1041-1111). *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 27. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960.
- Gonijō moromichiki* 後二条師通記. By Fujiwara no Moromichi (1062-1099). In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-3. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1956-1958.
- Gumaiki* 愚昧記. By Sanjō Sanefusa (1147-1225). In *Dai Nihon shiryō daishihen hoi*. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1973.
- Gyokuyō* 玉葉. By Fujiwara no Kanezane (1149-1207). Vols. 1-3. Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai, 1988.
- Haku sōshi kuketsu* 薄草子口決. T. 2535, no. 79.
- Hakuhōkushō* 白宝口抄. In *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 6. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1977.
- Heihanki* 兵範記. By Taira no Nobunori (1122-1187). In *Shiryō tsūran: Heihanki*, vols. 1-2. Tokyo: Nihonshi Shiseki Hozonkai, 1918.
- Hōjōji tō kuyō ganmon* 法成寺塔供養願文. By Fujiwara no Sanetsuna (1013-1082). In *Honchō zoku monzui*, vol. 29. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Honchō seiki* 本朝世紀. In *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 9. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1964.
- Honchō shinshū ōjōden* 本朝新修往生伝. In *Nihon shisō taikei*, vol. 7. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1974.
- Hōryūji engi shizaichō* 法隆寺縁起資材帳. In *Dai Nihon komonjo*, vol. 4. Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku, 1955.
- Hōryūji tōin engi* 法隆寺東院縁起. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 85. Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidai, 1972.
- Hyakurenshō* 百鍊抄, in *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 11 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965).
- I sadaijin kuyō Jōmyōji ganmon* 為左大臣供養淨妙寺願文. By Ōe Masahira (952-1012). In *Honchō monzui, Honchōzoku monzui*, vol. 29. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Inouechō nendaiki shō* 井上町年代記抄. Tokyo: Kuwana Bunseidō, 1943.
- Inryōken nichiroku* 蔭涼軒日録. By Kikei Shinzui (1401-1469). In *Zohō shiryō taisei*, vol. 22. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1978.

- Irohaji ruishō* 伊呂波字類抄. In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Jikkanshō* 十卷抄. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Zuzōbu*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1971.
- Jikkishō* 実帰抄. *T.* 2497, no. 78.
- Jūichimen shinju shinkyō gisho* 十一面神呪心經義疏. *T.* 1802, no. 39.
- Kajūji kyūki* 勧修寺旧記. In *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 27. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1984.
- Kajūji monjo* 勧修寺文書. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 83. Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1965.
- Kakuzenshō* 覺禪抄. In *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 4. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1976.
- Kankebon shoji engishū* 菅家本諸寺縁起集. In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Kenkyū gojunreiki* 建久御巡礼記. By Jitsuei 實叡. In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Kikki* 吉記. By Fujiwara no Tsunefusa (1143-1200). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Kōfukuji bettō shidai* 興福寺別当次第. In *Zoku zoku kunsho ruijū*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969.
- Kōfukuji engi* 興福寺縁起. By Fujiwara no Yoshiyo (823-900). In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.
- Kōfukuji garan enshō no ki* 興福寺伽藍炎焼之記. In *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan'endō shūri kōji hōkokusho*. Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1996.
- Kōfukuji ingeden* 興福寺院家伝. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 65. Tokyo: Zaidan Hōjin Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1972.
- Kōfukuji matsuji chō* 興福寺末寺帳. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.
- Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji* 興福寺年中行事. In *Yamato bunka kenkyū* 12, no. 12 (1967).
- Kōfukuji nenjū gyōji* 興福寺年中行事. In *Yamato bunka kenkyū* 13, no. 1 (1968).

- Kōfukuji ranshōki* 興福寺濫觴記. In *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969.
- Kōfukuji ruki* 興福寺流記. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.
- Kōfukuji ryaku nendaiki* 興福寺略年代記. In *Zoku kunsho ruijū*, vol. 27 (ge). Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1984.
- Konjaku monogatari shū* 今昔物語集. In *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai*, vol. 17. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Kōryūji shizai kōtai jitsurokuchō* 広隆寺資財交代実録帳. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho: Jishibu*, vol. 83. Tokyo: Suzuki Kakujutsu Zaidan, 1972.
- Koshaki* 古社記. In *Shinto taikai jinjahen*, vol. 13. Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985.
- Kōshinshō* 幸心抄. By Shinkai 親快 (1215-1276). *T.* 2498, no. 78.
- Kōya zappitsu shū* 高野雜筆集. In *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 12 (jō). Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1986.
- Midō kanpakuki* 御堂関白記. By Fujiwara no Michinaga (966-1028). Vols. 1-10. Tokyo: Takashina Shoten, 1985-2010.
- Myōgi shingyō shū* 明義進行集. By Shinzui 信瑞. In *Hōnen shōnin zenshū*. Kyoto: Ikawa Jōkei, 1952.
- Myōhō renga kyō* 妙法蓮華經. *T.* 262, no. 9.
- Nan'endō dōtō daimei* 南円堂銅灯台銘. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.
- Nan'endō gohonzon ika goshūri zenrei* 南円堂御本尊以下御修理先例. In *Bijutsu Kenkyū* 128 (January, 1943).
- Nara bōmoku sekkai* 奈良坊目拙解. By Murai Kodō. Kyoto: Sōgeisha, 1977.
- Nihon kiryaku* 日本紀略. In *Kokushi taikai*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Nihon kōki* 日本後記. In *Rikkokushi: Kokushi taikai*. Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1916.
- Nihon shoki* 日本書紀. In *Rikkokushi*, vol. 2. Osaka: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1928-1931.
- Ō Nakatomi Tokimori Kasuga onsha hon'en tō chūshinmon sha* 大中臣時盛春日御社本縁等注進文写. In *Shinto taikai jinsha hen*, vol. 13. Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985.

- Ōkagami uragaki* 大鏡裏書. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 25. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960.
- Ono ruihishō* 小野類秘抄. By Kanshin (1085-1153). In *Shingon zenshū*, vol. 36. Kyoto: Dōhōsha, 1977.
- Ōntame bōkō On no miya udaijin yonjūkyūnichi tsuizen* 奉為亡考小野宮右大臣四十九日追善
By Fujiwara no Sukehira (986-1068). In *Honchō zoku monzui*, vol. 29. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Rihōōki* 吏部王記. In *Shiyō sanshū*. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1974.
- Ruijū zatsurei* 類聚雜例. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 29. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1959.
- Saga Nenbutsubō o ōjōin shūzen mon* 嵯峨念仏房於往生院修善文. In *Zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 28 (jō). Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1983.
- Sakeiki* 左經記. By Minamoto Tsuneyori (985-1039). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vol. 6. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Sankaiki* 山槐記. By Nakayama Tadachika (1131-1195). In *Shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-3. Tokyo: Naigai Shoseki Kabushiki Kaisha, 1935.
- Senchaku hongan nenbutsushū* 選択本願念仏集. By Hōnen (1133-1212). In *Jōdoshū zensho*, vol. 7. Tokyo: Jōdoshū kanshū Happyakunen Kinen Kyōsan Junbikyoku, 1970.
- Shichi daiji junrei nikki* 七大寺巡礼日記. By Ōe Chikamichi (d. 1151). In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Shichi daiji junrei shiki to jūgo daiji nikki* 七大寺巡礼私記と十五大寺日記. In *Nara Bunkazai Kenkyūjo gakuho* 21 (1972).
- Shichi daiji junrei shiki* 七大寺巡礼私記. By Ōe Chikamichi (d. 1151). In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Shikuchi* 師口. *T.* 2501, no. 78.
- Shōgoshū* 勝語集. By Ejū 惠什 (1060-1144). *T.* 2479, no. 78.
- Shoji engi shū* 諸寺縁起集. In *Kōkan bijutsu shiryō: Jiin hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1972.
- Shoku nihonki* 続日本紀. In *Kokushi taikei*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1901.
- Shoson yōshō* 諸尊要抄. By Jitsuun 実運 (1105-1160). *T.* 2484, no. 78.

- Shōyūki* 小右記. By Fujiwara no Sanesuke (957-1046). In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vols. 1-11. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1959-1986.
- Shunki* 春記. By Fujiwara no Sukefusa (1007-1057). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vol. 7. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Shunya shinki* 春夜神記. In *Shinto taikai jinsha hen*, vol. 13. Tokyo: Shinto Taikai Hensankai, 1985.
- Sō kōsōden* 宋高僧伝. *T.* 2061, no. 50.
- Taiki* 台記. By Fujiwara no Yorinaga (1120-1156). In *Zōho shiryō taisei*, vols. 1-2. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1965.
- Teishinkōki* 貞信公記. By Fujiwara no Tadahira (880-949). In *Dai Nihon kokiroku*, vol. 8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1956.
- Tōdaiji yōroku* 東大寺要録. In *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1985.
- Tōdaiji zoku yōroku: kuyō hen* 東大寺続要録：供養編. In *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1985.
- Tōdaiji zōritsu kuyō ki* 東大寺造立供養記. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 24. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960.
- Tōshikaden* 藤氏家伝. In *Tōshikaden: Kamatari, Jōe, Muchimaro den: chūshaku to kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbankan, 1999.
- Uchiyama Eikyūji okibumi* 内山永久寺置文. In *Uchiyama Eikyūji no rekishi to bijutsu (shiryō hen): Chōsa kenkyū hōkokusho*. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994.
- Urabonkyō sanjutsu*. 孟蘭盆經讚述. *T.* 2781, no. 85.
- Yamato meisho zue* 大和名所図会. By Akisato Ritō. Vol. 3. Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1995.
- Yamato no kuni Nara gen Kōfukuji garan ki* 大和国奈良原興福寺伽藍記. By Kan'en In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 119. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.
- Yōsonhō* 要尊法. *T.* 2478, no. 78.
- Yōwa gannen ki* 養和元年記. In *Nara rokudaiji taikan*, vol. 8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.
- Yuima-e narabini Tōji kanjō ki* 維摩会並東寺灌頂記. In *Nara rokudaiji taikan*, vol. 7. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970.

Zan Guanshiyin pusa song 讚觀世音菩薩頌. By Huizhi 慧智 (ca. 676-703). *T.* 1052, no. 20.

Zō Kōfukuji ki 造興福寺記. In *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 123. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1978.

Zoku honchō ōjōden 続本朝往生伝. In *Gunsho ruijū*, vol. 5. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1960.

Zuzōshō 図像抄. In *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō: Zuzō*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankōkai, 1975-1978.

Sources in Japanese, English, and Chinese

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

Aboshi Yoshinori. “Hakkaku hōfun to sono igi.” In *Kashihara kōkōgaku kenkyūjo ronshū 5*, edited by Kashihara Kōkōgaku Kenkyūjo, 181-226. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979.

Adachi Kō. *Kodai kenchiku kenkyū ge*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shuppan, 1987.

_____. *Tōba kenchiku no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1987.

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

Akinuma Takeshi. “Sakuhin shōkai mokuzō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zazō mokuzō Jūichimen Kannon zazō Kyoto Konkaikōmyōji zō.” *Kyoto Hokuritsu Hakubutsukan gakusō 29* (May 2009): 77-83; 17-21.

Akiyama Masami. *Butsuzō inzō daijiten*. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1985.

Asai Kazuharu. “Fukūkenjaku Kannon, Juntei Kannon zō.” *Nihon no bijutsu 382* (March 1998).

_____. “Hokkedō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no seiritsu.” In *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 4: Tōdaiji to Heijōkyō*, edited by Mizuno Keizaburō, 167-173. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1996.

_____. “Kōkei to Unkei: iwayuru ‘sōfū’ to Tenpyō (Heian shoki) fukkō ni tsuite.” In *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butszō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, edited by Fujisawa Norio, 10-15. Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991.

_____. “Okayama Daitsūji no Fukūkenjaku Kannon Bosatsu zazō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu 246* (September 1999): 69-85.

_____. “Raichōgo no Ganjin—sono hito to zōkei.” In *Meihō nihon no bijutsu 6: Tōshōdaiji*, edited by Ōta Hirotarō, et al., 113-157. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1990.

- Asaki Shūhei. “Inseiki no Kōfukuji daibusshi to daibusshi shoku ni tsuite.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 293 (July 2007): 13-32.
- _____. “Kamakura chōkoku ni okeru kōkei wa sōfū ka.” *Shiseki to bijutsu* 41, no. 5 (June 1971): 182-195.
- _____. “Kanezane to Kōkei—Nan’endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no zōryū o megutte.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 138 (1981): 83-102.
- _____. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō no sōken tōsho honzonzō to Kamakura saikōzō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 160 (May 1985): 11-48.
- _____. “Shoki keiha yōshiki no keisei to kodai chōkoku ge.” *Bukkyō Geijutsu* 186 (September 1989): 47-60.
- _____. “Shoki keiha yōshiki no keisei to kodai chōkoku jō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 184 (May 1989): 11-27.
- Bauer, Mikael. “The Power of Ritual: An Integrated History of Medieval Kōfukuji.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 2011.
- _____. “The Chronicle of Kamatari: A Short Introduction to and Translation of the First Part of the History of the Fujiwara House.” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 71, no. 2 (June 2017): 477-496.
- _____. “The Chronicle of Jōe: A Translation of the Second Part of the History of the Fujiwara House.” *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques* 72, no. 1 (March 2018): 207-214.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Edited by Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Blair, Heather. “Rites and Rule: Kiyomori at Itsukushima and Fukuhara.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73, no. 1 (June, 2013): 1-42
- _____. *Real and Imagined: The Peak of Gold in Heian Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2015.
- Bock, Felicia, trans. *Engishiki: The Procedures of the Engi Era*, vol. 2. Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1972.
- Boehm, Christian. *The Concept of Danzō: Sandalwood Images in Japanese Buddhist Sculpture of the 8th to 14th Centuries*. London: Saffron Book, 2012.
- Braudel, Fernand. “History and the Social Sciences: The *Longue Durée*.” trans. Immanuel Wallerstein, *Review* 32, no. 2 (2009): 171-203.
- Breen, John and Mark Teeuwen, eds. *Shinto in History: Ways of the Kami*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000.
- Brenner, Elma, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown, eds. *Memory and Commemoration*

- in Medieval Culture*. England: Ashgate, 2013.
- Brinker, Helmut. "Facing the Unseen: On the Interior Adornment of Eizon's Iconic Body." *Archives of Asian Art* 50 (1997/1998): 42-61.
- _____. *Secrets of the Sacred: Empowering Buddhist Images in Clear, in Code, and in Cache*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011.
- Buswell, Robert Jr. and Donald Lopez Jr., ed., *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Ciappelli, Giovanni and Patricia Lee Rubin, eds. *Art, Memory, and Family in Renaissance Florence*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Covaci, Ive, ed. *Kamakura: Realism and Spirituality in the Sculpture of Japan*. New York: Asia Society Museum; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Cox, Rupert, ed. *The Culture of Copying in Japan: Critical and Historical Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Date Muneyasu. "Kofun tera shizoku." In *Shūmatsuki kofun: Ronshū*, edited by Mori Kōichi, 255-283. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1973.
- Davis, Richard H. *Lives of Indian Images*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Dobbins, James C. "Editor's Introduction: Kuroda Toshio and His Scholarship." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26.3 (1996): 217-232.
- Dobbins, James C., ed. "The Legacy of Kuroda Toshio." Commemorative Issue of *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26.3-4 (1996).
- Dorothy Wong. "Qiba shiji Guanyin zaoxiang de fanyan." In *Yishushi zhong de hanjin yu tangsong zhi bian*, edited by Yen Chuan-Ying and Shih Shou-Chien, 193-224. Taipei: Shitou Publication, 2014.
- Drogin, Melanie Beth. "Images for Warriors: Unkei's Sculptures at Ganjōjuin and Jōrakuji." Diss., Yale University, 2000.
- Eckel, Malcolm. *To See the Buddha: A Philosopher's Quest for the Meaning of Emptiness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Emura Masafumi. "Busshi nenpyō: Kōkei, Unkei, Tankei." *Shiseki to bijutsu* 37, no. 8 (October 1967): 302-310.
- Fan Jin-Shi. "Xuanzang yijing han Dunhuang bihua." *Dunhuang yanjiu* 2 (2004): 1-12.
- Faure, Bernard. "Buddhism's Black Holes: From Ontology to Hauntology." *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* 27, no. 2 (December 2017): 89-121.

- Ford, James L. *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan*. Oxford, London: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Forte, Antonino. “Brief Notes on the Kashmiri Text of the *Dharani Sūtra of Avalokiteśvara of the Unfailing Rope* Introduced to China by Manicintana (d. 721).” In *Buddhism and Buddhist Art of the Tang*, edited by Kathy Cheng-mei Ku, 13-28. Taiwan: Chuefeng Foijiao Jijinhui, 2006.
- _____. “Hui-chih (fl. 676-703 A.D.), a Brahmin Born in China.” *Annali dell’Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 45 (1985): 105-134.
- Fowler, Sherry. “Travels of the Daihōonji Six Kannon Sculptures.” *Ars Orientalis* 36 (2009): 178-214.
- _____. *Accounts and Images of Six Kannon in Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2016.
- _____. *Murōji: Rearranging Art and History at a Japanese Buddhist Temple*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005.
- Freeman, Lindsey A. and Benjamin Nienass, and Rachel Daniell. “Memory, Materiality, Sensuality.” *Memory Studies* 9, no. 1 (2016): 3-12.
- Fuji Yukiko. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō no rekishiteki igi to engi shiryō: kyūseiki ni okeru shizokusei henyō to ujidera.” *Dōhō bukkyō* 51 (July 2015): 105-132.
- Fujiki Masao. “Nihonjin no senzo kuyōkan no tenkai.” In *Bukkyō minzokugaku taikei 4*, edited by Fujiki Masao, 96-106. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1988.
- Fujioka Yutaka. “Butsuzō to honyō: Kamakura jidai zenki no Nyorai ryūzō ni okeru Sō butsuga no juyō o chūshin ni.” In *Kōza Nihon bijutsushi 2: Keitai no denshō*, edited by Itakura Masaaki, 133-163. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2005.
- _____. “Gedatsu Jōkei to Kōfukuji no Kamakura fukkō.” *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan gakusō* 24 (May 2002): 9-42.
- _____. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite jō.” *Kokka* 1137 (August 1990): 19-34.
- _____. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō Shitennō to Chūkondō Shitennō zō ni tsuite ge.” *Kokka* 1138 (September 1990): 7-19.
- _____. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō Shitennō zō no saikentō: aratana Unkei imeji no kōchiku.” *Osaka daigaku daigakuin bungaku kenkyūka geijutsugaku geijutsushi kōza* 30 (March 2013): 95-139.
- Fukunaga Mitsuji. *Dōkyō to kodai Nihon*. Kyoto: Jinbunshoin, 1987.

- _____. *Dōkyō to Nihon bunka*. Kyoto: Jinbunshoin, 1982.
- Fukutō Sanae. *Ie seiritsushi no kenkyū: Sosen saishi, onna, kodomo*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 1991.
- Fukuyama Toshio. “Kasuga Taisha, Kōfukuji sōsetsu.” In *Kasuga Taisha, Kōfukuji*, edited by Kinki Nihon Tetsudō Sōritsu Gojūshūnen Kinen Shuppan Henshūsho, 1-56. Osaka: Kinki Nihon Tetsudō, 1961.
- _____. *Jiin kenchiku no kenkyū chū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1982.
- _____. *Nihon kenchikushi kenkyū*. Tokyo: Bokusui Shobō, 1968.
- Funata Jun’ichi. *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2011.
- Gerhart, Karen. *The Material Culture of Death in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009.
- Glassman, Hank. “Chinese Buddhist Death Ritual and the Transformation of Japanese Kinship.” In *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, edited by Bryan J. Cuevas and Jacqueline Stone, 378-404. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2007.
- Goodwin, Janet. “Shooing the Dead to Paradise.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 63-80.
- Gorai Shigeru. *Kōya hijiri*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1975.
- Graham, William. *Beyond the Written World: Oral Aspects of Scripture in History of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Grapard, Allan G. “Flying Mountains and Walkers of Emptiness: Toward a Definition of Sacred Space in Japanese Religions.” *History of Religions* 21, no. 3 (1982): 195-221.
- _____. *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.
- _____. “Japan’s Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shinto and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji (“Shimbutsu Bunri”) and a Case Study: Tōnomine.” *History of Religions* 23, no.3 (February 1984): 240-265.
- Groner, Paul. *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth Century*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002.
- _____. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley, 1984.
- Habito, Ruben L. F. “Buddha-body Theory and the Lotus Sutra: Implications for Praxis.” In *A Buddhist Kaleidoscope: Essays on the Lotus Sutra*, edited by Gene Reeves, 305-317. Tokyo: Kōsei Publishing Company, 2002.

- Hakeda, Yoshito. *Kūkai: Major Works Translated, with An Account of His Life and A Study of His Thought*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Collective Memory*. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.
- Hamada Takashi. “Fukūkenjaku Kannon josetsu: Tōdaiji Hokkedō zō o chūshin ni.” In *Higashi Ajia to Nihon: Kōko bijutsu hen*, edited by Tamura Enchō, 183-203. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987.
- Hara Hirofumi. “Kōfukuji Kōdō Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no zōritsu to Nan’endō iza—senkō senpi no tame no zōzō no sono ato.” ‘Ontame no zōzō’ kenkyū, *Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, edited by Nagaoka Ryūsaku, 28-46. Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2006-2009.
- Harris, Victor. *Kamakura: The Renaissance of Japanese Sculpture, 1185-1333*. London: British Museum Press, 1991.
- Harrison, Paul. “Commemoration and Identification in *Buddhānusmṛti*.” In *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*, edited by Janet Gyatso, 215-238. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Haruna Yoshishige. *Heian jidai shodōshi*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1993.
- Hashimoto Masatoshi. “Chūsei Bukkyō setsuwa no tenkai to waka, engi.” PhD diss., Kyoto University, 2004.
- Hashimoto Yoshihiko. *Heian kizoku shakai no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1976.
- Hatta Tatsuo. *Reigen jiin to shinbutsu shūgō: Kodai jiin no chūseiteki tenkai*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoin, 2003.
- Hayami Tasuku. *Kannon shinkō*. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1970.
- Hida Romi. “Kajūji shūbutsu saikō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 212 (March 1994): 61-88.
- Horiike Shunpō. “Nara jidai Bukkyō no mikkyōteki seikaku.” In *Nihon kodaishi ronsō*, edited by Kodaigaku Kyōkai, 625-637. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1960.
- Horton, Sarah. *Living Buddhist Statues in Early Medieval and Modern Japan*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Hu, Jun. “Embracing the Circle: Domicil Buildings in East Asian Architecture CA. 200-750.” PhD diss., Princeton University, 2014.
- Hurst III, G. Cameron. “The Structure of the Heian Court: Some Thoughts on the Nature of ‘Familial Authority’ in Heian Japan.” In *Medieval Japan: Essays in Institutional History*, edited by John W. Hall and Jeffrey P. Mass, 39-59. New Haven and London: Yale

- University Press, 1974.
- Hutton, Patrick H. "The History of Mentalities: The New Map of Cultural History." *History and Theory* 20, no. 3 (October 1981): 237-259.
- Imai Shōji, et al. *Sho no nihonshi: Asuka/Nara*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1975.
- Imao Humiaki. "Hakkakufun no shutsugen to tenkai." *Kodai o kankaeru shūmatsuki kofun to kodai kokka*, edited by Shirai Taiichirō, 24-53. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2005.
- Inoue Tadashi. "Danzō." *Nihon no bijutsu* 253 (June 1987).
- Ishida Hisatoyo. *Esoteric Buddhist Paintings*, trans. E. Dale Saunders. Tokyo and New York: Kodansha International, 1987.
- Ishida Mosaku. *Shakyō yori Narachō Bukkyō no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1930.
- Ishimatsu Hinako. "Kuyōshazō: zūzō ni yoru kishin mei." In *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 5: Kinōron: tsukuru, tsukuru, tsutaeru*, edited by Nagaoka Ryūsaku, 179-199. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2014.
- Itō Shirō. "Daigōji Enmaten zazō to dōgannyū." *Museum* 474 (September 1990): 4-15.
- _____. "Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no butszō." In *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butszō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, edited by Fujisawa Norio, 1-5. Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991.
- _____. "Kōfukuji mandara to gensonzō." In *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō Kōfukuji mandara zu*, edited by Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 73-79. Kyoto: Benridō, 1995.
- _____. *Heian jidai chōkokushi no kenkyū*. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, 2000.
- Izumi Takeo. "Kōfukuji mandara no zuyō to hyōgen." In *Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō Kōfukuji mandara zu*, edited by Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 52-72. Kyoto: Benridō, 1995.
- Izumi, Yoshiko. "The Making of a Mnemonic Space: Meiji Shrine Memorial Art Gallery, 1912-1936." *Japan Review* 23 (2011): 143-176.
- Izumiyama Yasuo. *Kōfukuji*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997.
- Jinno Yūta. "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no kebutsu ni tsuite." *Seisen joshi daigaku daigakuin kagaku kenkyūka ronshū* 19 (October 2013): 21-41.
- Jinno Yūta. "Kujō Kanazane no busshari hōnō ganmon ni miru Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō saikō no igi." *Mikkyō zūzō* 33 (December 2014): 15-32.
- Kainuma, Yoshiko. "Kaikei and Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Study of the An'amiyō Amida Form." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1994.

- Kameda Tsutomu. "Nara jidai no soshizō to Kusha mandara zu." *Bukkyō geijutsu* 1 (August 1948): 31-55.
- _____. *Nihon Bukkyō bijutsushi josetsu*. Tokyo: Gakugei Sholin, 1970.
- Kanda Fusae. "Hōnen's Senchaku Doctrine and His Artistic Agenda." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 31, no. 1 (2004): 3-27.
- Kaneko Hiroaki and Iwasa Mitsuharu. "Nihon kodai ni okeru mokuchōzō no jushu to yōzaikan shichi-hachi seki o chūshin ni." *Museum* 555 (August, 1998): 3-54
- _____. "Nihon kodai ni okeru mokuchōzō no jushu to yōzaikan II-hachi kyūseki o chūshin ni." *Museum* 583 (April, 2003): 5-44.
- Karetzky, Patricia Eichenbaum. "Wu Zetian and Buddhist Art of the Tang Dynasty." *Tang Studies* 20, no. 21 (2002): 113-50.
- Karino Kayoko. "Kasuga Taisha shozō 'Kasuga shaji mandara' no butsumon hyōgen ni tsuite." *Bukkyō geijutsu* 336 (September 2014): 9-32.
- Katata Osamu. *Nihon kodai jinshi no kenkyū*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1991.
- Kawahara Yoshio. "Shōzō o hōshisuru jidai izen: Eizanji Hakkakudō no tsuizendō no seikaku." *Yamato bunka* 96 (September 1996): 1-13.
- Kieschnick, John. *The Impact of Buddhism on Chinese Material Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Kinki Nihon Tetsudō Sōritsu Gojūshūnen Kinen Shuppan Henshūsho, ed. *Kasuga Taisha, Kōfukuji*. Osaka: Kinki Nihon Tetsudō, 1961.
- Kobayashi Takeshi. "Daibusshi Kōkei ge." *Kokka* 749 (August 1954): 227-228.
- _____. "Daibusshi Kōkei jō." *Kokka* 746 (May 1954): 157-161.
- Kobayashi Yūko. *Kōfukuji sōkenki no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2011.
- Kopytoff, Igor. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by Arjun Appadurai, 64-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Kudō Miwako. *Heianki no ganmon to bukkyōteki seikaikan*. Kyoto: Bukkyō Daigaku, 2008.
- Kuno Takeshi. "East Asian Buddhist Sculpture and the *Henzan*." In *International Symposium on the Conservation and Restoration of Cultural Property: Interregional Influence in East Asian Art History*, edited by Tokyo Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 15-27. Tokyo: Tokyo National Research Institute of Cultural Property, 1982.
- Kurihara Hiromu. *Heian zenki no kazoku to shinzoku*. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō, 2008.

- Kuroda Toshio. *Jisha seiryoku*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980.
- Kusaka Sakiko. "Heian makki no Kōfukuji—mitera kannen no seiritsu." *Shimado* 28, (1970): 75-104
- Kyan, Winston. "Family Space: Buddhist Materiality and Ancestral Fashioning in Mogao Cave 231." *The Art Bulletin* 92, no. ½ (2010): 61-82.
- Kyōraku Mahoko. "Heian jidai no ie to dera: Fujiwarashi no Gokurakuji, Kajūji o chūshin toshite." *Nihonshi kenkyū* 346 (1991): 1-25.
- Kyoto Daigaku Bungakubu Kokushi Kenkyūshitsu, ed. *Nihonshi jiten*. Tokyo: Sōgensha, 1960.
- Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed. *Insei no butsuzō: Jōchō kara Unkei e*. Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1991.
- _____. *Shaka shinkō to Seiryōji*. Kyoto: Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1982.
- Larsen, Knut Einar. *Architectural Preservation in Japan*. Trondheim: ICOMOS International Committee, Tapir Publishers. Lawton, Thomas, and Linda Merrill, 1993.
- Leoshko, Janice. "The Appearance of Amoghapāśa in Pāla Period Art." In *Studies in Buddhist Art of South Asia*, edited by A. K. Narain, 127-139. New Delhi: Kanak Publications, 1985.
- Levine, Gregory. *Daitokuji: The Visual Cultures of a Zen Monastery*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2005.
- Li, Michelle Osterfeld. *Ambiguous Bodies: Reading the Grotesque in Japanese Setsuwa Tales*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Lippit, Yukio. "Negative Verisimilitude: The Zen Portrait in Medieval Japan." In *Asian Art History in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Vishakha N. Desai, 64-95. Williamstown: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2007.
- Liu Shu-Fen. *Zhonggu de fojiao yu shehui*. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Chubanshe, 2008.
- Luo, Di. "A Grain of Sand: *Yingzao Fashi* and the Miniaturization of Chinese Architecture." PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2016.
- Lynn, Richard John, trans. *The Classic of Changes: A New Translation of the I Ching as Interpreted by Wang Bi*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Makino Akisa. "Zuirinji Jizō Bosatsu zazō no meibun to busshi Kōkei." *Bigaku bijutsu shigaku gahō* 8 (March 2000): 51-69.
- Manabe Shunshō. "Fukūkenjaku Kannon no hyōgen to sono fuhensei." *Indogaku bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 65, no.1 (December 2016): 150-157.
- Maruo Shōzaburō, ed. *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Zōzō meiki hen*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Chūō

- Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1966.
- Maruyama Yumiko. *Shōsōin monjo no sekai*. Tokyo: Chūōkōron Shinsha, 2010.
- Masano Jun'ichi. "Fujiwara no Uchimarō ni tsuite." *Komazawa shigaku* 33 (March 1985): 61-73.
- Mason, Penelope. *History of Japanese Art*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005.
- Matsushima Ken. "Nan'endō kyū honzon to Kamakura saikōzō." In *Shinpen meihō Nihon no bijutsu 3: Kōfukuji*, edited by Ōta Hirotarō, et al., 111-153. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1990.
- Matsuura Masaaki. "Kōfukuji Nan'endō itakabe soshizō." In *Jion taishi mie shūei*, edited by Kōfukuji Yakushiji Jion Taishi Mie Shūei Kankōkai, 237-239. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1982.
- McCallum, Donald F. "The Replication of Miraculous Icons: The Zenkōji Amida and the Seiryōji Shaka." In *Images, Miracles, and Authority in Asian Religious Traditions*, edited by Richard Davis, 207-226. Boulder: Westview Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Four Great Temples: Buddhist Archaeology, Architecture, and Icons of Seventh-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.
- _____. *Zenkōji and Its Icon: A Study in Medieval Japanese Religious Art*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- McCullough, William H. and Helen Craig McCullough, trans. *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes: Annals of Japanese Aristocratic Life in the Heian Period*, vol. 2. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980.
- Meiszhall, R. O. "Amoghapāśa, Some Nepalese Representations and Their Vajrayānic Aspects." *Monumenta Serica* 24 (1967): 455-497.
- Midorikawa Akinori. "Konoেকে Konoে Iehiro hitsu 'Fukūkenjaku Kanzeon reizōki' o megutte," *Mita kokubun*, no. 53 (June 2011): 1-18.
- Mitsutani Takumi and Kojima Daisuke. "Tōdaiji Hokkedō (seidō) narabi ni hakkaku nijūdan no nenrin nendai chōsa." *Bukkyō geijutsu* 321 (March 2012): 69-86.
- Miyai Yoshio. *Ritsuryō kizoku Fujiwarashi no ujigami ujidera shinkō to sobyō saishi*. Tokyo: Seikō Shobō, 1978.
- Mizuno Keizaburō. "Busshi Kōjo shiryō." *Bijutsu kenkyū* 206 (September 1959): 36-43.
- _____. "Sōdai bijutsu to Kamakura chōkoku." *Kokka* 1000 (May 1977): 53-61.
- _____. *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Heian jidai jūyō sakuin hen ni*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1976.
- Mizuno Keizaburō, Kudō Yoshiaki, and Miyake Hisao, ed. *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 10: Unkei to Kaikai: Kamakura no kenchiku chōkoku*. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1991.

- Mochizuki Shinkō, ed., *Mochizuki Bukkyō daijiten*, vols. 2-3. Tokyo: Seikai Seiten Kankō Kyokai, 1988.
- Moerman, D. Max. *Localizing Paradise: Kumano Pilgrimage and the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005.
- Mōri Hisashi. “Kōkei no shiryō.” *Museum* 29 (August 1953): 22-23.
- _____. *Busshi Kaikei ron*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1987.
- _____. *Sculpture of the Kamakura Period*, trans. Katherine Eickmann. New York: Weatherhill, 1974.
- Mori Masahide. “Indo no Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 262 (May, 2002): 43-67.
- Morishita Wakiko. “Kōfukuji mandara zu.” In *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*, ed. Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki, 259-273. Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011.
- Moriya Misuo. *Chūgoku ko saijiki no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Teikoku Shoin, 1963.
- Morse, Anne Nishimura. “The Invention of Tradition: The Uses of the Past in Buddhist Paintings from Nara during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009.
- Morse, Samuel C. “Revealing the Unseen: The Master Sculptor Unkei and the Meaning of Dedicatory Objects in Kamakura-Period Sculpture.” *Impression* 31 (2010): 24-41.
- Motoki Yasuo. “Kōfukuji in the Late Heian Period.” In *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, edited by Joan R. Piggott, 298-325. Ithaca: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006.
- _____. *Fujiwara no Tadazane*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.
- Mukasa Akira. “Heian kōki kyūtei kiken no biishiki to butsuzōkan.” In *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 6: Byōdōin to Jōchō, Heian no kenchiku chōkoku*, edited by Mizuno Kezaburō, Suzuki Kakichi, and Itō Shirō, 181-187. Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1994.
- Nagao, Gadjin. “On the Theory of Buddha-body: *Buddha-kāya*.” trans. Hirano Umeyo, *Eastern Buddhist* 6 (1973): 25-53.
- Nagaoka Ryūsaku. “Kodai Nihon no shōjin kan to zōzō.” *Bijutsu shigaku* 29 (2008): 35-60.
- _____. “Ontame no zōzō ron: shutai, kigan, hyōgen.” In “*Ontame no zōzō*” *kenkyū, Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, edited by Nagaoka Ryūsaku, 4-27. Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2006-2009).
- _____. *Nihon no butsuzō: Asuka, Hakuho, Tenpyō no inori to bi*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2009.

- Nagashima Fukutarō. “Kōfukuji no rekishi.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 40 (September 1959): 1-22.
- _____. *Nara bunka no denryū*. Tokyo: Mokuroku Shoten, 1951.
- _____. *Nara*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1963.
- Nakamura Natsuyo. “Chūgoku tonkō ni okeru Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō ni kansuru kenkyū.” *Nagoya daigaku dagakuin bungaku kenkyūka kyōiku kenkyū suishin shitsu nenpō* 2 (2008): 224-228.
- Nakano, Chieko. “Kechien as Religious Praxis in Medieval Japan: Picture Scrolls as the Means and Sites of Salvation.” PhD. Diss., The University of Arizona, 2009.
- Nakao Takashi. *Chūsei no kanjin hijiri to shari shinkō*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002.
- Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed. *Daikanjin Chōgen: Tōdaiji no Kamakura fukkō to arata na bi no sōshutsu: Goonki 800-nen kinen tokubetsuten*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2006.
- Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed. *Danzō: byakudan butsu kara Nihon no mokuchō butsu e*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2011.
- _____. *Kaikei: Nihonjin o miryōshita hotoke no katachi: Tokubetsuten*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2017.
- _____. *Ko mikkyō: Nihon mikkyō no taidō*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2005.
- _____. *Seichi Ninpō (Ninpō): Nihon Bukkyō 1300-nen no genryū: subete wa koko kara yatte kita*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2009.
- _____. *Tokubetsuten: Unkei, Kaikei to sono teishi tachi*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1994.
- _____. *Tokubetsuten Saigoku Sanjūsansho: Kannon reijō no inori to bi*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 2008.
- Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai, ed. *Nara rokudaiji taikan: Kōfukuji 1-2*, vols. 7-8. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1969-1970.
- Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, ed. *Jūyō bunkazai Kōfukuji Nan’endō shūri kōji hōkokusho*. Nara: Naraken Kyōiku Iinkai, 1996.
- Narashi Henshū Shingikai, ed. *Narashi shi: Jisha hen*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1985.
- _____. *Narashishi: Tsūshi san*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1988.
- Naruse Masakazu. “Shōsōin no hōshokuyō.” *Nihon no bijutsu* 522 (November 2009).
- Natō Sakae. “Chōgen no sankaku gorintō to Ninpō Ashokaōji.” In *Nara nanto Bukkyō no dentō*

- to kakushin*, edited by Nemoto Seiji and Samuel Morse, 189-215. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2010.
- Nedachi Kensuke. “Inseiki Kōfukuji ni kakawaru daibusshi o meguru horon.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 296 (January 2008): 57-72.
- _____. “Misogi kaji o meguru shōron.” In *Shidai (chi sui ka fu) no kanseiron: Shisō, ato, shizen kagaku no kakawari ni tsuite no kiban kenkyū*, edited by Iwaki Kenichi, et al., 157-166. Kyoto: Kabushiki Kaisha Nakata Purinto, 2005.
- _____. “Shitennōzō (Chūkondō anchi).” In *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, edited by Mizuno Keizaburō, 65-73. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003.
- _____. *Nihon chūsei no busshi to shakai: Unkei to keiha, shichijō busshi wo chūshin ni*. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2006.
- Nedachi Kensuke. ed. “Tokushū: Bukkyō chōkoku no reigensei to chōkokushi.” *Bijutsu forum* 21, no 22 (2010).
- Nelson, Robert S. and Margaret Olin, eds. *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Nezu Bijutsukan Gakugeibu, ed. *Kasuga no fūkei: Uruwashiki seichi no imeji*. Tokyo: Nezu Bijutsukan, 2011.
- Nishikawa Kyōtarō. “Kōkei to Unkei.” In *Nara no tera: Kōfukuji Hokuendō to Nan’endō no shozō*, edited by Nishikawa Kyōtarō and Tsujimoto Yonesaburō, 1-16. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1994.
- Nishikawa Shinji. “Kōkei no ichi: Kōfukuji Nan’endō shoson o chūshin ni,”
- _____. *Nihon chōkokushi ronshū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1991.
- Nomura Tadao. *Narachō no seiji to Fujiwarashi*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1995.
- Nora, Pierre. “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Memoire.” *Representations* 26 (Spring, 1989): 7-24.
- Numajiri Toshimichi. “Tōmatsubon Ōkagami uragaki no Nan’endō setsuwa.” *Kokugakuin daigaku daigakuin kiyō bungaku kenkyūka* 39 (2007): 185-204.
- Obara Hitoshi. “Kujō Kanazane no ganmon o meguru notto: juei ninen ganmon o chūshin ni.” In *Gyokuyō o yomu: Kujō Kanazane to sono jidai*, edited by Obara Hitoshi, 3-31. Tokyo: Bensei Shuppan, 2013.
- _____. “Kujōke no kitōsō: Chisen o chūshin ni.” In *Chūsei no Bukkyō to shakai*, edited by Ōsumi Kazuo, 2-27. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.

- Ōhashi Katsuaki and Kataoka Naoki, eds. *Kōfukuji: Bijutsushi kenkyū no ayumi*. Tokyo: Ribun Shuppan, 2011.
- Ōkawa Naomi. “Kamakura shoki no Kōfukuji zōei to sono kōshō ni tsuite.” *Kenchikushi kenkyū* 31-32 (August 1962): 1-13.
- Oku Takeo. “Daibusshi Kōkei no zōzō.” *Unkei: jikū o koeru katachi Issue of Bessatsu Taiyō: Nihon no kokoro* 176 (December 2010): 42-49.
- _____. “Nyorai no kamigata ni okeru Heian matsu Kamakura shoki no ichi dōkō: hajōhatsu no shiyō o megutte.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 256 (May 2005): 89-109.
- _____. “Shōjin shinkō to Kamakura chōkoku.” In *Nihon bijutsu zenshū 7: Unkei, Kaikei to chūsei jūin*, edited by Yamamoto Tsutomu, 188-196. Tokyo: Kabushiki Kaisha Shōgakukan, 2013.
- _____. “Tōdaiji Hokkedō hakkaku nijūdan shōkō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 306 (September 2009): 92-107.
- Okuda Shizuyo. “Denryaku kara miru Fujiwara no Tadazane no Aizen Myōō shinkō.” *Kokubun ronsō* 34 (March 2004): 69-77.
- Ono Kayo. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō no sōkensha Fujiwara no Fuyutsugu o meguru bijutsu: soshiga no mondai o chūshin ni.” In *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 6: Soshikiron: seisakushita hitobito*, edited by Tsuda Tetsuei, 48-67. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2016.
- _____. “Nara Raigōji no Zendō Daishi zazō no kenkyū—so no katachiga imisuru mono.” *Waseda Daigaku kōdō kenkyūjo kiyō* 2 (2010): 1-18.
- _____. *Kōfukuji Nan’endō to Hossō rokusoizō no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2008.
- Ōoka Minoru. *Nanto shichi daiji no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 1966.
- Ooms, Herman. *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650-800*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009.
- Orzech, Charles D. and Henrik H. Sørensen. “Mudra, Mantra, Mandala.” In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, edited by Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne, 76-89. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Orzech, Charles D., Richard K. Payne, and Henrik H. Sørensen. “Introduction: Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia: Some Methodological Considerations.” In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, edited by Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne, 3-18. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Osborne, James F., ed. *Approaching Monumentality in Archaeology*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2014.

- Ōshiba Shōen. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō dōtō daimei no Kōbō Daishi osasetsu.” *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 49 (March 2017): 21-36.
- Ōta Hirotarō. *Nanto shichi daiji no rekishi to nenpyō*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1979.
- Ōtsuka Nobuo. “Amoghapāśakalparāja ni okeru seken jōjuhō giki to Fukūkenjaku Kannon ni tsuite.” In *Mandara no shosō to bunka jō: Yoritomi Motohiro hakashi kanreki kinen ronbunshū*, edited by Yoritomi Motohiro Hakashi Kanreki Kinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai, 41-64. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2005.
- Pal, Pratapaditya. “The Iconography of Amoghapāśa Lokeśvara—I.” *Oriental Art* 22.4 (1966): 234-239.
- _____. “The Iconography of Amoghapāśa Lokeśvara—II.” *Oriental Art* 23.1 (1967): 21-28.
- Parent, Mary Neighbour. *The Roof in Japanese Buddhist Architecture*. New York; Tokyo: Weatherhill, 1983.
- Peng Jin-Zhang, ed. *Mijiao huajuan*. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press, 2003.
- Peng Jin-Zhang. “Dunhuang Bukongjuansuo Guanyin jing bian yanjiu.” *Dunhang yanjiu* 1 (1999): 1-24.
- Piggott, Joan. *The Emergence of Japanese Kingship*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.
- Pradel, Chari. *Fabricating the Tenjukoku: Shūchō Mandara and Prince Shōtoku’s Afterlives*. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Reis-Habito, Maria. “The Amoghapāśa Kalparāja Sutra: A Historical and Analytical Study.” *Studies in Central and East Asian Religions* 11 (1999): 39-67.
- Riegl, Alois. “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin.” In *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage*, edited by Nicholas Stanley Price, Mansfield Kirby Talley, and Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro, 69-83. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 1996.
- Rosenfield, John. *Portraits of Chōgen: The Transformation of Buddhist Art in Early Medieval Japan*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Ruppert, Brian O. “Beyond Death and the Afterlife: Considering Relic Veneration in Medieval Japan.” In *Death and Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, edited by Jacqueline Stone, 102-136. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2008.
- Sasaki Moritoshi. “Kōryūji zō Fukūkenjaku Kannon ryūzō.” *Kokka* 106, no. 1268 (June, 2001): 23-24.
- Satō Akio. “Jishō gannen zaimei no Jizō Bosatsu zazō ni tsuite.” *Kokka* 1041 (April 1981): 18-31.

- Satō Kenji. *Chūsei kenmon no seiritsu to kasei*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.
- Satō Makoto. “Kaden to Fujiwara no Nakamaro.” In *Tōshikaden, Kamatari, Jōe, Muchimaro den: chūshaku to kenkyū*, edited by Okimori Takuya, Satō Makoto, and Yajima Izumi, 399-415. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1999.
- Satō Michiko. “Soshie no shiteki kenkyū.” *Geinō no kagaku* 9 (March 1978): 1-56.
- Seya Takayuki. “Kōfukuji Nan’endō Hossō rokuso zō o meguru shomondai: zōmei hitei to sono sōi o chūshin ni.” *Bijutsu shigaku* 22 (2001): 37-61.
- _____. “Kōfukuji Shitennō zō no saikentō—sono nikushin iro o tegakari toshite.” *Bijutsushi* 49, no. 1 (October 1999): 15-33.
- Self, Elizabeth. “Art, Architecture, and the Asai Sisters.” PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2017.
- Sharf, Robert H. and T. Griffith Foulk. “On the Ritual Use of Ch’an Portraiture in Medieval China.” In *Buddhism: Critical Concepts in Buddhist Studies*, edited by Paul Williams, 337-365. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Sharf, Robert. “On the Allure of Buddhist Relics.” *Representations*, no. 66 (Spring 1999): 75-99.
- _____. *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2002.
- _____. review of *Secrets of the Sacred: Empowering Buddhist Images in Clear, in Code, and in Cache*, by Helmut Brinker, *The Art Bulletin* 95, no. 1 (March, 2013): 166-167.
- Shen, Hsueh-man. “Copies without the Original: King Asoka’s 84,000 Stupas and Their Replications in China.” In *Between East and West: Reproductions in Art: Proceedings of the 2013 CIHA Colloquium in Naruto, Japan, 15th-18th January 2013*, edited by Shigetoshi Osano, 227-236. Cracow: IRSA, 2014.
- Shibuya Wakiko. “Kōfukuji ruki ni tsuite.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 160 (May 1985): 49-62.
- Shigematsu Akihisa. *Nihon jōdokyō seiritsu katei no kenkyū: Shinran no shisō to sono genryū*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1964.
- Shimada Akira. “Ujidera kō.” *Aisen joshi tanki daigaku kiyō* 10 (1975): 24-34.
- Shimao Arata, Kameda Kazuko, and Princess Akiko, ed. *Utsushi no chikara: Sōzō to keishō no matorikusu*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2013.
- Shimizu Ken. “Suijaku suru seichi: chūsei Nihon no Fudarakusan hyōshō no shoyōtai o rei toshite.” In *Higashi Ajia Bukkyō bijutsu ni okeru seichi hyōshō no shoyōtai, Monbukagakushō kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kenkyū seika hōkokusho*, edited by Inamoto Yasuo, 155-175. Japan: Monbukagakushō, 2013-15.

- Shimizu Masumi. "Inson to Myōen." In *Go-Shirakawa Inseiki no busshi to butszō: Bukkyō bijutsu kenkyū ueno kinen zaidan josei kenkyūkai hōkokusho*, edited by Fujisawa Norio, 6-8. Kyoto: Bukkyō Bijutsu Kenkyū Ueno Kinen Zaidan Josei Kenkyūkai, 1991.
- Shimizu, Yoshiaki. "Copying in Japanese Art: Calligraphy, Painting, and Architecture." In *Bridges to Heaven: Essays on East Asian Art in Honor of Professor Wen C. Fong*, edited by Jerome Silbergeld, 761-778. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Shimonaka Kunihiko, ed. *Shodō zenshū*, vol. 11. Tokyo: Heibōnsha, 1955.
- Shinohara, Koichi. *Spells, Images, and Mandalas: Tracing the Evolution of Esoteric Buddhist Rituals*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2014.
- Shirahara Yukiko, "Kasuga miya mandara kenkyū no genzai: sakuhin kenkyū no seika to shiron," *Tetsugaku* 132 (March 2014): 191-220.
- Shively, Donald and William McCullough, eds. *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2, Heian Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Smith, Robert. *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Soeda Ryūshun. "Fūkūkenjakukyō no seiritsu ni tsuite." *Mikkyō kenkyū* 40 (1931): 97-143.
- Steinhardt, Nancy. "The Sixth Century in East Asian Architecture." *Ars Orientalis* 41 (2011): 27-71.
- Stevenson, Daniel. "Buddhist Practice and the *Lotus Sutra* in China." In *Readings of the Lotus Sutra*, edited by Stephen Teiser and Jacqueline Stone, 132-150. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- _____. "Deathbed Testimonials of the Pure Land Faithful." In *Buddhism in Practice*, edited by Donald Lopez, Jr., 592-602. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- _____. "Tales of the *Lotus Sutra*." In *Buddhism in Practice*, edited by Donald Lopez, Jr., 427-451. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Stone, Jacqueline. *Right Thoughts at the Last Moment: Buddhism and Deathbed Practices in Early Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016.
- Sugaya Fuminori. "Hakkakudō no kenritsu o tsūjite mita kofun shūmatsu no ichi yōsō." In *Shūmatsuki kofun: Ronshū*, edited by Mori Kōichi, 445-470. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1973.
- Sugiyama Nobuzō. *Fujiwara no ujidera so no inge*. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo, 1968.
- _____. *Inge kenchiku no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981.

Suzuki Yoshihiro. “Danzō no shōrai to nihon teki tenkai-hakuki chōkoku ron josetsu.” *Rokuon zasshū* 13 (March, 2011): 31-36.

_____. “Fukūkenjaku Kannon bosatsu zō (Nan’endō anchi).” In *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, edited by Mizuno Keizaburō, 50-64. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003.

_____. “Kōfukuji Nanendō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō shūri ni yoru shin chiken.” *Kinki bunka* 569 (1997): 4-7.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete jō.” *Kōfuku* 91 (March 1996): 3-4, 6.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete chū.” *Kōfuku* 92 (June 1996): 3, 6.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no shūri o oete ge.” *Kōfuku* 93 (September 1996): 3-4.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki chū.” *Kōfuku* 79 (March 1993): 5-6.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki ge.” *Kōfuku* 80 (June 1993): 5-6.

_____. “Nan’endō honzon idō tenmatsu ki jō.” *Kōfuku* 78 (December 1992): 5-6.

Taga Munehaya. *Gyokuyō sakuin: Fujiwara no Kanazane no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974.

Tagawa Shun’ei and Kaneko Hiroaki. *Kōfukuji no subete*. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 2014.

Takahashi Hideki. “Chūsei zenki no sosen saishi to futatsu no ie.” in *Nihon kazokushi ronshū 7: Shinzoku to sosen* edited by Yoshie Akiko and Sasaki Junnosuke, 164-192. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002.

Takama Yukari. “Chionji shozō jūyō bunkazai Zendō Daishi zō ni tsuite.” *Geijutsu kenkyū* 24 (2011): 1-18.

Takamatsu Momoka. “Kujō Kanazane no Kōfukuji saiken: chūsei sekkanke to Kamatari.” *Jinmin no rekishigaku* 162 (December 2004): 1-11.

Takasaki Fuhiko. “Tanakashi kizō no den Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō ni tsuite.” *Museum* 336, (March 1979): 10-16.

Takashima Masato. *Fujiwara no Fuhito*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1997.

Takata Osamu. “Hōōdō honzon tainai nōchi no bonji Amida daishō ju gachirin kō.” *Bijutsu kenkyū* 3, no 183 (September 1955): 29-34.

Takeda Chōshū. “Shichisei fubo kō.” In *Sōsō bōsei kenkyū shūsei 3*, edited by Takeda Chōshū,

- 45-65. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1979.
- Takenaka, Akiko. *Yasukuni Shrine: History, Memory, and Japan's Unending Postwar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.
- Tanabe, Willa. "The Lotus Lectures: Hokke Hakko in the Heian Period." *Monumenta Nipponica* 39, no. 4 (Winter 1984): 393-407.
- Tanaka Risada. "Sosen saishi ni miru ie ishiki: uji kara ie e." *Nihon bungaku* 52, no. 7 (2003): 1-11.
- Tanaka Shigehisa. *Nihon ni iryū indokei bunbutsu no kenkyū*. Osaka: Tobundō, 1943.
- Tanaka Tsuguhito. *Nihon kodai busshi no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1983.
- Tani Shin'ichi. "Butsuzō zōken sakuho kō chū: rekisei moku busshi kenkyū no issetsu toshite." *Bijutsu kenkyū* 54 (July 1936): 11-24.
- _____. "Butsuzō zōken sakuho kō jō: rekisei moku busshi kenkyū no issetsu toshite." *Bijutsu Kenkyū* 54 (June 1936): 1-15.
- Taniguchi Kōsei. "Kusha mandara to Tenpyō fukko." In *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 1: Yōshiki ron: sutairu to modo no bunseki*, edited by Hayashi On, 137-156. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2012.
- _____. "Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan zō kenpon chashoku Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō." *Rokuon zasshū* 4 (2002): 59-70.
- Tanimoto Akira. "Kōfukuji Nan'endō Fukūkenjaku Kannonzō no raireki." *Bukkyō geijutsu* 334 (May 2014): 56-69.
- Teeuwen, Mark and Fabio Rambelli, eds. *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm*. London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.
- Tei Morita. "Toward Regency Leadership at Court." In *Capital and Countryside in Japan, 300-1180*, edited by Joan R. Piggott, 207-226. Ithaca: Cornell University East Asian Program, 2006.
- Teiser, Stephen. "Ghosts and Ancestors in Medieval Chinese Religion: The Yun-Lan-Pen Festival as Mortuary Ritual." *History of Religion* 26, no. 1 (1986): 47-67.
- ten Grotenhuis, Elizabeth. *Japanese Mandalas: Representations of Sacred Geography*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.
- Tōdaiji Myūjiamu, ed. *Nara jidai no Tōdaiji*. Nara: Tōdaiji, 2011.
- Tokyo Bijutsu Gakkō, ed. *Nanto jūdaiji ōkagami: Kōfukuji*, vols. 14-15. Tokyo: Ōtsuka Kōgeisha, 1932-1933.
- Tokyo Geijutsu Daigaku Bijutsukan, ed. *Kōfukuji kokuhō ten: Kamakura fukkōki no mihotoke*.

- Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2004.
- Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, ed. *Kasuga Taisha: sennen no shihō tokubetsuten*. Tokyo: NHK, 2017.
- _____. *Kōfukuji kokuhōten: Nan'endō Heisei daishūri rakkei kinen*. Tokyo: Geijutsu kenkyū shinkō zaidan, 1997.
- _____. *Uchiyama Eikyūji no rekishi to bijutsu (shiryō hen): Chōsa kenkyū hōkokusho*. Tokyo: Tokyo Bijutsu, 1994.
- _____. *Unkei: Kōfukuji Chūkondō saiken kinnen tokubetsuten*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 2017.
- _____. *Tokubetsuten: Kamakura jidai no chōkoku*. Tokyo: Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan, 1975.
- Tseng, Alice. "Urban Parks and Imperial Memory: The Formation of Kyoto Imperial Garden and Okazaki Part as Sites of Cultural Revival." In *Kyoto Visual Culture in the Early Edo and Meiji Periods: The Arts of Reinvention*, edited by Alice Tseng and Morgan Pitelka, 91-116. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Tsu, Yun Hui, Jan van Bremen, and Eyal Ben-Ari, eds. *Perspectives on Social Memory in Japan*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tsunoda Bun'ei. *Taikenmonin Shōshi no shōgai: Shōtei hishō*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1985.
- Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.
- Tyler, Royall. "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato." *Japan Review* 1 (1990): 153-223.
- _____. *The Miracles of the Kasuga Deity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Tyler, Susan C. *The Cult of Kasuga Seen through its Art*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1992.
- Uehara Eiko. "Fujiwara no Uchimarō no seijishiteki no kenkyū: hokke taitō no ketteiteki kikai." *Seiji keizai shigaku* 1 (February 1963): 19-31.
- Ullrich, John Dodson. "The Kōfukuji Clerical Assembly in the Politics of Early Medieval Japan." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2005.
- Unno Hiroyuki. "Den e no manazashi: kodai, chūsei ni okeru butsumō anchi to zushi." In *Bukkyō bijutsu ronshū 5: Kinōron: tsukuru, tsukaru, tsutaeru*, edited by Nagaoka Ryūsaku, 345-371. Tokyo: Chikurinsha, 2014.
- van Gennep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

- Walley, Akiko. *Constructing the Dharma King: The Hōryūji Shaka Triad and the Birth of the Prince Shōtoku Cult*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- _____. “Inscribing and Ascribing Merit: Buddhist Vows and the Hōryūji Shaka Triad.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73, no. 2 (December 2013): 299-337.
- Watanabe Satoshi. “Fukūkenjaku Kannon zō no egakareta Kasuga mandara zu—Tokugawa Bijutsukan hon Kasuga mandara zu ni tsuite.” *Kinko sōsho* 16 (1989): 297-321.
- Watari Tsunenobu. *Nihon kodai no denshō to rekishi*. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2008.
- Watsky, Andrew M. *Chikubutshima: Deploying the Sacred Arts in Momoyama Japan*. Seattle: University of Hawai’i Press, 2005.
- Weinstein, Lucie R. “The Yumedono Kannon: Problems in Seventh-Century Sculpture.” *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 25-48.
- Williams, Paul. *Mahayana Buddhism: The Doctrinal Foundations*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Wong, Dorothy C. “The Art of *Avatamsaka* Buddhism at the Courts of Empress Wu and Emperor Shōmu/Empress Kōmyō.” In *Avatamsaka Buddhism in East Asia: Huayan, Kegon, Flower Ornament Buddhism: Origins and Adaptation of a Visual Culture*, edited by Robert Gimello, Frederic Girard, and Imre Hamar, 223-260. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
- _____. “The Case of Amoghapāśa.” *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 2 (2007): 151-158.
- Wu, Hung. “A Deity without Form: The Earliest Representation of Laozi and the Concept of *Wei* in Chinese Ritual Art.” *Orientalia* 33, no. 4 (2002): 38-45.
- _____. *A Story of Ruins: Presence and Absence in Chinese Art and Visual Culture*. London: Reaktion, 2012.
- _____. *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.
- Wu, Pei-Jung. “The Manjusri Statues and Buddhist Practice of Saidaiji.” PhD diss. University of California, Los Angeles, 2002.
- Yamamoto Nobuyoshi. “Fujiwara no Kanezane.” In *Sho to jinbutsu: Seijika*, edited by Haruna Yoshishige, 36-37. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha, 1978.
- _____. “Hokke Hakkō to Michinaga no sanjikkō ge.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 78 (November 1970): 81-95.
- _____. “Hokke Hakkō to Michinaga no sanjikkō jō.” *Bukkyō geijutsu* 77 (September 1970):

71-84.

Yamamoto Tsutomu. "Hossō rokusoazō (Nan'endō anchi)." In *Nihon chōkokushi kiso shiryō shūsei: Kamakura jidai zōzō meiki hen daiichiken kaisetsu*, edited by Mizuno Keizaburō, 74-79. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron Bijutsu Shuppan, 2003.

_____. "Nara Ōgenji Fukūkenjaku Kannon zazō." *Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan kenkyūshi* 388 (July 1983): 12-20.

Yen, Chuan-Ying. "Tang dai shiyimian Guanyin tuxiang yu xinyang." *Foxue yanjiu zhongxin xuebao* 11 (2006): 89-116.

_____. "The Sculpture from the Tower of Seven Jewels: The Style, Patronage, and Iconography." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986.

Yiengpruksawan, Mimi Hall. *Hiraizumi: Buddhist Art and Regional Politics in Twelfth-Century Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

_____. "The House of Gold: Fujiwara Kiyohira's Konjikidō." *Monumenta Nipponica* 48, no. 1 (1993): 33-52.

_____. "The Phoenix Hall at Uji and the Symmetries of Replication." *The Art Bulletin* 77, no. 4 (December, 1995): 647-672.

Yoneda Yūsuke et al. *Shin sekkanke den*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1995.

Yoneda Yūsuke. "Kōfukuji Nan'endō no kenritsu to Fujiwara no Uchimaro." *Shoku nihongi kenkyū* 281 (August 1992): 29-36.

_____. *Fujiwara sekkanke no tanjō: Heian jidaishi no tobira*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2002.

Yoritomi Motohiro. *Mikkyō butsu no kenkyū*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1990.

Yoshida Hiroko. "Nan'endō dōtō daimei." In *Kokyō ibun chūshaku*, edited by Jōdai Bunken o Yomukai, 316-324. Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1989.

Yoshida, Sanae. "Aristocratic Journals and Courtly Calendar: The Context of Fujiwara no Tadahira's *Teishinkōki*." In *Teishinkōki: The Year 939 in the Journal of Regent Fujiwara no Tadahira*, edited by Joan R. Piggott and Yoshida Sanae, 8-21. Ithaca: East Asian Program Cornell University, 2008.

Yoshii Katsunobu. "Kujō Kanezane no Bukkyō shinkō: gojisō Jigen to sonshō nenju, Aizenō kuyō." *Otani Daigaku Daigakuin kenkyū kiyō* 8 (December 1991): 189-215.

Yoshikawa Toshiko. *Ritsuryō kizoku seiritsu no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 2006.

Yoshimura Rei. "Nihon kodai butsuazō no chakui to sono meishō: kesa, sōgishi, kun, utansan, oyobi hensan, jikitotsu, ōhi." *Bukkyō geijutsu* 305 (July 2009): 9-39.

Digital Sources

Nara National Museum. “Kasuga tōsai tō seki.” Nara National Museum.
<http://www.narahaku.go.jp/guide/08.html> (accessed May 13, 2015).

Nara Joshi Daigaku (Nara Women University). “Map of the Precinct of Kasuga Shrine and Kōfukuji (*Kasuga Kōfukuji kennai zū*).” Nara Joshi Daigaku. http://mahoroba.lib.nara-wu.ac.jp/y08/kasuga_taisha/keidai_zu/ (accessed May 13, 2015).

International Research Center for Japanese Studies. *Sekkanki kokiroku*. International Research Center for Japanese Studies. <http://db.nichibun.ac.jp/ja/category/heian-diaries.html> [accessed August 23, 2016].