Harvard-Yenching Institute

who struggled along its mountain trails and offered their prayers at the sacred sites. But Moerman also shows that Kumano was carried to the people by the travels and teachings of *bikuni* and *yamabushi*. Eventually more than twenty-five hundred branch shrines were established throughout Japan where Kumano deities were worshiped and the sacred legends of Kumano proliferated. As he argues, what had begun as an imperial and aristocratic cult flourished in later centuries because of its appeal to ordinary men and women.

If there is one aspect that this reviewer would have liked to see more fully developed, it is the doctrinal. Certainly Moerman introduces the texts, Buddhist and Shinto, poetic and historical, associated with the various shrines: the *Lotus Sutra* and the *Daihanyakyō*, as well as the ideas of "original enlightenment (*hongaku*), death, and rebirth. The author discusses and interprets texts and paintings for his readers, but he does not make it clear how the priests, monks, nuns, and *yamabushi* might have used them in their teachings at Kumano sites, or in their presentations at marketplaces, temples, and shrines around Japan. What doctrinal basis was being developed for Kumano? Who shaped it? How did it change over time? I would like to have read more on this topic. But this is a small criticism of a fine book, which offers a searching and enriching view of the complex, shifting religious terrain of medieval Kumano.

The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha: Monastic Warriors and Sōhei in Japanese History by *Mikael S. Adolphson*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007. Pp. xviii + 212. $36.00.

Thomas D. Conlan, Bowdoin College

Aiming to explore the social and political underpinnings of religious violence, Mikael Adolphson has crafted an innovative and insightful study of monk-warriors that is likely to become the definitive treatment of this topic. Building on his earlier work, which explored the political significance of monastic temple "power blocs," Adolphson now shifts his attention to describing how and why monks fought. By providing an overview of the social origins of monks and their leaders, he explains that monks were often indistinguishable from warriors and that violence thus seemed natural to them. His terminology epitomizes his

perspective; so as to show that monastic affiliations were secondary to social origins, Adolphson prefers the moniker "monk-warriors" instead of the more common term "warrior monks." The otherwise incongruous title of his work aptly encapsulates this notion, for it is drawn from a famous phrase depicting warriors as "teeth and claws" of the court.

Another objective of Adolphson's complex work is to reveal how monastic warriors have been stigmatized and their behavior portrayed as illegitimate. The tension between the "actual" image of these monk-warriors and their later trope is epitomized by the word *sōhei*, or "warrior monk," which Adolphson shows to be a fourteenth-century Korean neologism (p. 146) latent with pejorative meanings. Thus the seemingly redundant subtitle "Monastic Warriors and *Sōhei* in Japanese History" in fact refers to the contrast between the "real" nature of these fighters and later stereotypes that came to represent them.

Adolphson sets up the framework of his argument in Chapter 1, "Discourses on Religious Violence and Armed Clerics," where he provides a comprehensive historiography of studies on monastic warriors and discusses their inherent conceptual limitation of failing to treat the violence of monks as legitimate. This chapter aims to explore "the contexts in which religious institutions and their supporters, whether monks, menial workers, secular warriors, or any other group, used arms as a means to resolve conflicts" (p. 20).

Chapter 2, "The Contexts of Monastic Violence and Warfare," discusses the "discursive environment" of using weapons against evil and provides an overview of monastic conflicts from the tenth through fourteenth centuries. Adolphson sees social tensions as causing a "general tendency toward violence" and posits the origin of warring monks to factional disputes rather than viewing them as arising in the "sphere of religion itself" (p. 28). These disputes were exacerbated by quarrels over land rights. Ultimately, Adolphson sees a transformation arising in the fourteenth century, in which "warrior rule" predominated, attacks on religious institutions ceased (p. 53), and, until the time of the third Ashikaga shogun Yoshimitsu, as Adolphson boldly declares: "There was no longer a need for religious rhetoric. Accordingly, Buddhist claims to protect the state became less common, if not obsolete" (p. 54).

Chapter 3, "The Fighting Servants of the Buddha," illuminates "the network of connections between various groups and the social and ideological framework within which they acted" (p. 58). Adolphson

184   REVIEWS

reveals that the appellation "evil monk" (*akusō*) was applied to those
monks of all ranks who "acted without the consent or sanction of their
larger community" (p. 64). Since only some monks who engaged in
violence were called "evil monks," Adolphson argues that the term
"temple warrior" (*jihei*) might be a more appropriate moniker than the
limited term "evil monk" or the anachronistic word *sōhei*.

The ensuing chapter, "The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha," portrays
the rise of several charismatic temple leaders, from both esoteric (Ten-
dai and Shingon) institutions and such temples as Tōdaiji and Kōfukuji.
These leaders, Adolphson maintains, were indistinguishable from other
aristocrats and effectively led these socially stratified institutions.

In his fifth chapter, Adolphson provides an overview of how the idea
of the warrior monk was constructed and how it came to pervade his-
torical dramas and *manga* comic books as a trope of popular Japanese
culture. He also shows that the strength of this cultural cliché caused
sōhei stereotypes to cloud later scholarship. At times, Adolphson's fervor
to debunk these stereotypes leads him to some infelicitous generaliza-
tions. In explaining the latent anachronisms of a television show, he
argues that monks could not wield a curved blade (*naginata*) mounted
on a pole, on horseback.[1] His comment that "the modern Japanese
public is unaware of how unwieldy the *naginata* is on horseback or that
this combination does not occur in pre-1600 sources" (p. 155) is flatly
contradicted by figure 17 of his work, a battle scene of the fourteenth-
century *Kasuga gongen kenki e*, that depicts a mounted figure wielding
precisely such a weapon on horseback. Such an error is unfortunate
but does not overly detract from Adolphson's argument. One can assert
that the trope of the warrior monk exists irrespective of how a *naginata*
actually was used.

Other niggling errors deserve correcting in future editions of the
work. Some are errors in typography—thus Kusama temple should
be Kurama in Map 2—while others are of consistency—the *Aki no yo
no nagamonogatari* picture scroll, for example, is variously described as
being a fifteenth (pp. 80–81) or, correctly, a fourteenth-century work
(p. 137). Save for these minor mistakes, this volume is otherwise hand-
some, well designed, carefully edited, and replete with illustrations.

[1] Primarily translated as "halberd," Adolphson prefers the archaic term "glaive," which has
been resurrected by Karl Friday. See Friday, *Samurai, Warfare and the State* (New York: Routledge,
2004), p. 86.

Focusing largely on esoteric Buddhist institutions, *The Teeth and Claws of the Buddha* reveals profound organizational differences between the Shingon and Tendai sects. Powerful abbots and an integrated organizational structure allowed Shingon temples to police their monks far more effectively than their Tendai counterparts. In one episode, the abbot of Tōji sent some temple warriors from Mt. Kōya to the capital, where they were promptly turned over to the imperial police (p. 104). Abbots of Mt. Hiei, or Kōfukuji, for that matter, commonly seem to have lacked the clout of their Shingon compatriots (see pp. 86–100ff). Furthermore, the disunion of Tendai, and the existence of two warring temples, meant that Tendai institutions appeared most commonly in accounts of monastic warriors.

Adolphson raises important questions about religious and political authority. He ably shows how monks and religious institutions functioned almost identically to other contemporary institutions and their respective personnel, and explains how tensions over economic resources (such as land, pp. 42–46) or office (p. 40) were the "real" rationale for disputes (p. 49). He also provides the novel argument that the Buddhist orders should be conceived of as a "profession" (p. 24), and that, for menials and administrators associated with temples, who largely comprised their fighting forces, "the label 'monk' carries little religious meaning" (p. 158).

Precisely because Adolphson sees monks as being indistinguishable from the rest of society he believes it is misguided to describe their actions in terms of Buddhist beliefs or ideologies. He writes: "monastics were fighting for the same reasons as secular elites, and anyone looking for larger religious motivations will be disappointed" (p. 37). At times, Adolphson seems to profess the notion that religious rhetoric served merely as a "smoke screen" to justify behavior (pp. 2, 98).

Adolphson persuasively argues that monks often resorted to violence without the sanction of their communities, and that this led to their being called "evil monks" (p. 64). His suggestion that "early monastic violence, by and large, lacked direct connections to either the monastic institutions or to Buddhism generally" (p. 26) works well with his assertion that religious considerations were not a factor: Buddhist violence represents a failure to follow precepts and a lapse by "bad monks." Hence, in Adolphson's descriptions of violent acts, one commonly sees references to strong emotions such as rage (p. 42, 92), envy (p. 104), or

belligerence and ambition (p. 91). His reliance on emotion in his narrative precludes other interpretations—this reader is left wishing, however, that Adolphson had further pursued the question of how such
emotions were related to other explanatory factors. Was envy over
patronage the only reason why a quarrel erupted over "the procedures
of a Daidenbōjin ceremony" (p. 39)? Or, was the ceremony so invested
with significance as to generate violence in cases of discord over ritual
practice?

Readers might wish that Adolphson had explored how monks reconciled violent acts with their doctrinal and ritual understanding of
Buddhism. Adolphson seems to suggest that the primary difference
between "secular authorities" and "temples" is merely that the latter
had a higher toleration of hypocrisy, for he writes: "What sets religious discourses apart from secular ones, it appears, is the discrepancy
between religious precepts promoting peace and prohibiting the use
of arms and the violent activities of many monastics" (p. 2). But one
might best explain the rationale for monastic violence in Buddhist
terms. The only reference Adolphson makes to Buddhist scripture, the
Bonmōkyō (Sutra of Brahma's net) contains a prohibition against monks
carrying arms (p. 21). This citation is relevant in a Tendai context,
for it became the basis for precepts of the Tendai patriarch in Japan,
Saichō.[2] Moreover, the existence of these precepts explains why figures such as Ryōgen would later criticize the carrying of weapons and
killing as a cause of great shame (pp. 30–31). Nevertheless, an important ninth-century change in doctrine served to nullify Saichō's precepts and make the recourse to violence acceptable to members of the
clergy.

That esoteric ceremonies enshrined ritual violence largely helps to
explain why physical violence was condoned at these institutions. Paul
Groner has argued that the ninth-century Tendai abbot Annen superseded Saichō's precepts with a more general set of guidelines because
"some of the rituals found in Esoteric texts contained elements that
would have been unacceptable to any monk who carefully observed
the Vinaya [precepts]."[3] Beginning in the mid-ninth century, one sees

---

[2] For a good overview see Richard Bowring, *The Religious Traditions of Japan 500–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 133, 167.
[3] Paul Groner, "The *Fan-wang ching* and Monastic Discipline," in Buswell, ed., *Chinese Buddhist
Apocrypha* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990), p. 259.

that the court employed rituals such as the Rite of Ātavaka (*Taigen no hō*) to quell internal rebellions and attacks from abroad. Fabio Rambelli characterizes these rites as an "exploitation of the 'dark side' of Buddhism, in which demonic violence is deployed for the protection of the Dharma and of Buddhist Rulers" and goes on to say that "the ritual itself required three hundred weapons—a hundred each of swords, bows and arrows" to be placed on the main altar.[4] One might also consider the tantras dedicated to Akṣobhya (J. Fudō, illustrated on p. 23) which could be used to "petrify," "subdue," or "slay" enemies through "chalk-rituals for destroying an enemy army" or gruesome "vomiting rituals."[5] The enshrining of ritual violence helps explain why temples were awash with weapons and why monks had few qualms about resorting to physical violence.

Ample opportunity exists to build on Adolphson's study of monk-warriors, and to show how warriors, courtiers, and monks perceived maledictions as being equal to, if not superseding, recourse to arms. To provide one example, documents pertaining to Daisenji, a temple in Harima province alluded to in this narrative, reveal that curses and monks fighting in battle were analogous because they were listed alongside rosters for wounded monks,[6] but the ritual component of their actions falls outside of Adolphson's scope (see p. 111). Forceful protests did not represent the greatest acts of violence; rather, rituals patronized by the state, such as the rite of Ātavaka, were thought to be more potent. To take one example from the late fourteenth century, Hosokawa Kiyouji was not punished for burning the house of rivals, but mere rumor that he was performing curses led to his downfall and death.[7]

[4] Fabio Rambelli, "The Emperor's New Robes: Processes of Resignification in Shingon Imperial Rituals," in *Cahiers de'Extréme-Asie* 13 (2002–3): 436; and, for illustrations of the placement of these weapons, p. 453.

[5] D. L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), pp. 50–53.

[6] Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, comp., *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文, vol. 41 (Tōkyōdō shuppan, 1990), doc. 32148, Genkō 3 (1333) 5.10 Harima no kuni Daisenji shūto gunchūjō, p. 261. Commanders ordered that "young priests (*wakashū*) fight and the old pray"; see Matsuoka Hisatō 松岡久人, *Nanbokuchō ibun Chūgoku Shikoku hen* 南北朝遺文中国四国編, vol. 1 (Tōkyōdō shuppan, 1987), doc. 236, Kenmu 3 (1336) 2.3 Nawa Nagatoshi gunzei sasokujō utsushi, p. 120.

[7] Conlan, *State of War: The Violent Order of Fourteenth Century Japan* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, 2003), pp. 191–92, 217–18. Thus, the notion (Adolphson, p. 100) that "the Hōgen incident marks the first time in Japanese history that members of imperial court called temple

Effectively arguing that temple violence was indistinguishable from "secular" power, Adolphson provides a valuable antidote to studies that tend to suggest that all political behavior by temples was somehow illegitimate. At the same time, one wonders whether the notion of secularism distorts the past. Those wielding political power, even prominent warriors, still shared in the same beliefs as monks. For example, Ashikaga Yoshiakira, the second shogun of his dynasty, and the daimyo Sasaki Dōyo, one of his most influential supporters, granted lands to Mt. Hiei during the fourth month of 1363. Yoshiakira apparently feared an inauspicious dream, which was thought to suggest a malediction.[8]

The term secular is absent from contemporary sources, the only apparent exception being two references to what Adolphson characterizes as "secular warriors" (zokuheishi, 俗兵士, zokuhei 俗兵).[9] In fact, the term zoku refers only to the laity—that is, those who had not taken Buddhist vows—and thus does not have the more general sense of "secular" or "worldly" identity. This can be proven by a court diarist who counted three "people of the shrines" (jinnin 神人) among ninety wounded zokuheishi (p. 72).[10]

In the end, I suggest that, following John Milbank's lead, one think of the notion of "secular" as being a recent imagining[11] and jettison it entirely. "Larger religious motivations" (p. 37) were neither the sole prerogative of temples nor, as Adolphson rightly argues, used only to justify or condone violence (pp. 159–60). Instead, they constituted an integral and essential component of the intellectual universe of medieval Japan. Granting then, that temples, monks, warriors, and nobles acted similarly, they did so according to a *weltanschauung* whereby prayers

forces to battle" is accurate only when focusing on physical violence, for the court had been relying on temples' ritual violence for more than three centuries before the Hōgen era (1156–1158).

[8] Sanjō Kintada 三條公忠, *Gogumaiki* 後愚昧記, vol. 1 (Iwanami shoten, 1980), 4.24.1363 (Jōji 2), p. 59.

[9] Both passages have been ably translated by Adolphson, along with other translated documents used in this work, and are accessible at www.teethandclaws.net. I verified that these terms appear only twice by a search of documents and diaries on the Tokyo University Historiographical Institute's varied databases, 7/20/2007. By contrast, terms such as warrior (*heishi* 兵士) appear 170 times.

[10] Here, Adolphson translates *zoku heishi* as "secular warriors," but "lay warriors" provides a better sense of their identity. For the original passage, see *Dainihon shiryō* 大日本史料, series 3, 25:149.

[11] John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*, 2nd edition (London: Blackwell Publishing, 2006).

and ritual actions were indistinguishable from physical and political acts. After all, can Ashikaga Yoshiakira, who destroyed one of his generals (Hosokawa Kiyouji) and commended lands to Enryakuji because of perceived curses, be portrayed as a "worldly" and "secular" figure, shogun though he was?

Such questions belie the interest that this work generates. Mikael Adolphson has crafted a pathbreaking and informative study of monk-warriors. His portrayal of monk warriors, and the trope of *sōhei*, is unlikely to be surpassed. At the same time, this monograph raises important questions about the role of religion and the state in Japan, particularly from the tenth through fifteenth centuries. This monograph will stimulate further analysis of ritual violence and the role of monasteries, as well as of the relationship between temples and shrines in Japan's medieval state.

Crimson Rain: Seven Centuries of Violence in a Chinese County by William T. Rowe. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006. Pp. xiii + 437. $60.00.

Joseph W. Esherick, University of California, San Diego

William Rowe has been writing big, important, influential books on Chinese history for over twenty years, and with *Crimson Rain* he has made another seminal contribution to the field. Rowe's characteristic technique grounds a major conceptual argument within a meticulously researched and richly textured historical narrative. His conclusions are always original and frequently provocative enough to invite challenge. They invariably influence the way we think about late imperial China. His two books about Hankou challenged Weber's notion of the official-dominated Chinese city and advanced a powerful argument for local urban consciousness and an active public sphere, provoking a sharp dissent from the late Frederic Wakeman and a lively debate.[1] His

[1] William T. Rowe, *Hankow: Commerce and Society in a Chinese City, 1796–1895* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984) and *Hankow: Conflict and Community in a Chinese City, 1796–1895* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989); Frederic Wakeman Jr., "The Civil Society and Public Sphere Debate: Western Reflections on Chinese Political Culture," *Modern China* 19.2 (April 1993): 108–38.