

Gaynor SEKIMORI

Paper Fowl and Wooden Fish
The Separation of Kami and Buddha
Worship in Haguro Shugendō, 1869–1875

In 1868 the Meiji government enacted a series of laws, often called the “Separation Orders,” which was to raise “Shinto” to the status of a state cult to embody the ideals of the new order. This Shinto did not reflect even the practices of local communities, let alone the contemporary religious matrix of kami-buddha combination. Thus it was necessary to “clarify” what was and was not Shinto. Shugendō shrine-temple complexes in particular were targeted for reform, since Shugendō was predicated on kami-buddha combination. This paper looks at how the “Separation Orders” affected the Shugendō of Hagurosan institutionally, ritually, ideologically, and socially. Using insights gained from recent “revisionist” scholarship concerning the English Reformation(s), it examines how change that was not demanded or welcomed locally was able to occur. An important source for evidence is the unpublished Diary of the first head of the reconstructed shrine, Nishikawa Sugao.

KEYWORDS: Shugendō – *shinbutsu shūgō* – *shinbutsu bunri* – Hagurosan – English Reformation – Nishikawa Sugao

Gaynor Sekimori is an Associate Professor in the Institute of Oriental Culture at The University of Tokyo.

RECENT HISTORIOGRAPHY of the English Reformation, based particularly on local studies, has drawn attention to the diversity of the impact of religious change on English society. Christopher Haigh, for whom such studies have been instrumental in forging his own position that England's was a "political Reformation," which "came with restraint, in orderly obedience to royal instruction," has suggested four possible interpretations of the phenomenon: rapid reformation from above, rapid reformation from below, slow reformation from above, and slow reformation from below (HAIGH 1987, pp. 19–28). In other words, was the Reformation primarily a political act or a popular movement, and how readily was it accepted over a variety of regions and social classes? In one particular area, the restructuring of ritual space, the effects were almost immediate, and speak of the actions of a strong central government able to mobilize personnel, despite having no standing army or direct policing authority to enforce orders at a local level. Whether or not these actions were welcome in the local community is a far more complicated question. Scarisbrick indeed opened his work on the English Reformation with the explicit statement, "English men and women did not want the Reformation and most of them were slow to accept it when it came" and continued that it was "only in a limited sense popular and from 'below'" (SCARISBRICK 1984, p. 1). HAIGH too has commented that the Reformation was something "which most did not understand, which few wanted, and which no one knew had come to stay" (1993, p. 14). While a new generation of scholars is refining this broad view, there is general agreement that there was not a massive Protestant groundswell that triumphed over a decrepit and corrupt Catholic Church and carried all before it in alliance with a reforming monarchy, or even what SCARISBRICK termed "a predatory crown on the prowl" (1984, p. 135). If then people were largely satisfied with the existing Church, what was the mechanism by which this Reformation was able to occur? Indeed, one of the few points on which all Reformation scholarship tends to concur is that "the remarkable penetration of England's 'Reformation from above' remains largely unexplained" (SHAGAN 2003, p. 2).

Similar actions by a government redefining religion and making tentative steps towards the establishment of a modern nation state were taken by the new Meiji government after 1868. Just as the Henrician Injunctions set into motion a process that would reshape the religious, political, and social life of England, legislation passed in Japan in 1868 and 1869 changed the matrix of the kami-buddha combination (*shinbutsu shūgō* 神仏習合) that had been the hallmark of Japanese religion, with the intention of separating what was Shinto from what

was Buddhist and establishing Shinto as the basis of a new state ideology. Over the next decade, “traditional religion”¹ was interrogated and recast, in the course of which sectarian Buddhism too changed under the critical gaze in ways reminiscent of how Counter-Reformation Catholicism strove both to deny its magical dimension and to rationalize its doctrine and traditions. While in Japan, just as in England, there existed a cry for change from below that cautions us to take a sufficiently nuanced interpretation, neither nativism in Japan nor Protestantism in England passed broadly beyond certain social groups. In both societies grass-roots proponents tended to come from what in Japan might be called members of networks of local notables, what Sarah Thal terms “a small segment of the scholarly and cultural elite” (THAL 2005, p. 125), such as land holders, local officials, wealthy farmers, post-station officials, and so on (ICHIMURA 1929, pp. 145–52, 155–60, 296–319; ITŌ 1982, p. 5), as well as from disgruntled shrine priests, and from what in England were people belonging particularly to literate, urban, and mercantile groups. How then did religious change, imposed from above on a majority which was seemingly satisfied with the status quo, penetrate society? I will attempt to answer this question, in regards one particular location, by examining the role of Nishikawa Sugao 西川須賀雄 (1838–1906) in the transformation of Hagurosan 羽黒山 (Yamagata prefecture) from a Shugendō shrine-temple complex into an imperial shrine.

In the broadest terms, the equation of promulgation and acquiescence consists of two axes, the authority of the central government and the reaction of the local populace, but there also exists a mediating power between the two. The force of the state was an overwhelming presence both in Tudor England and in early Meiji Japan, though where the Tudor regime backed its demands with coercion and at times brutal punishment, the Meiji government, having inherited the mantle of the “public authority” of the ruling power (BITŌ 2000, pp. 58–61), generally achieved compliance without threatening the lives (if not the livelihoods) of those targeted. Further, the religious changes in Japan were only one part of a greatly larger social, political, and economic revolution, rather than the core of these changes, as the English Reformation was. Initially they seemed to concern the purveyors of religion more than its consumers, though the longer term implications for the latter soon became apparent. For instance, communities had to deal with the disposal of Buddhist statues from shrine precincts or were prevailed upon to follow Shinto rather than Buddhist funerary customs. Pilgrims to sacred mountains no longer recognized the divinities to whom they were being asked to give their prayers and were remonstrated for demanding traditional rituals and practices. People all over the land were both required to subscribe to Shinto ritual requirements at a community level and forbidden the

1. I follow DUFFY’s definition: “A shared repertoire of symbols, prayers, and beliefs” (1992, p. 3).

mediation of folk religious practitioners such as diviners and shugenja, who had been banned from practicing their trade.

In both countries there existed an extensive local infrastructure directly responsible to the central government, though it was more informal in Tudor England than in Meiji Japan. With both societies “reliant upon local collaboration for the maintenance of ordinary administration” (SHAGAN 2003, p. 2), those responsible for carrying out policy were not necessarily committed to the specifics of either the Reformation or kami-buddha Separation. Certainly several instances have been reported in early 1870s Japan of prefectural officials being suspicious of the officials concerned with religious policy who had been sent to the localities by the central government, and of them obeying the letter rather than the spirit of the laws (FUJII 1977, pp. 4–5). Ultimately it was local community support that was crucial for the success of the Meiji government’s religious policy (as well as its wider reforms), since it was local elites (religious, economic, political) that ensured its integration. This integration was not ultimately the result of an abstract political decree, but the culmination of decisions made by various interest groups and named people, who might be termed “brokers,” in that they negotiated locally for or against the degree of acceptance of outside policy. Nishikawa Sugao may be considered such a “broker.”

In a recent work on the English Reformation, Ethan H. SHAGAN (2003) has brought to the fore issues of resistance and collaboration as keys to explaining the popular reaction to the Reformation. These issues are equally valuable when looking at how the Meiji changes were negotiated at Hagurosan, and no doubt at other places as well. Modern scholarship has hitherto tended to surmise, based on the fact that neither the Reformation nor the Separation policy experienced any overwhelming popular resistance, that people on the whole supported their aims. Local uprisings, such as that at Mikawa in Japan and the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536) in England, were few and not the norm, and even these were not exclusively about religious concerns. Though there was not a great deal of active resistance, examples of passive resistance are much easier to find and give a more nuanced interpretation of the issue of “support.” A very common form of such resistance was procrastination, in the belief that “this world will not ever last,” in the words of the vicar of Stanton Lacy as he pasted slips of paper over the pope’s name in his prayer book (HAIGH 1993, p. 142), or even simple disbelief.² It is in this light that we should understand Hagurosan’s petitions to the central government to have its Buddhist identity recognized and its decision when these were refused to send a number of its statues for safekeeping to the nearby Takadera. A similarly practical regard is perhaps also evident in the example of a wooden nameboard at the Kumano Shrine in what is now known

2. Memorandum (ca 1871) of Chōkin of Enjūin, Hagurosan, quoted in TOGAWA 1986, p. 246. “Have the kami deserted us?... What will happen now? We can only pray that everything will return to what it was before.”

as Takuminomura, near Sarugakyō in Gunma Prefecture, where the designation of Gongen has been covered with a small piece of wood with “Ōkami” written on it.³ Recorded instances of resistance at Hagurosan often are associated with fear of divine retribution, and indeed a reluctance to act often stemmed from what was probably laziness rather than any more exalted motivation. Some of these will be mentioned below.

Rather than asking why there was not more resistance, if traditional practices were so prized, we should perhaps ask what the nature of that consent was. James M. SCOTT points out the ubiquitousness of the “dissembling of the weak in the face of power” (1990, p. 1) and urges the necessity of recognizing the “hidden transcript” behind the public face (“performance”) in transactions between the dominant and subordinate, where open defiance is the exception rather than the rule. Without a “key symbolic act” by a charismatic individual declaring the hidden transcript openly, mass defiance is unlikely. The existence of differing agenda between the dominant and the subordinate explains differing degrees of consent and compliance, and also the bewilderment of the dominant when the subordinate acts contrary to expectations. We will see a good example of this in the relationship between Nishikawa and elite members among the married shugenja of Tōge 手向, the pilgrimage village at the foot of Hagurosan. It is in the context of a consensual relationship between the dominant and the subordinate that the concept of collaboration comes into play. I follow SHAGAN in using the term without negative connotation to describe “political actions in which subjects contribute to the effectiveness of controversial government policies” (2003, p. 13). He points out that collaborators “form symbiotic relationships with authority” and may co-opt that authority for their own ends. Those who supported the new order at Hagurosan may seem to have given in to the demands made on them to adopt a new Shinto guise, but in their own way they used their position within the system to make sure that what to them were the essential elements of the past continued, specifically, as we shall see, their economic base, centering on their traditional “parishes” (*kasumi* 霞, *dannaba* 旦那場) and the religious practice closest to their identity as shugenja, the Akino-mine 秋峰 (Autumn Peak). Shagan also points out the symbiosis that emerges when the two sides experience a “convergence of interests” and quotes Stephen KOTKIN (1995, p. 15): “The presence of coercion, subtle and unsubtle, does not mean the absence of a high degree of voluntarism any more than the holding of genuine ideals precludes the energetic pursuit of self-interest.” We can see this at work at Hagurosan in a situation where people who had no interest in the Shinto underpinnings of the changes there decided to throw in their lot with Nishikawa; their decisions were not the result of outward coercion so much as

3. It reads *Nihon daiichi daireigenjo konpon Kumano sansho* “Ōkami” 日本第一大靈驗所根本熊野三所「大神」(overwriting 権現 *gongen*).

a desire to stabilize their lives in the midst of change. Those who did so, around twenty percent of the total shugenja population of Tōge at the beginning of Meiji, were those in a social and economic position to be able to benefit from their decision. It is equally telling that the majority of shugenja simply gave up their calling, since the new order had nothing to offer them. This pattern is repeated among the village shugenja (*mappa shugen* 末派修験) as well. Though there were a few men at Hagurosan committed to Buddhism, the restoration of the old order and the preservation of the traditions of Haguro Shugendō, they did not have the critical mass to compete with those who eventually affiliated with Ideha Shrine through the confraternity Nishikawa established for them. Yet interestingly, some of the descendants of those “collaborators,” the Tōge shugenja who today run pilgrims’ lodgings (*shukubō* 宿坊) and are affiliated to what is now called Dewa Sanzan Jinja, openly recite the *Heart Sutra* as well as the post-Meiji shrine liturgy when conducting pilgrims to Gassan, and many are reputed to secrete Buddhist images within the Shinto-style altars in their ritual space. Too long a time has passed for them to be called “resistors,” yet an interesting dynamic, even tension, does seem to be emerging between them, as self-professed shugenja, and the shrine hierarchy, for whom Shugendō is ultimately local color and necessarily subordinate to its conservative Shinto.

While insights from the English Reformation are extremely valuable in analyzing the process of kami-buddha separation in Japan, it must be emphasized that there is an essential difference between the Japanese and European experience of religious reform. This revolves around the nature of “belief” and the respective demands of an ostensibly monotheistic religion based upon a single scripture, and of a religious environment where multiple foci of devotion interacted one with the other and where questions of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and assent and dissent over questions of faith and doctrine were not binding on the people at large. Whereas in sixteenth-century Europe religion as represented by the Catholic church was all-pervasive, belief and faith were not the central issues of dispute in Japan. The European Reformation was concerned with the nature of the correct path of religious belief and practice, pitting a “corrupt” traditional religion and its political and economic infrastructure against the responsibility of the individual for his/her own salvation, while the Separation Edicts, which arose out of a temporary coincidence of interests between practical politicians and the religious ideologues who had supported the regime change, did not attack freedom of belief as such, but sought to impose a “correct” interpretation of the objects of belief through the control of ritual space. Ritualists, like the population at large, were free to make a choice—subscribe to the changes and continue to use the same ritual space or decline to subscribe, and lose it. As we shall see, in many instances people voted with their feet when familiar identifications and practices were forbidden them, forcing compromises to occur and continuities to remain. Yet the net result of the legislation did change the

traditional matrix upon which religious culture was based, and the post-Meiji definition of “religion” that replaced it still remains an artificial construct and explains why the Japanese in general do not consider themselves to be “religious,” although they take part in what are widely considered “religious” acts.

Comparatively little study on this topic has been done in Japan. Though there are a number of scattered local studies, no wide-ranging analysis exists for the phenomenon as a whole, though work in this direction has been done by YASUMARU Yoshio (1979) and TAMAMURO Fumio (1977, 1989, 1993). This is in part may be attributed to the sensitivity that still surrounds it as a subject. One problem for researchers is the lack of materials. The multi-volume *Meiji Ishin shinbutsu bunri shiryō* 明治維新神仏分離資料 (MURAKAMI et al., eds., 1970, SBBS) remains the lodestone for scholars in this field, and statistical information can be gleaned from government reports of the time, such as in the *Shaji torishirabe ruisan* 社寺取調類纂 (STSR). Descriptions of local results, in terms of renamed shrines or relocated statues, can be found in local histories. Local historians too, some closely associated with places that had borne the brunt of the legislation's demands, have collected documents and oral traditions that sometimes provide the personal element so hard to find in the Japanese record, unlike the case in England where the opinions and experiences of people on both sides of the religious divide have come down to us: documents such as the memoir of Roger Martyn recalling with nostalgia the religion of his youth (PARKER 1873), the account of the priest Robert Parkyn about the “grievous matters” that had been “brought to pass...to the great discomfort of all such as was true Christians (DICKINS 1947), the fifty-year record through churchwardens’ accounts of the priest of Morebath (DUFFY 2001), and of course the passionate denunciations of John Foxe in his *Acts and Monuments*. Whereas the English Reformation drew forth a voluminous literature from a fairly broad swathe of the literate populace, such does not appear to be the case in Japan. Fundamental differences between Japan and England in how religious attitudes were expressed, and the fact that in Japan the government required institutional and ritual reform that affected priests more than the lay population (who were required to acquiesce to the redefinition of the kami, but upon whom demands based on belief did not tend to threaten well-being) may account for this lack of a personal record.

In the case of the separation of buddha and kami worship at the Shugendō shrine-temple complex of Hagurosan Jakkōji, however, there exists a unique record, a diary (MS) written by Nishikawa Sugao, who in 1873 was appointed head of what had become Ideha Shrine.⁴ Though it is largely a terse description of daily occurrences, it contains transcripts of reports, notices, and letters concerning the process of religious change there, and occasionally we can catch the

4. This unpublished manuscript is in the possession of Dewa Sanzan Jinja. The assistance of the late Abe Yoshiharu 安部吉春 (former *gūji* of the Shrine) in making it available to me is here gratefully acknowledged. Formally called *Yukute no susabi*, referred to as Diary hereafter.

voices of those on the receiving end of his actions, as in the case of a letter sent to him by a group of Haguro shugenja begging him not to exclude them from their traditional sacred places, saying, “to ban the shugen from attendance at the Main Shrine is even more grievous than for a baby to lose its loving mother” (Diary, 3 October 1873). But in general we have to extrapolate emotion from actions, and interpret those actions through a variety of statistical data and the minutiae of official reports. Hagurosan has also been lucky in that it has a local historian, Togawa Anshō 戸川安章, now in his tenth decade, who from an early age made it his concern to preserve Hagurosan documents and to talk to people within whose living memory these events occurred (TOGAWA 1950, 1972, 1973, 1986).

I would like to suggest, to use Haigh’s interpretive structure, that at Hagurosan the separation of buddha and kami worship was a combination of rapid change imposed from above and reluctant and dilatory change from below. Like in the English experience too, for the majority of people it was a change that few understood or wanted. Unlike in England, though, it was only a matter of a few years before people knew the changes there had come to stay. Three key factors that had a bearing on the process of change were the local political, economic, and religious situation, the local reaction, and the attitude of the local authorities. Further local studies following similar interpretive structures should cast a more nuanced light on types of variation according to locality and institution, and the reasons for it.⁵

In the discussion below I will first give a brief description of the shrine-temple complex on Hagurosan as it had evolved down to the Meiji Restoration. I will then look at the tensions imposed by the political changes of 1868 and initial reactions to the Separation Edicts. The main focus of my analysis will however be Nishikawa Sugao’s role in the de facto conversion of Jakkōji to Ideha Shrine, in the course of which I would like to examine the issues of coercion, resistance, collaboration, and brokerage introduced above. I hope also to address crucial areas of similarity and difference between the experiences of enforced religious change in England and Japan, in order to show how local reactions in each society to changes in their traditional religion shared common motivations but were tempered by the inherent differences between what can broadly be described as a belief-based religion and one that was an amalgamation of identifications and practices within which questions of orthodoxy of belief were not so central.

Pre-Meiji Hagurosan

On the eve of the Meiji Restoration, Hagurosan was a mature shrine-temple complex with its organizational roots in the medieval period. Like other religious institutions in Japan its existence was embedded in social interactions, and

5. The most extensive analysis in English to date of local reaction to the Separation Edicts concerns Konpirasan (THAL 2005, pp. 115–201).

its history is closely linked with that of the dominant political power. It makes its first appearance in the national record in the *Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡, in an entry dated Jōgen 3 [1209] 5.5 concerning the ire of its yamabushi at the unauthorized incursion into its domain of the Kamakura-appointed steward,⁶ though its religious identity can be dated to the Heian period, evidenced by mirrors dating from that time deposited in the sacred pond in front of the Main Shrine. Though it may have originated as the *sato no miya* 里宮 (perhaps the Ideha Jinja 伊氏波神社 listed in the “Register of Kami Names” in the *Engishiki* 延喜式, 927) of Gassan 月山 (mentioned in the national histories from the ninth century), it had already become a shrine-temple complex called Hagurosan Jakkōji 羽黒山寂光寺 by 1275.⁷ Its earliest surviving chronological record states that it was patronized by the Hiraizumi Fujiwara around the middle of the twelfth century,⁸ and this pattern of symbiosis with the secular power continued. It was administered by a lay supervisor (*zokubettō* 俗別当) until the late sixteenth century; the appointment of Mutō Masauji, the lord of Daishōji castle (what is now Tsuruoka), in 1470 marked the beginning of a long and fluctuating history of the relationship between Hagurosan and the power that held the Shōnai plain. The first priestly appointee to the office, in 1583, was a Mutō relative called Keishun, who was replaced by the Uesugi with their own nominee when they took over the area in 1589. Keishun was restored when the Mogami defeated the Uesugi in 1598, but internal divisions between supporters of rival Mogami factions then threatened stability. Hagurosan was thus a politicized entity, giving or withholding allegiance and courting the favor of the secular power, with the ultimate aim of securing its prosperity and independence. The institutional reorganization of the complex and its conversion to Tendai by the Bettō Ten'yū 天宥 (1595?-1675) in 1641, subsequent moves to identify the founder with an imperial prince, and the determination of later priests to achieve high shrine ranking for the mountain (which bore fruition under the Bettō Kakujun 覚諄 [1762-1847] in 1823), all of which moved Hagurosan away from its traditional setting onto a broader canvas, can be interpreted as a reaction to a history of strained relations with the local power, the Sakai, who succeeded to the Shōnai domain in 1622.

Hagurosan had no particular sectarian affiliation before the mid-seventeenth century; its lines of ascetic tradition and doctrine were permeated both by Shin-gon and Tendai elements, and, by the sixteenth century, Yoshida Shinto. Jakkōji, as the administrative temple of the Main Shrine, where the kami (*gongen* 権現) of the three mountains of Yudonosan, Gassan, and Hagurosan were vener-

6. 出羽國里山衆徒等群參是所訴地頭大泉二郎氏平也。Here 里 is generally considered to be a transcription error for 黒。Hagurosan lay within the Ōizumi estate.

7. Bell inscription. ST 32, p. 590.

8. *Dewa no kuni Ōizumi sansho gongen engi* 出羽国大泉庄三所権現縁起 (variants entitled *Hagurosan nendaiki* 羽黒山年代記, *Ōizumi sansho gongen engi* 大泉三所権現縁起, *Hagurosan zaichō nendaiki* 羽黒山在序年代記). ST 32, pp. 40-49.

ated, was Shingon, but there also existed Tendai and Zen temples, mainly below the mountain, that were considered to be part of the complex.⁹ Five subtemples belonging to Jakkōji controlled the ritual and religious activities of the mountain, but though they were loosely affiliated with Sanbōin, Tendai ritual and liturgy was not excluded from the Main Shrine. Whatever the nominal affiliation, though, the individual temples were not part of an outside network; Hagurosan was an independent organization without a *honzan*.

Married shugenja were an integral part of the complex; occupying residences (*bō* 坊) on the mountain, in the village of Tōge at its foot, and in villages around northern Japan, they maintained links between the mountain as a religious center and widely scattered “parishes.” Like other Shugendō centers, by the end of the medieval period Hagurosan was increasingly dependent on financial support at a village level through local confraternities (*kō* 講); although the secular power remained an important presence, it could not extend the kind of finances that confraternity members and pilgrims could generate. The land the temple had accumulated (which amounted to fifteen hundred *koku* 石) was confirmed rather than granted by the successive Shōnai lords, so did not represent any expanding financial base, but income from pilgrims grew to the extent it has been estimated by the nineteenth century to have been worth three times the income from the land (TAMAMURO 1995).

As a result of Ten'yū's actions, Hagurosan came under the control of the Tendai temple Tōeizan (Kan'ei) in Edo; after Ten'yū, appointments to the position of Bettō were made by the head of Tōeizan, and since incumbents rarely went to Hagurosan, administrative duties were in the hands of local deputies. This led in time to a number of abuses. Ten'yū had also made the divisions between subtemples of fully ordained Tendai priests and shugen *bō* much greater, and made the mountain the site of priests' residences only. In 1638 he issued parish confirmation documents to holders of parish rights (priests and a small number of shugenja), thus exerting control over parish networks.¹⁰ Priests, who also had Shugendō qualifications, occupied thirty-one subtemples on the mountain, while around three hundred and thirty households of shugenja stood in Tōge. The kami were venerated at the Main Shrine as manifestations of Buddhist divinities (*gongen*) by Buddhist priests according to predominantly Buddhist rites. The most important of the subtemples were the so-called *daisendatsu* 大先達 temples: Hōzen'in 宝前院 (simultaneously the residence of the Bettō, the administrative center of the shrine-temple complex, the head temple of Haguro Shugendō, and a branch temple of Tōeizan), Shōon'in 正穩院, Chiken'in 智憲院, and Kezōin 華藏院. All but three of the subtemples were situated in the mountain; the exceptions were the three funerary temples (*mizuhikidera* 水引寺),

9. *Suichū mondō* 睡中問答 (1560). ST 32, p. 59.

10. Confirmations dated Kanei 15 exist for eighteen shugen (ST 32, pp 364–418). In all, Ten'yū confirmed the *kasumi* of fifteen subtemples and twenty shugen.

Shōzen'in 正善院, Kongōjuin 金剛樹院, and Gomadō 護摩堂 located at the foot of the mountain (they had a symbiotic relationship with two *nenbutsu* temples in the vicinity, since coffins could not be taken into their precincts). The shugenja were married and their positions hereditary; eldest sons were registered at birth and given the five precepts as children. They were allowed to take up their duties as shugenja, including service at the shrine and visiting parishes, after doing the Akinomine in their fifteenth year. Kakujun, the first resident Bettō in over one hundred years, divided the shugenja into two social groups, between which there was a wide social and economic divide. The first was the *onbun* 恩分, about sixty families who were made direct retainers of the Bettō, and who both worked in administrative positions in the Honbō and also managed parishes of supporting households extending throughout north and eastern Japan. The remainder were classed as *hiramonzen* 平門前, and they worked for the subtemples or the *onbun*. Some thirty-five hundred village shugenja (*mappa shugen*) linked Tōge and local adherents, managing temples, chapels or shrines, providing magico-religious services upon request, and acting as guides to Hagurosan in the summer. There were also a small number of shrine priests and miko receiving stipends from Hagurosan; the priests had Shugendō qualifications but never took out Yoshida licenses.

Ten'yū's relations with both Shōnai domain and with the four Shingon temples that controlled rights to perform ritual at Yudonosan had a direct bearing on the fate of Hagurosan in early Meiji. Ten'yū tried a number of times between 1639 and 1665 to impose Tendai rites on Yudonosan and demanded the temples be made direct branch temples of Jakkōji, as he had already succeeded in doing at Hagurosan; the temples however complained to the Bakufu, which rejected the Hagurosan position and confirmed the right of the Shōnai domain to nominate successors to their headships. Domain officials regarded such attacks on the Yudonosan temples as attacks upon the domain itself. Hagurosan's own position was more anomalous. When disputes came before the domain for judgement, Ten'yū regularly sidestepped local officials and went directly to the Bakufu, using the influence of the *monzeki* of Tōeizan, his head temple. This did not endear him or his temple's interests to the Sakai lords of Shōnai. Further acrimony between Hagurosan and Shōnai revolved around the domain's refusal to back Ten'yū's application in 1635 to have the Bakufu confirm the Hagurosan fief. When he tried again in 1665 he sought, through the *monzeki*, the intercession of the *jisha bugyō* in Edo, Inoue Masanori 井上正利, to get the domain's written permission. This was obtained only when Ten'yū agreed to drop his claim to lands along the Shōnai border (ST 32, pp. 437–40). Though the Bakufu commended the land under vermilion seal as a "shrine" holding, not a "temple" holding as Ten'yū had wished, the confirmation clarified Hagurosan's position and removed it from any kind of direct Shōnai control (ST 32, p. 437).

Yudonosan resentment against Hagurosan did not grow less as time passed.

A dispute between the two over entry and ritual performance rights broke out again in 1786, and the temples erected notices at Yudonosan, stressing its Shin-gon identity. The deputy administrator of Hagurosan complained to Shōnai, which denied any support on the grounds the problem was essentially religious. He appealed to the Bakufu in 1791, and the decision eight years later was seen to favor Hagurosan, which promptly banned Yudonosan personnel from entering the shrine on the summit of Gassan. The Yudonosan temples retaliated by harassing Haguro shugenja and pilgrims under the pretext of preventing banditry. By the nineteenth century, pilgrims as a matter of course changed their style of clothing when descending from Gassan to Yudonosan.

Another occurrence that had crucial repercussions in the early Meiji period was the raising of the shrine's rank by the court in 1823. Kakujun, whose policy this was, had arrived at Hagurosan in 1813 with orders to regularize affairs on the mountain, which were in considerable disarray at the time. The institutional reforms he put in place tightened the Bettō's control and limited internal disputes. He initiated a harsh economizing policy and revamped, as we have seen, the social structure. By making senior shugenja directly responsible to him, he was able to bypass the authority of the more powerful subtemples on the mountain, which had been accused of fraud and other irregularities going back decades, and quell the considerable local opposition his reforms had aroused. The Main Shrine had burned down twice between 1796 and 1811; it was rebuilt in 1820, at which time Kakujun applied to have it formally recognized as the Ideha Jinja of the Englishiki. He also sought to have the legendary founder of Haguro Shugendō, Nōjo Taishi 能除太子, acknowledged as the imperial prince Hachiko 蜂子 and given bodhisattva rank in the same way En no Gyōja had in 1799. In 1823 the court granted the title of Shōken Daibosatsu to Nōjo Shōja (not Prince Hachiko!) and raised "Ideha Jinja Haguro Sansho Daigongen" to Senior First Rank (ST 32, pp. 478–88).

The most important ritual for shugenja was the Akinomine 秋峰, since it determined ranking. It was held annually from the twentieth of the seventh month to the fourth of the eighth month at three different ritual sites in the vicinity of Hagurosan. The so-called "first lodging" was held at the residence of the *daisendatsu*, the ritual leader, a position held in turn by each of the four *sendatsu* temples. The bulk of the practice (7.24 to 8.1) took place at the Buchūdō, at Fukigoshi on the way to the inner precinct. The third lodging was at a place called Daiman, on the pilgrimage route to Gassan, and it was from here that shugenja visited the most sacred site of all, Sangozawa. Ritual practice combined journeys to sacred places in the mountains and the performance of purificatory and incantatory rites centered on the Lotus repentance ritual (*Hokke senbō* 法華懺法). An outdoor fire ritual called *saitō goma* was held on 8.1 and marked the transition between the second and third lodgings. Ritual attention during the Akinomine was focused on the founder, whose cult had been fostered by Ten'yū

and reinforced after the granting of the bodhisattva title in 1823. Meiji reformers were not able to do away with the Akinomine and devotion to the founder and so both were absorbed into the religious structure and doctrine of the shrine, albeit in a new guise.

Hagurosan and the Separation Orders

Kanden 官田 (1800–1872), Hagurosan's last Bettō, took up his position in November 1861 (Bunkyū 1.10). The appointment was a reward for the services he had rendered the young Rinnōji no miya, Kōgen 広現 (1847–1895) as tutor, but it was not the easy retirement that he had probably envisaged. Relations with the Yudonosan temples remained uneasy and those with the Shōnai domain complicated. Though Hagurosan was virtually independent of the domain, it was still closely tied to it as a minor regional power in that it occupied an important strategic position on its eastern border. In May 1868, Shōnai joined the Alliance of Northeastern Domains to fight for the continuation of Tokugawa rule. Since Hagurosan was traditionally part of Shōnai military planning (though not subject to its orders), Kanden was asked to allow shugenja volunteers to play a role in domain defence. He refused on the grounds that their first duty was to the kami of the three mountains.¹¹ Activists from among leading *onbun* households led by the *toshiyori* Harada Kenmotsu, a vociferous Tokugawa supporter, formed an anti-Kanden faction and established illegal contacts with the domain (ABE 1941, p. 206). A meeting was held in Tōge, where the shugenja decided to volunteer with or without the Bettō's permission. The domain set up a drill ground in the grounds of Kitanoin 北之院, one of the three subtemples that made up the inner precinct of Hagurosan, Kōtakuji 荒沢寺. Trees were felled without permission to make targets and barracks and wild shooting was heard at night. Facing a breakdown of hierarchy and discipline, Kanden complained to the domain in September 1868:

Recently, in making provision for war, I understand you have instructed my retainers to undertake gunnery training. Such training is a matter apart from their religious duties. Harada, alleging illness, told us he would remain at home, yet he has appeared at gunnery training. Moreover he has told those there that they should resign from their temple duties, feigning illness. These men have now stopped performing their religious duties. Further, on 5.28 (July 17) a number of people violently entered the Honbō, but the senior official (that is, Harada) made no investigation.... I must depend upon the authority of the domain lord to control the situation here and ask that you send officials to ascertain the rights and wrongs of the matter so peace may return to the mountain. (ABE 1941, p. 208)

11. Oral testimony of Hayasaka Eikō, quoted in HAGUROCHŌ YAKUBA, ed. 1994, p. 6.

In his defiance of Kanden, Harada seems to have been confident of Sakai support, perhaps to the extent of overturning Kanden's authority. Kanden privately discussed resigning over the issue with the three senior *sendatsu*, who then conferred with Harada, who refused any compromise, saying Kanden was hated by the domain lord. In what seems to have been an atmosphere of passionate excitement, shugenja put pressure on their fellows to join them and suspected betrayal all around them. The incident that Kanden cited of a break-in at the Honbō seems to have been an act of intimidation: a story passed down among the people of Tōge down tells that supporters of firearms training entered the Honbō and smeared faeces on the bedding of one of the officials who had refused to join the group (TOGAWA 1972, pp. 186–87). The atmosphere of suspicion and the breakdown of social cohesion is well illustrated by a further incident cited by Kanden in a memorandum accompanying his letter.

On 6.5 the *onbun* Miyata Gozaemon complained at a meeting held at Shōzen'in (one of the Tōge subtemples) that he and his son had been refused guns because he had been accused of giving information to the authorities. Honma Magobe accused Miyata of lying and threatened to decapitate him if he did not confess. This annoyed Miyata greatly. (ABE 1941, p. 208)

Severe economic problems as much as patriotic enthusiasm may have contributed to the situation. Relief rice had been distributed in June 1868 and the Kanden stated explicitly to the domain that the Honbō was in no position to loan more rice or money to the trainees. Promises by Harada of rice and samurai privileges to trainees may have attracted both shugen and *chōnin* support. Senior priests advising Kanden in fact were convinced that economic problems rather than political motivations were at the root of the situation, and suggested that the unease that lower-ranking shugen felt about the future might be relieved by the further distribution of relief rice and making payment for certain jobs (ABE 1941, p. 205–208). Despite official disapproval, a Haguro troop of seventy-one men fought for Shōnai, while local lore says that only two *onbun* remained working at the Honbō (TOGAWA 1972, p. 186). This experience of Tokugawa loyalism at Hagurosan contrasts strongly for instance with the experience of Hikosan, another important Shugendō complex, many of whose shugenja were closely involved with the imperial loyalist movement and whose adverse experiences with the Tokugawa authorities in the Bakumatsu period colored their positive reaction to the new religious order. Hagurosan had never been a part of the nativist circles of scholarship that existed in the Shōnai area among some shrine priests and merchants who were followers of Suzuki Shigetane 鈴木重胤 (1812–1863), and so there was no inherent core of support for Shinto.

Following the unconditional surrender of the domain on 12 November 1868, an administration office (*minseikyoku*) was set up in Sakata, and as a recipient of a shogunal land grant, Hagurosan fell under its direct supervision. It was

from here that it officially received the Separation Orders in June 1869,¹² fifteen months after they were first promulgated. There had been two pivotal acts: one, the requirement that Buddhist priests serving the kami (*shasō* 社僧, *bettō* 別当) laicize in order to serve the kami as *kannushi* 神主 and *shanin* 社人 (9 April 1868,¹³ reiterated 25 May 1868¹⁴) and the other, the requirement that all statues and implements associated with Buddhism be removed from shrines, together with the prohibition of the use of Buddhist titles such as Gongen or Bosatsu for kami (20 April 1868,¹⁵ reiterated 16 May 1868¹⁶ and 20 August 1869¹⁷). It was the former that was transmitted to Kanden by the Minseikyoku.

Hagurosan, as a shrine-temple complex, and its priests who served the kami as Gongen at the Main Shrine were clearly subject to the letter of the legislation. Temples such as Hieizan, whose priests served in the shrines of protector deities, could survive either by removing the shrines from their land, or declaring the shrines to be separate and giving them over to their traditional sacerdotal lineages. Indeed, Hieizan, now the de facto Tendai head temple following the destruction of Tōeizan, sent out a letter to its branch temples August 1869 warning against panic-stricken laicisation of priests and stating “Though the orders have demanded the separation of buddhas and kami, they do not imply the destruction of temples” (ABE 1941, pp. 210–211). However it was not apparent how Hagurosan could survive in its present configuration; its only option was to have itself recognized as a temple, yet this would mean a redefinition of its cult and certainly the removal of all kami related sites—including the Main Shrine, the central and most imposing building in the complex, and the *raison d'être* for its existence. In October 1869, Kanden sought permission to travel to Tokyo to “consult about the government orders,” presumably with his head temple and perhaps with his former pupil Kōgen. This was refused and he was reprimanded, and indeed Kōgen himself was soon to return to lay life, eventually to become Prince Kitashirakawa, and Tōeizan, already with much of its fabric lost as a result of fighting in 1868, was deprived of its *honzan* status the following April.

Hieizan appealed to the Dajōkan twice to allow Hagurosan to remain Buddhist, in October 1869 and March 1870, and senior officials from Hagurosan went to Tokyo to present their petitions. As Kakujun had succeeded in having Haguro Gongen recognized as Ideha Jinja, however, Hagurosan had in fact little

12. Sakata Minseikyoku directed to village officials and farmers' representatives in Akumi-gun and Yuri-gun, dated Meiji 2.5. Quoted in ABE 1941, pp. 209–210. The order forwarded was the Dajōkan edict of 25 May 1868 (see note 14 below).

13. Jingi jimukyoku, No. 165, Keiō 4.3.17. (YASUMARU, ed., 1988, p. 425.)

14. Dajōkan, No. 280, Keiō 4.int.4.4 (YASUMARU, ed., 1988, p. 426).

15. Dajōkan, No.196, Keiō 4.3.28 (YASUMARU, ed. 1988, p. 425).

16. Dajōkan (unnumbered), Keiō 4.4.24 (YASUMARU, ed. 1988, p. 426).

17. Naimushō No. 769, Meiji 2.7.13 (YASUMARU, ed. 1988, p. 426).

to stand on, and the petitions were rejected. At the end of October, Kanden and the heads of Shōon'in, Shōzen'in, and Danjoin were ordered to appear at the prefectural office in Sakata to make application to laicize in order to continue their duties as shrine priests. There is no documentary evidence concerning why they agreed to laicize. Togawa, however, refers to a memorandum made by his father, Shimazu Dendō 島津伝道 of Shōzen'in, recording conversations with former subtemple heads and shugenja that indicate senior officials of the temple had decided to go along with what they considered would be a temporary imperial restoration as a way of tiding things over until the Tokugawa house should return to power (TOGAWA 1986, p. 251). That this decision was not easily accepted is evidenced by the fact that Kōkan, head of Shōon'in, who went with Kanden to Sakata to laicize (as Masaki Hiromi), attempted suicide a few months later, reputedly distressed at having had to give up Buddhism. Ironically he was the last to act as *daisendatsu* of the Akinomine in its traditional form (1873).

Kanden was appointed head of the new Ideha Jinja, and the Buddhist priests who had laicized were appointed *negi* 禰宜 (senior priest), *gonnegi* 権禰宜 (assistant senior priest), or *shuten* 主典 (priest), depending on their former status.¹⁸ Only five men retained their Buddhist identity: two were priests of temples (Kōtakuji and Kongōjuin) not directly affected by the Separation Orders, being outside shrine precincts, and another was the priest in charge of the Founder's Hall. With Jakkōji abolished, the shugenja were advised to affiliate with the Tendai sect through Kōtakuji. Kanden had hoped to preserve as much of the Buddhist and Shugendō past as possible, and had promised at a meeting of all those associated with the complex that a number of temples and sacred sites associated with Shugendō would be preserved, and that statues, implements and records would be stored at Kōtakuji. Change apparently remained cosmetic, and reports of rituals from 1871 and 1872 show that they were conducted according to Buddhist rites by the former Buddhist priests using their full Buddhist titles.¹⁹ A report in the *Meiji Ishin shinbutsu bunri shiryō* states:

The changes were in fact on the surface; everything continued in much the same manner as the past. The priests would wear the robes of a *kannushi* when serving at the shrine, but did not abandon their Buddhist robes for everyday wear.... Food offerings were supposed to include fish and fowl, but the ex-Buddhists hesitated to do so since previously such food had been considered impure and was strictly forbidden. They were afraid of the anger of Haguro Gongen. Since they were reluctant to disobey a government order, they made

18. A certificate giving the senior priest Kezōin permission to laicize as Hanaoka Yasuki is extant, signed Sakata-ken and dated Meiji 3.10 (November 1870). TOGAWA 1986, p. 251.

19. Rebuilding of the Bentendō (ostensibly Itsukushima Jinja), Meiji 4.5.8; Akinomine 1871–1873; funeral of Kanden, March 1872.

fowl of paper and fish of wood and presented that. Hagurosan was a shrine to outward appearances, but a temple within. (SBBS, vol. 2, p. 1020)

Nishikawa Sugao, appointed successor to Kanden in 1873, confirms this.

The Shrine Office (Honbō) formerly belonged to the fully-ordained Tendai priests; they laicized in name only, and Buddhist statues, goma platforms and ritual implements are still in place. The *shōji* and ceilings are black with incense. (Diary, 20 September 1873)

Even the priests who have recently laicized and are now serving the kami wear hakama and haori in public when they serve at the shrine, but when they return to their dwellings they wear Buddhist robes and perform goma rituals. Buddhist statues in the shrine precincts and the Buddhist altar in the Shrine Office remain unmoved. All my three meals were vegetarian and I did not so much as lay eyes on anything like fish.

(Diary, Letter to Inoue Yorikuni and Tokoyo Nagatane, 10 October 1873)

It is extremely unlikely that the government order of December 1872 that all shrines should follow state ritual was obeyed, despite the compromise over ritual offerings; in September 1873, Nishikawa stated explicitly that he was conducting Shinto rites for the first time (Diary, 21 September 1873).

Kanden died in March 1872. The funeral ceremonies that followed reflected inherent continuities with the Buddhist past. The former heads of the major ten subtemples conducted his body to his residence, where the wake was held. The body was then moved to the inner sanctuary of the temple, where for seven days priests chanted the daily liturgy, including the *Hokke senbō*, the *Amida Sutra*, and the *Kannon Sutra*, in front of it. The funeral itself was held at the former Honbō (now ostensibly the Shrine Office), where the *honjibutsu* 本地仏 of the deities of the three mountains were still enshrined, though normally hidden behind sliding doors with a curtain in front. Kanden's body, dressed in Buddhist robes, was placed before the now displayed images. Present were all the former priests, most wearing Buddhist robes, the *onbun* shugen in formal samurai dress and lower-ranking shugen wearing yamabushi dress. The service was based on the Mantra of Light; sand was sprinkled on the body to enable it to attain rebirth in the Pure Land. After cremation, the remains were enshrined in the Honbō for forty-nine days, after which they were buried in a grave marked by a Mantra of Light stone tower.

No immediate appointment was made to replace Kanden and the senior priest, Hanaoka Yasunori 花岡安記, the former priest of the *daisendatsu* temple Kezōin, took over the daily running of the shrine. There was considerable hope that this signalled the imminent reconstitution of the Buddhist identity of the mountain.

Nishikawa Sugao and Hagurosan

In the course of 1872 a series of new government initiatives regarding religion took place. The Kyōbushō 教部省 was constituted in April to deal with both shrine and Buddhist affairs, an evangelist (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職) system of fourteen ranks to be attained through examination, which involved Buddhist as well as Shinto priests, was set up in May, and the Three Principles (revering the kami, honoring the ethic of loyalty, and protecting the state) were laid down as the basis for their teaching in June. The same month all Shinto priests were declared to be *kyōdōshoku*. while the establishment of the Daikyōin as their institutional base was promulgated in December and inaugurated a month later. *Kyōdōshoku* were encouraged to return to their own areas and set up *kyōkai* 教会 as local teaching centers.

The Daikyōin was funded through contributions from shrines and temples, a Kyōbushō order of October 1872 having stipulated that it was to receive forty percent of the income of official shrines. The appointment of Mishima Michitsune 三島通庸 (1835–1888) to the Kyōbushō in November resulted in a stronger anti-Buddhist and pro-Shinto policy, and he encouraged the development of a network of regional and prefectural teaching centers to link up with the Daikyōin. He also encouraged a series of senior appointments to major popular shrines like Hagurosan, Asama and Kotohira, and this was certainly related to the need to funnel financial resources to the center. The appointment in March 1863 of Nishikawa Sugao as *gūji* 宮司 of Ideha Jinja, newly ranked *kokuhei shōsha* 国幣小社 (small national shrine), should be seen in this context.

Nishikawa (1838–1906) was a native of Ogi in Kyushu and was closely associated from at least 1856 with Shibata Hanamori 柴田花守 (1809–1890), a Hirata-influenced Kokugaku scholar, a central figure in the Shintoization of the Fuji confraternities, and the eventual founder of Jikkōkyō 実行教. He was appointed to the religious affairs section of Saga domain in June 1869 as a religious expositor (*gakkō kyōdōshoku*), to the Jingikan in Tokyo in August 1870 as an evangelist, and following the downgrading of the Jingikan, he was seconded to Imari prefecture (Saga's successor), where part of his duties involved investigating the degree of kami-buddha separation in temples and shrines there (Diary, 25 September 1873).

During his stay in Tokyo he had been closely involved with Hirata scholars of an activist bent; he was one of a group who denounced as heretical the teachings of Ōkuni Takamasa 大国隆正 (1792–1871), criticized Ono Jushin and other Confucianists in the Jingikan, and in the company of Tokoyo Nagatane 常世長胤 performed a memorial rite at the grave of Kamo no Mabuchi in Shinagawa (Tokoyo 1983, pp. 196, 197). He was appointed *gūji* of "Ideha Jinja" in March 1873, with the specific brief of "taking the yamabushi in hand" (Tokoyo 1983, p.

221), and arrived the following September after a short stay in Sendai on official business.²⁰

Nishikawa's thoroughgoing ritual and administrative changes at Hagurosan earned him a reputation as an iconoclast.

Seeing the situation he was feverish to change things and promptly set about to do so. He disposed of the Buddhist temples and halls and destroyed many things. The separation of buddhas and kami at Hagurosan took place after he arrived. (SBBS, vol. 2, p. 1021)

His Diary does not refer to iconoclasm per se nor to the kinds of coercion that the SBBS details (see below) but concentrates on his day to day negotiations with local shugen who had been officials of the temple under the old order, to persuade them to give up their Tendai affiliation and to bring them into the new order. In the records of his exchanges with local people and in his letters and reports to Tokyo he appears as a broker, not forcing but negotiating change. An interesting story is told that this man, to whom words were so important, was unable to speak for three days after he had insisted on being taken to one of the most secret of all the sacred sites on Gassan (TOGAWA 1972, pp. 251–52). But by the time the SBBS reports were being collected, he had become the demonic symbol of all the changes that kami-buddha separation brought to Hagurosan, and thus he remains today. The wider question of demonization, as represented by the example of Nishikawa, is worthy of more detailed study.²¹

When Nishikawa arrived in Hagurosan in September 1873, all former priests still occupied their subtemples, to which they had title to under the agreement negotiated by Kanden, while administration both of the shrine and village remained in the hands of the same *onbun* officials. Nishikawa was escorted from Tsuru(ga)oka to Hagurosan by the *gonnēgi* Kurobane Konomo, a former priest (Danjoin), and received at the Shrine Office with such politeness that Nishikawa commented “I told them that such formality was the custom of former times and that in this new age it is desirable that things be done in a much simpler fashion. However, they did not listen but just kept on bowing” (Diary, 13 September 1863). “Listening” in fact became a contentious point; Nishikawa was often frustrated by differences between what he thought had been agreed and what people actually did. Instances of “convergence of interests” that we will examine below highlight the fact that each side, though following similar courses of action, ultimately had quite different agendas: Nishikawa wanted to

20. STSR *Yamagata jō*, 42. Notice signed by Hirayama and Ōtori, July 31 1873. The Diary contains a full account of this trip.

21. The concept of “demonization” is not necessarily recent. The SBBS (II, pp. 796–97) reports that local people in Nikkō called Abe Hiroshi, newly appointed *gonnēgi* at Futara Shrine a “demon” (*akuma* 悪魔) for forcing Kami-Buddha separation there.

bring the light of the new age to a benighted bastion of the past and the people of Tōge wanted to preserve as much of that past as possible.

With one exception, no one among the old priestly and administrative hierarchy demonstrated positive enthusiasm for the changes that Nishikawa had come to implement. That exception was Sugawara Nagane 菅原長根 (1833–1899), formerly head of the *daisendatsu* temple Chiken'in and as one of the senior priests was made *negi* when Ideha Shrine came into being. Unlike his peers Hanaoka Yasunori (d. 1906; formerly the head of Kezōin) and Masaki Hiromi (d. 1886), who remained sympathetic to the Buddhist and Shugendō past, Sugawara reacted strongly against it, and attempted to distance himself from it even before Nishikawa came. At Kanden's funeral in March 1872, which, as we have seen, was held at the Honbō before the buddhas of the three mountains according to full Buddhist ritual, Sugawara attended but took no formal part like the other two *daisendatsu* temple heads, and was dressed not as a Buddhist priest but as a Haguro yamabushi. He may have been hoping to be nominated Kanden's successor. Again, though it was his turn, as Chiken'in, to act as *daisendatsu* for the 1873 Akinomine, he declined, and was on hand when Nishikawa arrived in September.

Because Nishikawa's actions on arriving at Hagurosan exhibit a great amount of local knowledge, we must presume the existence of a local informant. It cannot have been by chance, for instance, that Nishikawa scheduled his "new-style festival and lecture-series" at the Main Shrine on September 21 when he could be assured of a captive audience.

Because this was the day between the first and second lodgings of the Akinomine, the shrine was crowded within and without with well-wishers, young and old, men and women, who had come from all directions...and so I have chosen it for the occasion of the revised shrine ritual.

(Diary, 21 September 1873)

Nishikawa was certainly in close touch with the newly-appointed *gongūji* 権宮司 (assistant chief priest), Kojima Takaaki 児島高明, who was a local man; little is known about him, but a reference in the Diary suggests he may have been a brother of Tanabe Gihei 田辺義兵 (1825–1895), who with Matsudaira Chikahiro 松平親壞 (1838–1914; the former *karō* 家老, or domain elder) dominated Shōnai affairs, which might explain the appointment. Kojima, however, does not seem to have had any long-standing ties with Hagurosan, and indeed seemed intent on spending as much time as possible at his own home in Tsuru(ga)oka. Where, then, did Nishikawa get his information from? Was it perhaps Sugawara? There is no certain answer. Nishikawa did not show any particular favor to Sugawara, and indeed was in closer daily contact with Hanaoka Yasunori. Yet Sugawara or not, there was someone who had provided detailed local knowledge to Nishi-

kawa before his arrival, which suggests collaboration more than the more general reluctant compliance.

In the discussion that follows, rather than presenting a chronological account of Nishikawa's actions at Hagurosan, I will highlight six specific points of contact and friction to demonstrate aspects of the issues of coercion, resistance, collaboration, and brokerage, specifically confrontations over iconoclasm, the question of meat-eating, the conversion of the Founder's Hall into a shrine, the Shintoization of the Akinomine, tensions over the economic implications of the new order for individual shugena, and confrontations with Buddhist supporters.

Iconoclasm: No act is more symbolic of religious change than iconoclasm, and it is in terms of iconoclasm that Nishikawa is most often portrayed. But behind the instances that I will introduce below we also get hints of how the changes appeared to the local people. According to local lore, prior to the Shinto ritual on 21 September, Nishikawa had all Buddhist statues removed from the one hundred and thirteen halls on the mountain, eighty-five of which he then demolished. The SBBS (vol. 2, p. 1022) reports that at this time he also ordered laborers to throw into the valley the large number of stone Jizō statues that lined the path leading from Hagurosan to Gassan. No mention of such actions is made in his Diary, and there is no independent evidence that he was responsible, but a large group of mutilated Jizō statues reputedly recovered from the valley behind the shrine²² can be found beside the Reisaiden (near the Main Shrine) where they are central to a *mizuko kuyō* 水子供養 cult. Another informative episode in the creation of the Nishikawa legend is related to the stone Enma statue that sits today in the grounds of the Koganedō, administered by Shōzen'in.

A great stone statue of Enma stood near the Fugendō. After he had read a *norito* before it, Nishikawa had it surrounded by a wooden fence. This met with opposition. Nishikawa called stonemasons and ordered them to break it up, but they feared Enma's anger and would not touch it. Nishikawa was perplexed; afterwards it was moved secretly to another place.

(SBBS, vol. 2, p. 1022)

Another, probably later, more embroidered version says that when Nishikawa ordered the statue destroyed, no stone mason would touch it, fearing divine punishment. Therefore he read a *norito* before it and announced that as a result the statue's spirit had been removed. Reluctantly a frightened workman took a chisel to the stone. No sooner had he done so, Enma opened an eye and called out, "That hurts." Nishikawa was scared out of his wits, and decided not to touch the statue further (TOGAWA 1972, pp. 6–7). Two points are of interest here, the attitude of the workmen, and the way in which local lore increasingly showed Nishikawa to be frightened of the Haguro deities. Nishikawa the

22. Oral communication from shrine *hafuri* Yōseibō, September 1993.

destructive outsider is no match against the locals, and by extension we may infer that his new Shinto cannot withstand the power of the old kami. Yet probably it is the Nishikawa who allowed statues to be moved to new locations, as in the case of Gohō Dōji to the nearby Ganzan Daishidō (TOGAWA 1972, p. 106), rather than the Nishikawa who destroyed them, who is closer to the actuality of the man himself.

The participation of local people in the removal of statues is also suggested. For example, it is related that the statue of the Founder remained even after its hall was converted to a shrine (see below). It was only when “a certain person who disliked the situation” appealed to the *gūji* (unspecified) that it was taken out and pushed under the floor of the hall and screened from sight. The carpenters who did the job always declared later that they could not wait for the Founder to see the light of day once more (TOGAWA 1972, pp. 56–57). The Diary (15 June) says no more than that Nishikawa discussed what to do about the statue with Haga Kyūbei, one of the leading *onbun*. Opportunism, of the kind that did not prevent devout Catholics buying up monastic property in England, is also to be found. For example, it was not unusual for those who worked at the Honbō to take things home saying they were “looking after” them, and when an unnamed *onbun* shugenja cut down a valuable bell that hung in a gateway near the Jōkadō at Kōtakuji citing a similar motivation it caused general amusement (TOGAWA 1972, pp. 150–52). However, there seems to have been a widespread feeling that ordinary people should not possess sacred objects, and there are numerous tales about the misfortunes that befell those who had done so. Togawa cites the reason that antique shops in Tōge always went bankrupt was that they were cursed for selling Buddhist statues, sutras, and implements (TOGAWA 1972 p. 264).

These instances of iconoclasm may belong more to the realm of legend than history, but they reward analysis for the light they throw both on relationship between “dominant” and “subordinate,” and the way the latter is able to suborn the former. There was little active opposition to Nishikawa’s measures, but not a lot of evidence of much enthusiasm either. Ordinary people resented the changes, and expressed this resentment in terms of divine power, which humbled Nishikawa on the one hand and rained down retribution on ordinary people on the other.

The Question of Meat-eating: Another point of tension that allows us to see more clearly some of the motivations of the local people is the *naorai* 直会 (a communal meal taking place after the ritual where the food and sake offered to the kami are served to those who participated) that was held after the revised ritual on 21 September. Nishikawa noted:

The shrine priests here, though laicized, had never before eaten fish or fowl, or even eggs. Buddhist priests in other places may have secretly eaten such things, but here this precepts has been strictly kept, for they were fearful about

breaking the admonishment of the kami. I told them that things have now changed and strongly urged them to eat. (Diary, 21 September 1873)

Bream, trout and duck were served at the *naorai* and I encouraged all the priests to eat them. The response was anything but uniform; some felt ill, some refused to eat at all, and some ate well, relishing the taste for the first time.

(Diary, 10 October 1873)²³

Interestingly, the SBBS account treats this as an instance of coercion, saying that Nishikawa forced the food down the mouths of those who refused to eat. Probably we should regard this as another example of how local lore has dramatized the incident and demonized Nishikawa, rather than as an accurate account. Following the meal, a number of the guests wrote *waka* to celebrate the “return” of Shinto to Hagurosan. The only one by one of the former priests that Nishikawa recorded was by Sugawara Nagane. It was not particularly original but it echoed the sentiments Nishikawa wanted to hear.

It has changed now,
The Law transmitted here:
Now we worship the kami.

The former priests, with official or semi-official positions at the shrine, had to follow Nishikawa’s requirements; the degree of compliance they probably exhibited is nicely summarized metaphorically in the description of how they reacted at the *naorai*.

Conversion of the Founder’s Hall: Nishikawa believed that the *onbun*, because of the economic interests they controlled, were the key to converting Hagurosan, whose economic prosperity depended on the income generated by their parishes. This income was all the more vital because its land (assessed at fifteen hundred *koku*) had been taken over by the local authority in 1871, though stipendiary compensation based on half the former income was disbursed through 1873. Thus for Nishikawa the situation was grave, since it was not until September 1874 that the government announced financial support for imperial shrines (Hagurosan had been ranked one in March 1873). Also, given the financial uncertainty of the new government, as well as the financial burden the support of the Daikyōin placed on shrines, it was wise to seek out separate sources of income, and this is what the parishes represented. Since income from parishes was still the private possession of the shugenja who owned their stock, it was imperative for the financial security of the shrine that Nishikawa direct this resource to the shrine. (Parishes belonging to the subtemples were probably already integrated

23. Letter to Inoue Yorikuni and Tokyo Nagatae at the Kyōbushō. He added “This will help you gauge the situation here.”

with the shrine, though I have seen no firm documentation of this.) In short, Nishikawa was concerned both to secure government funding by increasing the shrine's ranking and to encourage the continuation of the lucrative income from pilgrims and from the sale of talismans (*ofuda* お札) in the parishes. What he did not envisage was the unwillingness of the shugenja to alter their traditional financial relationship with the Honbō/Shrine Office (see below).

A crucial move by Nishikawa in his wooing of those who were the village elite and opinion-makers, was his publication on 24 September of a list of shrine offices and responsibilities. The speed with which this was done and his selection of men to fill the posts again argues of considerable inside information. He gave supervisory positions to the senior of the former priests (the *daisendatsu*) and to eight *onbun shugen* who represented some of the most prominent families in Tōge, and who had been senior officials in the Honbō. The employment of such men, while confirming long-standing offices, doubtless was a conscious effort to win the allegiance of a powerful sector of the community to the new order. The *onbun* for their part were proud of their family status (linked as it was to the means of livelihood) and supported Nishikawa to preserve that status;²⁴ nevertheless, they were reluctant to support fundamental change, such as the conversion of the Founder's hall to a shrine, and the Shintoization of the Akino-mine. Common prudence, self-interest, and cautious compliance marked local reaction at Hagurosan, in the same way they have been shown to have marked local reaction to the English Reformation.

At this point, the shugenja themselves seem not to have considered the implications of affiliation to the shrine. They still thought that past practices would be allowed to continue based on Kanden's disposition. Therefore they regarded their relationship with Nishikawa to revolve around the two points of retaining the sites and goods associated with Shugendō, and acknowledging the existence of the Founder's Hall as its ritual center. Following the ban of Shugendō itself in 1872, such a demand was anomalous to countenancing the coexistence of Buddhism, since this was the only way Shugendō could now exist. The prefecture had demanded that all goods belonging to the Honbō be given over to the shrine, and this evoked a complaint by Jibō 自坊, an *onbun shugen* who had taken full Tendai ordination in 1872, to Enryakuji in July 1873. He seems to have assumed that since kami-buddha separation had been actualized by the appointment of Nishikawa, there could be no objection to passing over the goods "necessary for the administration of Jakkōji." Yet Jakkōji had been abolished with the conversion to Ideha Jinja, and so to refer to it was tantamount to asserting that Buddhism still had a right to exist in parallel with the shrine. Nishikawa though was adamant that there could be no question of any Buddhist presence in close association with the shrine and refused to discuss the issue at all,

24. Oral communication from Gotō Takeshi of Tōge, former *gonnegi*, Dewa Sanzan Jinja. August 1996.

dismissing such requests as a plot to return Hagurosan to Buddhism,²⁵ a subject to which he constantly returned. He also objected to the way Enryakuji had been brought into negotiations about the Buddhist goods and so stood on formality, saying regretfully if Jibō had asked privately the matter could have been dealt with between them, but as it was it was out of his hands. More and more he was convinced he was on a knife-edge between the success and failure of Shinto,²⁶ and this success or failure was symbolized for him by his ability to bring the shugenja over to the shrine.

To remove the possibility of (Buddhist) Shugendō surviving in close proximity to the shrine, he announced on 18 September his plan to return the Founder's bodhisattva title to the court and have him declared a kami, as an imperial prince (as we have seen, Ten'yū, and later Kakujun, had tried to have the founder recognized as Prince Hachiko in order to raise the temple's status). This would mean converting the Founder's hall to a shrine. Jibō had already expressed the desire of the shugenja that it remain as it was, since it was sufficiently secluded from the Main Shrine by "gates and a wall." Thus the shugenja did not take the news well; Nishikawa reported "they did not say anything but frowned and looked extremely alarmed." The following day he called them back and told them they were betraying the Haguro kami by maintaining their Buddhist status and threatened them with the loss of their livelihoods, since they could not, he said, distribute Hagurosan talismans in their parishes legally as Buddhists. He accused them, using Buddhist terminology, of the "three poisons" of anger, greed and stupidity: of "daring to raise thoughts of struggle," "forgetting their debt of gratitude to the kami," and thinking only of their own economic gain. However, he offered them a way out of their predicament—"Let all those with faith in the Three Mountains enter our *kyōkai* 教会 (confraternity), and reverently accept Shinto, for when the principle of obedience to the imperial law is lodged firmly in your hearts, and you are no longer confused about life and death, the Shrine will undoubtedly prosper." But, he added, he was not forcing those who did not believe; whether they accepted or not was completely up to them (Diary, 9 September 1873).

Another important node in the negotiation between Nishikawa and the shugenja developed as a result of this. On 3 October he received a petition signed by twenty-seven shugenja, mostly *onbun* and including all but one who had been appointed to office on 24 September. They asked him to postpone his decision regarding the Founder's Hall, stressing that Hagurosan had been a Buddhist mountain for more than a thousand years and that the founder himself was a Buddhist practitioner. "We would lose our heart's purpose," they said, if

25. Diary, 2 October 1873. Letter to Kuroda Kiyotsuna and Mishima Michitsune. "The three hundred shugen, still not liberated from deep-rooted evils, have mostly affiliated with Tendai and are planning to make Buddhism prosperous here again."

26. Diary, 4 October 1873. Letter to Ōtori Sessō, Tanaka Yoritsune, and Motoori Toyokai.

the founder was made a kami. “We cannot place any reliance on the kami alone, but only on Shōken Daibosatsu.” They used the example of the Daikyōin to add strength to their argument, to indicate the possibility of joint worship, and said that although they were willing to modernize their customs, they could not depend on the continuing support of the parishes if restructuring took place. Here was a veiled threat to the economic well-being of the mountain (Diary, 3 October 1873).

Nishikawa was furious. Not only had those he had made shrine officials signed the petition, but they had also leaked information to the shugenja at large. Moreover, since they had accepted paid positions in the new shrine organization they should know better than to jeopardize the shrine’s prosperity by encouraging its dismemberment. In fact, they were duplicitous.

If you are serious about entering the Buddhist Way, how can you distribute (shrine) talismans and receive shrine stipends? This is not the terms of the reform. It is the same with the Founder’s Hall and basing your lives on the mountain ritual (that is, the Akinomine). You should understand times are changing. An old tree eventually withers but a new tree grows in its place. The Akinomine is the old tree and the reformed ways (that is, Shinto) are the new.
(Diary, 3 October 1873)

There could be no compromise. If the shugenja wanted to maintain their livelihoods they had no option but to cast in their lot with the shrine and follow the “reformed ways.” That he was cynically aware of the economic motivation for the *onbun* in particular to do so is apparent in a later entry.

During the time of the former Bettō, retainers called *onbun* were concerned with administrative matters, the distribution of talismans, and the management of pilgrims and confraternities. With the ending of all that, there was natural concern about livelihood, and many faced poverty. If, however, they obey the Shrine Office in all things, they may obtain the permission of the kami priests to continue their activities.
(Diary, 3 August 1874)

Nishikawa succeeded in jumping the bureaucratic hurdles necessary to return the court-issued bodhisattva title by February 1874 and immediately set about getting permission to establish a confraternity based on the shrine. Since this also needed prefectural approval he had to negotiate with the Shōnai authorities, who were very closely linked to the old domain, and thus were cautious in their dealings with Hagurosan. Eventually he succeeded in setting up “a confraternity known as the Sekishin gokoku kyōkai 赤心護国教会 for the priests of Ideha Shrine.” By May he had persuaded “sixty or seventy shugenja” to apply for laicization but he was still worried that “the evil customs of the past ha[d] not yet died out” and shugenja needed to be taught properly through the confraternity so as not to “fall into heretical ways.” “I have been instructing the

shugenja carefully,” he wrote, “showing them the classical forms of ritual and teaching them in a hundred ways by letter. Gradually they are coming to understand” (Diary, 31 May 1874).

At the end of May 1874 Nishikawa sent a circular to all the former shugenja, announcing the first festival to the new kami on June 18 and 19, and justifying his actions in terms of the principle of kami and buddha separation.

Since the Restoration...kami and buddhas have been completely separated. There is no admixture and no confusion; all has been purified. It is not suitable to have a Buddhist deity (i.e. the Founder) enshrined within the shrine precincts. If kami and buddhas are separated, it will lead to the prosperity of the Three Mountains....
(Diary, 31 May 1874)

Kanbayashi Eisen, a former high-ranking *onbun* who had been appointed to head the confraternity, sent a further circular on 5 June which hints strongly of considerable discontent. In a choice of words that sounds suspiciously like Nishikawa's, he wrote:

There are those who find fault and demand explanations. They should remember that a warm summer follows a cool spring.... Because the shrine has not changed to Shinto, things should not be done against its principles. If you are without doubt and truly believe, the merits of the kami will shine forth and it is certain all will prosper.
(Diary, 5 June 1874)

Nishikawa gave no details of who attended the festival, but mentioned in a letter that “shugenja from the eight Kantō provinces attended and also ordinary people came in great crowds like ants...the shugenja were all very impressed and we can confidently expect them to apply for laicization” (Diary, 27 June 1874, Letter to Motoori Toyokai). In fact about one hundred shugen households, the majority *onbun*, had affiliated with the shrine by the end of 1874.

The Shintoization of the Akinomine: Nishikawa was convinced that the shugenja needed continual instruction if they were not to continue their “evil customs from the past” (Diary, 13 May 1874; 31 May 1874). This was to be the major function of the confraternity.

The *kyōkai* aims to correct what is wrong and solve the troubles of people's hearts. With this aim we will try to rectify the stubbornness of the mountain.
(Diary, 17 August 1874)

“Stubbornness” for Nishikawa meant any behaviour that tried to retain or restore the past, particularly Shugendō practices and customs, and Buddhism. He was quite happy for holders of “extreme and heretical views” to join as long as they were willing to change; he would not however tolerate “wicked scheming or evil passions” (Diary, 29 August 1874).

Having converted the Founder's Hall and set up a confraternity to serve it, Nishikawa decided to abolish the Akinomine as an "evil custom" and "a hazard to health and an undertaking of foolish people in backward places" (Diary, 31 May 1874). Moreover, as far as he was concerned, the Akinomine could not continue to exist either in Shinto or Tendai terms, and so made a formal application to ban it on 31 May. However, he was soon made aware that the shugenja who had affiliated with the shrine were not happy with the decision. By 19 August, he had reluctantly decided to allow it to proceed to inaugurate the confraternity, albeit in a form more suitable to the modern age, "since it is the mountain's most popular practice and we cannot expect it to be given up easily" (Diary, 19 August 1874). He noted that "everybody was overjoyed" by the decision, but they failed to realize the implications of Nishikawa's description of the reformed practice as a series of "services and lectures"... "performed according to reformed doctrine" (Diary, 24 August 1874). Though large numbers of shugenja asked that it be performed in the old way, Nishikawa was adamant, saying "the old belonged with the old" (Diary, 25 August 1874) and he met with the shrine priests and former shugenja on 27 August to urge them not to be stubborn and to agree with the new format, intimating that those who wanted to adhere to traditional practices were only interested in short-term profits and were being disloyal to the kami of Hagurosan.

The resulting format, announced on 29 August, had little in common with the Akinomine of old. The idea of progression through the ten realms of enlightenment towards rebirth that is the core of the religious drama that makes up the practice was discarded as were its defining practices such as fasting, fanned smoke (*nanban ibushi*), and repentance. It is unlikely that the ban on the use of water was retained, since ritual purification through ablutions was important for Shinto. *Tenguzumo* was retained, but as "exercise." In their place were lectures, dealing with the changes at Hagurosan, national modernization, ethics, and the new theology. Shugenja were made to practice lecturing themselves, in preparation for the examination they would all have to take to become accredited *kyōdōshoku*. It is unlikely too that the shugenja performed prayer-requests, long a source of income for participants; services were according to the new liturgy introduced at this time. Nishikawa did not want to have the practice contaminated by memories of the past and so banned the traditional dress. Nevertheless, as he recorded on September 2, "some wore white hakama with the Shugendō surplice (*yuigesa*), others wore an *eboshi* in place of the traditional *tokin*, but with the Haguro surcoat. It was a mixture of Shinto and Buddhist styles." It was little wonder that those participating in the Buddhist-sponsored Akinomine pasted the following poem on the door of the Buchūdō: "No conchshells, no *shakujō*, this new style Akinomine; lots of lectures but no income" (Diary, 7 September 1874).

Economic Implications for Individual Shugensha: Pilgrims involved Nishikawa in a constant battle to accommodate their needs with his own ideological ambitions. He noted for example how they continued to offer vegetarian food to the kami (Diary, 14 May 1874), and performed Buddhist rites for the spirits of the dead (Diary, 27 July 1874). He devised a special service for visiting groups at the Main Shrine, followed by one or two lectures, *norito*, and the presentation of *tamagushi* at the Shrine Office. An example of part of one such lecture is contained in the Diary.

The Tokugawa regime represents the final years of decay; the Restoration was like the sun breaking forth on a new day. No one should have any doubts or be surprised by the changes at the shrine. Those of you living in the cold should come into the sun and not cling to the old. (Diary, 17 June 1874)

Whether this satisfied those who visited the mountains specifically to honor the spirits of their forebears is open to question.

Another point of contention was over rights to guide pilgrims (and thus receive financial rebates from the shrine as well as income from lodging fees). There had traditionally been a close link between pilgrims from particular areas and their *sendatsu* (guides). These links were no longer necessarily operative, and in addition the shrine wanted control over the pilgrim registration office, run by the Tōge shugenja. There was also the problem of what to do with those who had not affiliated with the shrine. Could for example they be allowed to run the resthouses that were under their control? As Nishikawa acknowledged, “If the guiding of pilgrims is to be done according to previous custom, the presence of the Buddhist shugenja is a difficulty” (Diary, 18 July 1874). There was not only tension between the shrine and the Buddhists, but among the shrine-affiliated shugenja themselves over how things were being done. This was related to Nishikawa’s attitude about who the income basically belonged to.

Nishikawa was anxious to maximize the income from pilgrim fees, which he estimated were worth about fifteen hundred *mon* per person. The shugenja, however, wanted the system to work in the same way as it had always done, with the shrine office (in place of the Honbō) simply one *sendatsu* among many others. Under this system, a shugenja working for the Honbō could expect, for each pilgrim, to receive twenty percent of the lodging fee, thirty percent of income from talismans and services, and ten percent of donations and rest-house income. Shugenja who owned parish stock could expect a higher percentage. Nishikawa wanted to channel all this money, as well as that derived from shugenja who managed their own parishes, to the shrine. The people of Tōge, however, would not countenance any move towards the shrine monopoly that Nishikawa wanted, since they regarded their income as being an expression of the favor of the Gongen of the Three Mountains. To Nishikawa this seemed selfish and illogical and when he went to the Yamagata prefectural office in late

July he had it on his agenda to discuss this issue of what he called the “hard-to-eradicate evil customs of Tōge.”

The question of rights to sell talismans was also vital to potential shrine income. Points of issue were official approval to distribute them both within the prefecture and around the country, who was to distribute them, and what form they should take. Pilgrims, and therefore the shugenja, did not want the wording to change in any way, but Nishikawa could not countenance this. In the summer of 1874, however, those who held the rights to print and distribute them might as easily be Buddhist as shrine-supporting. On 12 August a number of shrine priests complained to Nishikawa that “the Tendai priests...are distributing talismans of the Three Mountains” using the traditional design, with the names of the three Gongen on the front and that of Jakkōji on the back. Because Nishikawa wanted all authority over talismans vested in the shrine office, he was initially concerned that only talismans issued in the shrine’s name be printed, and only members of the confraternity could distribute them. However, on 20 August he announced that both Buddhists and shrine shugenja would travel their parishes and distribute talismans “without discrimination” but of course the only talisman that could be sold was the approved type. He subsequently went to great lengths to get exclusive distribution rights from prefectures in northern Japan, emphasizing that the shugen “who in the past had been accused of lying and cheating” are now “educated and enlightened, their habits reformed and civilized” and that they “act according to the unity of rights and government and revere the kami” (Diary, 29 October 1874).

Confrontations with Buddhist Supporters: Nishikawa was haunted by the idea that the Buddhists were plotting to restore Hagurosan to Buddhism. He reported that “Hagurosan has been devoted to Buddhism for thirteen hundred years and there is resistance to change” (Diary, 31 May 1874) and described it as “the biggest nest of Buddhists in the land” (Diary, 30 July 1874). The Buddhist presence was not in fact great, but it seems to have been vociferous, at least in 1873 and 1874 which the Diary covers. There were four ordained Tendai priests: two former temple heads, Shimizu Kōden 清水 広田 of Kongōjuin and Yamamoto Kōjō 山本 広成 of Shakuzen’in, both in Tōge, and two former shugenja, Jibō (Koseki Shun’yū 小関 春融, b. 1823) and Kōmyōbō 光明坊. Shimizu Kōden, though low-ranking, was determined to maintain Hagurosan’s Shugendō heritage, and he was given strong support by Jibō, one of the most determined voices in the altercations with Nishikawa over the division of Buddhist assets. Of the shugenja, the names most often mentioned are Ōrinbō 桜林坊 (Umetsu Takematsu), Sankōbō 三光坊 (Kasuya Mataemon), Myōkōbō 明光坊 (Yoshizumi Noboru), and Nanrinbō 南林坊 (Teraoka Kinzaemon 寺岡 謹左衛門). The latter was employed by the shrine in September 1873 but he moved ever closer to the Buddhist group in the course

of the next year, and when faced in July 1874 with losing his right to supervise certain resthouses because of his affiliation, he appealed to the prefecture.

Nishikawa was adamant that there could be no Buddhist (Shugendō) sites retained on shrine land. The problem of land and assets was a continuing thorn in his side, and the Diary records numerous meetings over the issue. In July 1874 he was still complaining that “the Buddhists [were still] causing problems and campaigning for the land to be returned,” and asserted that “if the shrine office is approached in an antagonistic way, there can be no spirit of compromise.”²⁷ “Eight Tōge Buddhists” petitioned the prefecture in August 1874 over the restoration of Buddhist land, and there was evidently another appeal made on their behalf by the Tendai sect in October. The eventual disposition nevertheless remained as Nishikawa had initially determined—of the five sites set aside by Kanden, only two (Koganedō and Kōtakuji) remained Buddhist.

A more substantial threat emerged in July in the person of Sanne Reigen 三衣靈源 (d. 1874), a Buddhist priest of Chūsonji 中尊寺. In July Nishikawa visited Iwanezawa, one of the traditional seven entry points to Gassan, and the site of Nichigatsuji, Hagurosan’s most important branch temple. Its priest Kankai (1830–1885; Nishiyama Iwane) had decided in June 1869, without reference to Kanden, to convert Nichigatsuji, its four subtemples and twenty-six shugenja to Shinto, and campaigned to be named head of the shrine of the Three Mountains. He had aroused considerable ill-feeling locally, for his profligate use of Nichigatsuji money and resources, for his unilateral decision to burn the temple’s Buddhist statues, and for marrying, which was regarded as a betrayal of the precepts. In 1874 Iwanezawa was suffering from a vast depreciation in income, as the identity change was not welcomed by pilgrims and most went to Hondōji, one of the four Yudonosan temples, instead. Thus many local people favored the reconstitution of Nichigatsuji as a Buddhist temple and managed to bring this to the attention of the *sanji* 参事 (Prefectural Councillor) of Yamagata Prefecture, Usui Takenori. He invited Sanne to go and set up a branch temple there with the intention of returning Iwanezawa to Buddhism—and prosperity.

Nishikawa was appalled, seeing this as the first step in the reestablishment of Jakkōji, with Sanne, whom he called “a fox in a hole,” its head, and indeed a petition to that effect was sent to Sakata on 1 August. The situation was also complicated by the fact that the activists in Tōge involved in the so-called Wappa Disturbances over tax reform in Shōnai that summer²⁸ consciously linked reform with the restoration of Jakkōji and at a meeting in Tōge in August, which Jibō and Teraoka both attended, there was discussion with a representative from Iwanezawa about how to throw out Nishikawa and return Hagurosan to Buddhism. Nishikawa wrote to Adachi Masana and Tokoyo Nagatane at the

27. Diary, 13 July 1874. Meeting with Tanabe Gihei, Sakata prefectural office.

28. For details of the Wappa Disturbances, see KELLY 1985.

Kyōbushō that “those who have become ordained are becoming more and more obstinate and have invited a person called Sanne Reigen..., saying he is the successor to the headship of Jakkōji.... There is clearly a conspiracy right in front of us to restore the office of Bettō.... Of the three hundred former shugen below the mountain, more than half have become ordained as Buddhists, and to some degree they are breaking the regulations of the Shrine Office by distributing the talismans of the Three Mountains as they like, uttering heretical words, misleading pilgrims and causing great damage.” He was concerned because he could not trust the shugenja who had affiliated with the shrine not to join forces with the Buddhists if Jakkōji was reborn,²⁹ but tellingly, identified “fears of dismissal by the jobless shugenja” as the source of their “inclination to be involved in plots.” He wanted to avoid “any hint of confusion” in his endeavors to link their fortunes to the shrine; if they were offered an alternative, especially the hope of the restoration of the old order and concomitant economic security, they would be far less susceptible to his promptings. He thus stressed the inappropriateness of reinstating the name of Jakkōji, since there was no Buddhist presence left on the mountain which had given it its identity and the former temple lands had been alienated. Sanne Reigen appealed to Hieizan around September citing a concern for Buddhism in the area, but was told it would be more sensible to base the Buddhist future on Kōtakuji, which had retained its former endowments, rather on the nebulous Jakkōji, which was neither a physical nor an economic entity.³⁰

Nishikawa received further aggravation when he heard that Sanne had organized an Akinomine along traditional lines based at Kōtakuji, despite his rejection of the idea in May on the grounds that continuing the Dharma lineage of the founder had no meaning when the founder himself was a kami and the shugenja were now Tendai priests. After a flurry of negotiations throughout August, including threats to involve the prefecture, Nishikawa thought he had contained the plan, so he was incredulous when he was told on 30 August that the Buddhist shugenja were going ahead anyway. The Akinomine was severely compromised by Nishikawa’s refusal to let shugenja visit the Main Shrine or Hachiko Jinja, and local lore says that clashes occurred between the two groups at sacred sites (TOGAWA 1972, p. 194). Nishikawa records a poem the shrine shugenja stuck on the gate of Kōtakuji: “No first lodging, no second lodging during this mountain-entry ritual: even the *daisendatsu* is without lodging.” The loss of the traditional ritual space severely compromised Shugendō, and this experience only reinforced Sanne’s worry that if no one took responsibility, Buddhism would disappear.

29. Diary, 30 July 1874. “Even those who have laicized have not completely shed their whiff of Buddhist error.” Letter to Adachi Masana and Tokoyo Nagatane.

30. Letter from Hieizan to Kongōjuin and Shakuzen’in, dated October 1875 (TOGAWA 1986, pp. 260–71).

We can only surmise what might have happened if Sanne, the one figure that had emerged who might have been able to challenge Nishikawa, had not died at the end of 1874. Buddhism began to seem no longer to be able to offer an alternative and the passage of time blunted opposition. As the years passed, Tōge became much easier about its economic future and the old antagonisms died down to some extent. The acrimonious relationship between shrine and temple settled into one of watchful distrust, and most people considered it not worth fighting over the question of a Buddhist or Shinto identity. Without someone with a passion to revive the traditions of Shugendō it was hard to engineer long-term commitment and support.

Conclusion

The last extant report by Nishikawa is dated 5 October 1874. It reports the success of his initial strategy in that the shugenja, including the Buddhists, were showing more cooperation. However, the conundrum that had been present throughout his dealings with Tōge remained, that of shugenja motivations for agreeing with the changes. Nishikawa was a religious reformer as well as a bureaucrat and from his point of view promises of economic security were the means by which true religious reformation, not merely that of outer appearances, would be achieved. Shugenja concerns about their parishes and their income were important, but so was the need to turn them into modern civilized men, appreciative of state ideology and capable of teaching it to others. Nishikawa criticized the shugenja for being concerned only about making money, thinking only of their own profits, and having no care about either the doctrine or the shrine, and the former priests for simply enjoying their stipends and being content to remain mediocre, neither studying the new teachings nor becoming closely involved with the shrine. The only way that these “bad customs” would be cleansed, he thought, would be by selecting those who were most able to perform ritual and administrative duties, and pay them for them, and by encouraging the confraternity to flourish, so that through it people might be taught the “moral principles of revering the kami and making the nation excellent.” To the end, a wide comprehension gap remained between Hagurosan and its *gūji*.

How successful was Nishikawa at persuading the shugenja to join their fortunes to those of the shrine? In early July 1874 he reported that a total of one hundred and seven shugenja has laicized, and he was still waiting for a reply from a further thirty-three (Diary, 7 July 1874). A further fifty-one applied in October, citing an uncertain future,³¹ and the majority gradually followed.³² This does not necessarily mean they affiliated with the shrine, just that they had

31. Letter from Hieizan to Kongōjuin and Shakuzen'in, dated October 1875. (TOGAWA 1986, pp. 260–71).

32. STSR contains applications from seven Tōge shugenja dated 16 December 1976.

given up their Tendai identity and probably took up some other employment. This is apparent in the number of Buddhist funerals that were performed; a report of 1880 says that three hundred and twenty-five households of the three hundred and eighty-five Tōge total had Buddhist funerals, which implied that sixty households served the shrine. This was the same as the number of Tendai-ordained shugenja who remained affiliated with Kōtakuji.³³

Before Sanne Reigen died he had entrusted the future of Kōtakuji to Mibu Yūden 壬生宥田 of Risshakuji, a Dharma brother of Kanden. There was, however, no dynamic leadership among the Buddhists until 1897, when Moriya Shuntai (b. 1860), a Tendai priest and son of a Hagurosan *mappa shugen* from Yonezawa was invited to take over the headship of Kōtakuji, which had until then been held in abstentia. Moriya bought fields to finance the rebuilding of Kōtakuji, visited former shugenja to record their memories, and received a number of formal Haguro Shugendō transmissions from Hanaoka Yasunori. It is very likely that it was the presence of an abrasive “other” at Hagurosan that helped preserve the Shugendō past, both in shrine and temple contexts, and so its traditions were still living when Shugendō organizations were allowed independence under postwar religious legislation, and Moriya’s successor, Shimazu Dendō, established the Hagurosan Shugen Honshū in 1946. Nevertheless, what happened in the 1870s is still very real to those in Tōge who have retained an identity as shugenja, either in a shrine or temple context, and there remains a complicated attitude to the Shugendō past. This question, however, must await separate study.

When we look back at the enforcement process of the Separation Edicts, what is readily evident is, on the one hand, the authority of the central government which discouraged violent opposition, and on the other, the ability of strong individuals like Nishikawa, and potentially Sanne, to shape events. Such opinion-shapers acted as brokers between the center and the periphery, negotiating change. The effects of their actions remain apparent today, in the way Hagurosan faces its Shugendō past. Dewa Sanzan Jinja actively uses Shugendō color to attract visitors to the shrine, and the Akinomine, both in traditional and Shinto forms, is probably more popular today than at any time since the Meiji Restoration in terms of numbers of participants. Shugendō seems to have found a firm place in modern religious practice, but it is highly unlikely that its institutional forms, destroyed at Meiji, will ever be recreated at Hagurosan.

The model presented by local historians of the early English Reformation is that it was the result, not of local approval of policies of religious reform, so much as the “local recognition of the power and prestige of the monarchy” (WHITING 1982, p. 47). At the parish level people were reluctant to implement changes and only conformed when forced to do so. The ability of the govern-

33. *Shaji butsudō danshintō shirabe* (TOGAWA 1986, p. 279).

ment to inspect and coerce brought about compliance, as did its power to compel minds. The clergy too on the whole complied, preferring “an altar to silence, the parish to prison” (BOWKER 1987, p. 93). In our examination of the experience of kami-buddha separation at Hagurosan, we can clearly see a similar pattern. Further studies of local reactions to the early Meiji religious policy should cast light on how typical a pattern the Hagurosan experience represents, and the extent to which comparisons can usefully be made with the English experience.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- DSS *Dewa Sanzan shiryōshū* 出羽三山資料集. Ed. Dewa Sanzan Jinja 出羽三山神社. Hagurochō: Dewa Sanzan Jinja, 1994.
- MS *Yukute no susabi* 遊久天乃須作備. Nishikawa Sugao 西川須賀雄 (Diary). 1873–1874.
- SBBS *Meiji Ishin shinbutsu bunri shiryō* 明治維新神仏分離史料. Ed. Murakami Senshō 村上專精, Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, and Washio Junkyō 鷺尾順敬. 5 vols. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1970 [1926–1929]. (Re-issued 1984, 10 vols.)
- SS *Shugendō shōso* 修験道章疏. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Kokusho Hakkōkai, 2000. (first published 1919)
- ST *Shintō taikai* 神道大系, *Jinja-hen* 神社編, Dewa Sanzan 出羽三山. Ed. Togawa Anshō 戸川安章 and Shintō Taikai Hensankai 神道大系編纂会. Vol. 32. Tokyo: Shintō Taikai Hensankai, 1982.
- STSR *Shaji torishirabe ruisan* 社寺取調類纂. Undated manuscript. Archives of Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo, Kokugakuin Daigaku; Microfilm, Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan.

OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

INOUE Nobutaka 井上順孝, ed.

- 1990 *Shaji torishirabe ruisan, Shintō, kyōka hen* 社寺取調類纂 (神道, 教化篇). Tokyo: Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo.

TOKOYO Nagatane 常世長胤

- 1983 *Shinkyō soshiki monogatari* 神教組織物語. In Uno Masato 宇野正人, Tokoyo Nagatane kōjutsu monjinra hikki “Shinkyō soshiki monogatari” 常世長胤講述門人等筆記「神教組織物語」. *Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 52: 179–272.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ABE Masaki 安部正己

1941 *Dewa Sanzanshi* 出羽三山史. Yamagata: Abe Kōbō.

BITŌ Masahide 尾藤正英

2000 *Edo jidai to wa nani ka: Nihon shijō no kinsei to kindai* 江戸時代とはなにか—日本史上の近世と近代. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten. (originally published in 1992)

BOWKER, Margaret

1987 The Henrician Reform and the Parish clergy. In HAIGH ed., 1987, pp. 75–93.

BUKKYŌ MINZOKUGAKU TAIKEI HENSHŪ IINKAI 仏教民俗学大系編集委員会, ed.

1993 *Bukkyō minzokugaku no shomondai* 仏教民俗学の諸問題. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan.

DICKINS, A. G., ed.

1947 Robert Parkyn's narrative of the Reformation. *English Historical Review* 62: 64–82.

DUFFY, Eamon

1992 *The Stripping of the Altars, Traditional Religion in England c. 1400–c. 1580*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

2001 *The Voices of Morebath, Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

FUJII Sadafumi 藤井貞文

1976 Chūkyōin no kenkyū 中教院の研究. *Shintōgaku* 86: 1–24.

1977 Yamagataken no chūkyōin no kenkyū 山形県の中教院の研究. *Shintōgaku* 92: 1–14.

HAGUROCHŌ YAKUBA 羽黒町役場, ed.

1994 *Hagurochōshi* 羽黒町史, vol. 2. Haguro: Hagurochō Yakuba.

HAIGH, Christopher

1987 The recent historiography of the English Reformation. In HAIGH ed., 1987, pp. 19–33.

1993 *English Reformations*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

HAIGH, Christopher, ed.

1987 *The English Reformation Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ICHIMURA Minato 市村威人

1929 *Ina sonnō shisōshi* 伊那尊王思想史. Shimo Ina-gun: Shimo Ina-gun Koku-min Seishin Sakkōkai.

- ITŌ Tasaburō 伊東多三郎
 1982 *Sōmō no kokugaku* 草莽の国学. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan. (originally published in 1966)
- KELLY, William W.
 1985 *Deference and Defiance in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- KOTKIN, Stephen
 1995 *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as Civilization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- PARKER, William
 1873 *The History of Long Melford*. London (privately published).
- SCARISBRICK, J. J.
 1984 *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- SCOTT, James C.
 1990 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance, Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- SHAGAN, Ethan H.
 2003 *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TAMAMURO Fumio 圭室文雄
 1977 *Shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離. Tokyo: Kyōikusha.
 1989 *Shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離. In TANABE ed., pp. 335–54.
 1993 *Shinbutsu bunri to minshū no shinkō* 神仏分離と民衆の信仰. In BUKKYŌ MINZOKUGAKU TAIKEI HENSHŪ IINKAI, pp. 131–50.
 1995 *Kitōchō ni miru Dewa Sanzan to shinbutsu bunri* 祈祷帳に見る出羽三山と神仏分離. Unpublished lecture. Ideha Summer Academy, 5 July.
- TANABE Saburōsuke 田邊三郎助, ed.
 1989 *Shinbutsu shūgō to Shugen* 神仏習合と修験. Zusetu Nihon no Bukkyō 図説日本の仏教. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.
- THAL, Sarah
 2005 *Rearranging the Landscape of the Gods: The Politics of a Pilgrimage Site in Japan, 1573–1912*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- TOGAWA Anshō 戸川安章
 1950 *Haguro yamabushi to minkan shinkō* 羽黒山伏と民間信仰. Tsuruoka: Fumiya Shoten.
 1972 *Hagurosan nihyakuwa* 羽黒山二百話. Tokyo: Chūō Shoin.
 1973 *Hagurosan, rekishi to bunka* 羽黒山歴史と文化. Yamagata: Ikubundō.
 1986 *Dewa Sanzan Shugendō no kenkyū* 出羽三山修験道の研究. Tokyo: Kōsei Shuppansha. Revised edition.

WHITING, R.

1982 Abominable idols: Images and image-breaking under Henry VIII. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* xxxiii: 30-47.

YASUMARU Yoshio 安丸良夫

1979 *Kamigami no Meiji Ishin* 神々の明治維新. Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho.

YASUMARU Yoshio, ed.

1988 *Shūkyō to kokka* 宗教と国家. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.