This article introduces five oaths (kishōmon) from sixteenth-century Japan, currently held by the East Asian Library, Princeton University, United States. Each of these documents can be identified as one half of an oath passed down to the Saji family, a local warrior (samurai) family based in Kōga district, Ōmi province, central Japan (the other half was separated). Local warriors of Kōga are well known for their multi-layered networks and organizations called collectives (sō), which served as mediators in local disputes. Combining these Princeton oaths (we shall keep to this English term for the Japanese kishōmon) with other documents that survived in the Saji’s hereditary archive, this article discusses their function. We have here a case study of Kōga that reconstructs local disputes and mediation by local warriors and sheds light on their collective organizations. This article also explores how medieval people envisioned divine punishments for breaking promises to deities. The diary of Yoshida Kanemi, a Shintō priest in Kyoto, contains valuable information: people of Kōga and its surrounding areas often visited Kanemi and asked him for prayers to cancel the oaths they had written. Kanemi’s diary shows that the people of Kōga on the one hand did indeed fear divine punishments but, on the other, tried to avoid them by drawing on new practices offered by Yoshida Shintō. After the destruction of the Kōga gunchū sō, a district-wide collective of local warriors of Kōga, in 1585, the Saji and other local warriors were banished from Kōga. They later returned to their homeland but lost their warrior privileges in the region. In this process, the Saji lost some of their inherited documents, including those currently held by Princeton University. Thus, the Princeton oaths not only tell us how medieval oaths functioned in Warring States Japan but also describe the hardship one local warrior family experienced in the socio-political transition from the medieval to the early modern (Tokugawa) period.

Keywords: Medieval Japan, Warring States period, oath, kishōmon, Kōga district collective (Kōga gunchū sō), Yoshida Shintō

* Correspondence Details: Horikawa Yasufumi (堀川 康史), Associate Professor, the Historiographical Institute, the University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Bunkyō, Hongō, Tokyo, 113-0033, Japan. Email: horikawa@hi.u-tokyo.ac.jp

This article is part of the thematic section Oaths in Premodern Japan and Premodern Europe, guest editors: Philippe Buc and Thomas D. Conlan. To read all related articles, please access: doi.org/10.1553/medievalworlds_no19_2023
Background

Sixteenth-Century Japan as »The Warring States Period«

The sixteenth century in Japan is known as the Warring States period (sengoku jidai), during which the country experienced continuous civil war for over a hundred years. The Onin war of 1467-1477 and subsequent political turmoil led to the decline and ultimate collapse of the Muromachi bakufu (1338-1573), and, in this political vacuum, new regional hegemons called sengoku warlords (daimyō) emerged throughout Japan. From the middle of the sixteenth century, powerful sengoku warlords attempted to establish their local authority on a larger scale.

In conflicts between sengoku warlords, Oda Nobunaga (1534-1582) rose to power and, in 1573, banished the fifteenth shogun Ashikaga Yoshiaki (1537-1597), following which the Muromachi bakufu was never restored. After the assassination of Nobunaga by one of his generals in 1582, his de facto successor Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537-1598) subjugated other sengoku warlords and reunified Japan in 1590. After the death of Hideyoshi, Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542-1616) seized power and established a new regime called the Tokugawa bakufu (or the Edo bakufu) in 1603. This marks the end of the medieval period in traditional standard narratives.

Sixteenth-Century Japan as »The Age of Secularization«

Starting from before World War II, Japanese historiography viewed the medieval period (the late eleventh to late sixteenth centuries) as »the age of religion,« with the following Tokugawa period (1603-1867) being seen as »secular.«¹ This led a number of scholars to wonder about process and transitions, with many proposing the Warring States period as »the age of secularization.«²

1 In the first volume of »Medieval Japan« series published in 2002, Ishii Susumu enumerated »the age of religion« as one of the five elements that characterized medieval Japan. Ishii, Chūsei no katachi, 4-6. As for the Tokugawa period, in a recent (2023) study, Kobayashi Junji addresses »the secularization of the [Japanese] society« and argues for the supremacy of »secular lords.« Kobayashi, Tasai na bunka, 2-3.

2 For the historiography of »the age of religion/secularization« debate, see Klauta, Kindai nihon shisō; Yoshizawa, Nihon chūsei shakai, 7-14; Wasada, Chūsei no jisha yakiuchi, 16-21. See in English, McMullin, Buddhism and the State, 264-283.
Institutional history provided some backing for this position. In medieval Japan, influential traditional temples and shrines exercised political, economic, and even military powers, in close connection with the imperial court and the bakufu. However, as warfare became endemic and sengoku warlords consolidated their power, most temples and shrines lost their autonomy. The 1571 destruction of the Enryakuji temple epitomizes this trend. As the headquarters of the Tendai school, the Enryakuji temple complex was one of the few monastic institutions that maintained their autonomy well into the Warring States period. However, in 1571, Oda Nobunaga, who, according to one Jesuit missionary’s account, despised deities and superstitions, destroyed all the buildings and killed all the monks and many of their dependents to retaliate against the Enryakuji temple because it had allied with Nobunaga’s enemies.

The Warring States period saw the rise of new Buddhist schools. The Honganji temple, the headquarters of the Ikkō school, even became a regional hegemon and engaged in conflicts against other sengoku warlords, including Oda Nobunaga. After the ten-year long Ishiyama Honganji war (1570-1580), the Honganji temple and its followers surrendered to Nobunaga. Previous research has assumed that, along with the destruction of the Enryakuji temple, Nobunaga’s victory against the Honganji temple symbolized the end of »the age of religion«. After the Shimabara Amakusa rebellion in 1636, an unsuccessful uprising against the persecution of Christianity, the Tokugawa bakufu established a supervision system aimed at suppressing Christianity called the terauke or jidan system. In this system, temples served as monitors for the regime. Thus, in this narrative, temples and shrines lost their autonomy and became subordinated to »secular« authorities through the Tokugawa period.

---

3 See in English Adolphson, Gates of Power, building on Kuroda Toshio’s model of kenmon (Kuroda, Kenmon taisei ron).
4 See in English McMullin, Buddhism and the State.
5 Luís Fróis, Historia de Japam, trans. and ed. Matsuda and Kawasaki, vol. 4, 103-121. For a convenient English translation of Fróis’s evaluation of Nobunaga, see Cooper, They Came to Japan, 93.
6 An English-language biography is Lamers, Japonius Tyrannus. See also Ōta, Chronicle (trans. of the seventeenth-century Shinchō-hō ki), where the destruction of the temples and shrines is recounted in book 4 chapter 5, 164-166. Lamers, Japonius Tyrannus, 75-76, also translates the report, very close to the event, by the Jesuit Luís Fróis.
7 For the Honganji temple, see in English Tsang, War and Faith.
8 Kobayashi, Tasai na bunka; Hayashi, Kinsei teki na seikyō kankei. For Christianity’s fate, see Elisonas, Christianity and the Daimyo, 368-372. The complicated disciplining of schools, sects, and denominations under the Tokugawa bakufu has been recently explored in a volume of essays, Köck, Pickl-Kolaczia, and Scheid, Religion, Power, and the Rise of Shinto.
Oaths in »The Age of Secularization«

This secularization narrative has greatly influenced the study of Japanese oaths (kishōmon). Although many oaths were written for various purposes in the Warring States period, previous research has suggested that people’s attitudes toward deities and the use of oaths were shifting. For example, Chijiwa Itaru, one of the leading specialists of medieval oaths, discusses »the death of the oath« during the Warring States period. Chijiwa points out that the Warring States period witnessed (1) the widespread use of talismans issued by the three Kumano shrines as the paper for oaths; (2) the appearance of the Reisha jōgan oath, which had an extremely well-organized format with a redundant list of deities; and (3) the invention of the ritual for the cancellation of oaths called kishō gaeshi (»the reversal of an oath«). According to Chijiwa, these three changes represent the over-formalization of the oaths, the inflation of deities, and the decline of sincere relationships between people and deities. 

This view of the Warring States period as an »age of secularization« which witnessed »the death of the oath« is generally accepted. However, recent scholarship has challenged this orthodoxy. For example, Kanda Chisato emphasizes the importance of the religion for both sengoku warlords and commoners and characterizes the Warring States period as »the age of religion.« Wasada Makoto also argues that the »secularization« took place after the establishment of peace by the Tokugawa, and not in the Warring States period when warfare was so ubiquitous that people fervently prayed for salvation. This article cannot go into a full discussion of »the age of religion/secularization« debate, but it adheres to this recent trend and aims to engage critically the older position through a case study using the five medieval oaths held by Princeton University.
Material

The Princeton Oaths

The East Asian Library, Princeton University, holds five medieval oaths (hereafter, referred to as «Princeton oath» with its number). The first four oaths belong to the medieval period, while the fifth and last belongs to the early Tokugawa period.

(1) Kōji 2 (1556) 6.20: Daishi kanjō oath of the Isano family collective (To Saji Tarōsaemon no jō)

Figure 1: Princeton oath (1) Reverse, courtesy of Princeton University Library

14 For the transcriptions and translations of these documents by Horikawa Yasufumi and Thomas D. Conlan, see «Kishōmon: Four Oaths and Five Invocations,» komonjo.princeton.edu/kishomon/ (accessed on 19 November 2023).

The Princeton University employs a different numbering: (1) in this article corresponds to (1) in Princeton University Library. Likewise, (2) corresponds to (2), (3) to (3-A), (4) to (3-B), and (5) to (4).

15 The following images of Princeton oaths (1)-(5) were downloaded from the website of Princeton University Library (accessed on 19 November 2023): catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/99101663993506421.
(2) Eiroku 6 (1563) 6.25: Oath of local warriors (To Saji [Tarōsaemon no jō])

Figure 2: Princeton oath (2) Reverse
(3) Eiroku 12 (1569) 6.3: *Reisha jōgan* oath of local warriors (To Saji Tarōsaemon no jō, Saji Mimasaka no kami, and Kosaji village)

*Figure 3: Princeton oath (3) Reverse*
(4) Eiroku 12 (1569) 6.3: Daishi kanjō oath of local warriors (To Saji Tarōsaemon no jō, Saji Mimasaka no kami, and Kosaji village)
Oaths from the Warring States period often consist of two parts. The first part, called the content clause (maegaki), contains the specific contents of the promise. The second part, called the invocation clause (shinmon), contains the names of deities, temples, shrines, and authorities to whom one makes an oath, followed by the potential divine punishment these metapersons might mete out. Some oaths contain both content and invocation clauses on a single piece of paper, but, depending on the sophistication of the oath’s format and the number of deities that are included, content and invocation clauses increasingly came to be written on separate pieces of paper: plain paper for content clauses and talismanic paper for invocation clauses. The Princeton oaths only have invocation clauses, while their content clauses are missing.

16 Satō, Shinban komonjogaku nyūmon, 230-231.
The Kosaji Documents: The Origin of the Princeton Oaths

When Princeton University purchased these oaths from a Japanese antique bookseller in 2017, little was known about their origin except that the bookseller had obtained them from Takita Eiji (1904-1998), an entrepreneur and local historian from Aichi prefecture, who had studied Zen Buddhism and Japanese history at Tokyo Imperial University (present-day University of Tokyo).

However, judging from the names and places that appeared in the oaths, these documents can be identified as part of the medieval documents handed down to the Saji, a local warrior family based in Kōga district, in Ōmi province (present-day Kōka city, Shiga prefecture; see Figures 6 and 7). This origin explains why Takita Eiji had owned these oaths. Takita had studied the Saji of the Chita Peninsula in Owari province (present-day Chita city, Aichi prefecture), a warrior family that had branched out from the Saji of Kōga. Although Takita did not mention these oaths in his monograph, he likely had obtained them for his research. These oaths would have been sold when his collection was released after his death in 1998.

The Saji held the status of vassals of the Muromachi bakufu, and they also served the Rokkaku family, the provincial constable (shugo) and sengoku warlord of Ōmi province. Their descendants still possess the Saji’s inherited documents, called the Kosaji documents (Kosaji being the name of the village where they lived). Surprisingly, the content clauses of the three oaths in the Kosaji documents can be connected to the invocation clauses of Princeton oaths (1) to (4).

---

17 Takita, Tokoname shiwa sahuin, 3-103.
18 Takita’s collection of Zen Buddhist texts was donated to the Department of Indian Philosophy and Buddhist Studies, the University of Tokyo. For the Takita Eiji collection, see Sueki and Takita, Takita bunko mokuroku.
19 The Rokkaku played a crucial role in bakufu politics in the Warring States period but lost power after their defeat by Nobunaga in 1568. For the Rokkaku in the Warring States period, see Murai, Rokkaku Sadayori. See in English, Tonomura, Community and Commerce, 17-36; Eason, Culture of Disputes, 20-75.
Figure 6: The Japanese archipelago
Figure 7: Ōmi province and surrounding areas
**Kōga and Local Warriors in the Warring States Period**

Ōmi province, where the Saji lived, is a province neighboring Kyoto, the capital of Japan from 794 to 1869. Kōga is in the southwest of Ōmi province, on the Tōkaidō route that connected Kyoto with eastern Japan (see Figures 6 and 7). In the medieval period, Kōga was a strategic area because of its links to important transportation routes and mountainous terrain. The surviving documents show that the Kamakura and Muromachi bakufu often assigned the duty of securing this route and surrounding areas to local warriors of Kōga. After the Ōnin war and the subsequent political turmoil, politically important figures, including the shogun of the Muromachi bakufu, sometimes fled to Kōga to avoid upheavals in Kyoto.

During the Warring States period, local warriors of Kōga formed familial and territorial organizations, called sō (collective), for mutual benefits such as agricultural management and judicial arbitration. This has made Kōga unique and famous to modern historians. The smallest unit of such organizations was the dōmyō sō, a familial organization where the collective possessed the same surname. Such family collectives then allied with the collective of other surnames to form larger organizations based on territorial connections. In the middle of the sixteenth century, corresponding to the increasing military tension around the district, local Kōga warriors formed a district-wide organization called Kōga gunchū sō (the Kōga district collective). These collectives had egalitarian organization structures and developed a council system to deal with local disputes and military affairs. It is for such local disputes that the Princeton oaths were issued. In the next section, we shall explore how these oaths functioned.

**The Princeton Oaths and Local Disputes**

The Princeton oaths are written on the reverse side of the talismanic paper called go-ō hōin (Ox-head paper), following the custom of the medieval period. While there were various types of go-ō hōin issued by different temples and shrines, the go-ō hōin for the Princeton oaths is the one called Nachinotaki-hōin (talismans of the Nachi Falls) issued by the Kumano Nachi shrine in Kii province (present-day Wakayama prefecture) (see Figure 3 in Conlan’s article in this volume, depicting the reverse of Princeton oath [1]). Many small symbols of sacred crows and jewels spell out Nachinotaki-hōin (那智瀧宝印) on each of which there is a red stamp that symbolizes in Sanskrit the names for the Buddhist deities of the Kumano Nachi shrine.

---

20 For further discussion, see Aida, *Chūsei no sekisho*, 168-185.
22 The word sō is also translated as »league« or »confederacy.«
23 A considerable amount of research already exists for the Kōga district collective. For the historiography, see Ishida, *Chūsei Yamanakashi*. See in English Souyri, Autonomy and war, 116-118. For collectives formed at the village level, see Hitomi Tonomura’s analysis on the Imabori village collective in the same Ōmi province. Tonomura, *Community and Commerce*.
24 For the use of oaths in the same Ōmi province, see also Fukaya Kōji’s analysis of a series of oaths submitted from villages of southern Ōmi to Oda Nobunaga in 1572 that swore not to support the Honganji temple. Fukaya, *Oda Nobunaga*, 118-168.
25 In Japanese mythology, sacred crows guided Emperor Jinmu, the legendary first emperor of Japan, from Kumano to Nara, and supported his conquest.

---
Invocation Clauses

Medieval oaths can be classified according to invocation clauses that list the deities. Deities in invocation clauses quite often vary to reflect places and periods, and the writer’s religious beliefs. The Princeton oaths can be classified into three types:

First, the invocation clause of Princeton oath (2) belongs to the Jōei Code type. This means that it lists the deities of the Izu, Hakone, and Mishima shrines in eastern Japan, which were the same deities as those included in the oath placed at the end of the Jōei Code (Jōei shikimoku, a law code promulgated by the Kamakura bakufu in 1232. As the first systematic law for warriors, the Jōei Code was canonized in the medieval period. Princeton oath (2) must have been written under the influence of the Jōei Code. Later, the invocation clause of the Jōei Code served as a standard in the Tokugawa period.

Second, the invocation clauses of Princeton oaths (1) and (4) belong to the Daishi kanjō oath (大師勧請起請文), which means »an oath to invoke Buddhist master Saichō (the founder of the Tendai school in Japan).« Kenkō, the author of Tsurezuregusa (Essays in Idleness), wrote that Jie (912-985), a chief abbot of the Enryakuji temple, invented the Daishi kanjō oath. One of the characteristics of the Daishi kanjō oath is that its invocation clause includes the deities, masters, and buildings associated with the Enryakuji temple and the Tendai school. For example, Princeton oath (1) lists buildings of the Enryakuji temple such as the Central Hall (konpon chūdō) and the East and West Pagodas (tōzai ryōdō), as well as Buddhist masters such as Nangaku (Nanyue in Chinese) and Tendai (Zhiyi), the founders of the Tendai school in China, along with many Buddhist and Shintō deities.

Finally, the invocation clause of Princeton oath (3) belongs to the Reisha jōgan oath (霊社上巻起請文) type, which means »an oath sworn to the Reisha shrine.« The Reisha jōgan oath appeared in Ōmi province in the middle of the sixteenth century, and it became so popular that the rules of the Ōhara family collective (Table 1/15) in Eiroku 13 (1570) stipulated that the Reisha jōgan oath should be used in criminal cases. Later, Oda Nobunaga and Toyotomi Hideyoshi, who had at one point set their headquarters in Ōmi province, adopted the Reisha jōgan oath to serve as the standard oath template for their regimes. However, it fell out of favor in the subsequent Tokugawa regime, which preferred the invocation clause from the Jōei Code.

A characteristic of the Reisha jōgan oath is its overwhelming array of deities, which, according to Chijiwa Itaru, is a symptom of a general inflation of warranting powers. Princeton oath (3) is filled with the names of deities written in small letters (see Figure 3). While Princeton oath (3) is written on one piece of paper, the Reisha jōgan oath is often written on multiple pieces due to their length (since they name many, many deities). The invocation clause of one oath written by the two collectives of Kōga district and Iga province in Tenshō 1 (1573) (Table 1/18) is, for example, written on three pieces of go-ō hōin paper.

26 The Jinshaishū, a law code written by Date Tanemune (1488-1565), a sengoku daimyo of Mutsu province in northern Japan, in Tenbun 6 (1536), ended with almost the same oath as the Jōei Code. See Conlan, Samurai and the Warrior Culture, 206, 214-15. A recent translation of the Jōei Code appears ibid., 42-62. For an overview of the Jōei Code, see Adolphson, Weighing in on Evidence, 309-312.
27 For the Daishi kanjō oath, see Chijiwa, Daishi kanjō kishōmon.
28 Kenkō, Tsurezuregusa, section 205.
29 For the Reisha jōgan oath, see Chijiwa, Reisha jōgan kishōmon.
30 Chijiwa, Chūsei minshū, 33-37.
Satō Hiroo classifies the deities listed in the Daishi kanjō and the Reisha jōgan oath types into four categories: (1) Buddhist deities from India who live in the heavenly realm and protect the law of the Buddha; (2) Daoist deities from China such as Yanluo Wang, one of the judges in the underworld; (3) Japanese deities, local temples, and shrines; (4) Buddhist masters.  

For the deities of local Kōga temples and shrines, Princeton oaths (3) and (4) list the deities of the Aburahi shrine and the Handōji temple. The Aburahi shrine is one of the central shrines of Kōga; there, local warriors conducted various ceremonies to worship the shrine's deity and confirm their privileged status as local elites.  

The Handōji temple, on the other hand, is a temple of the Shugendō, a belief system that worships sacred mountains and centers on ascetic practice in mountains. The Handōji temple is one of the influential Shugendō temples, closely connected with some of the headquarters of the Shugendō, such as the Yoshino and Kumano mountains.

Other oaths from Kōga often include the deities of their familial temples and shrines. One oath of the Ōhara, for instance, includes «our familial shrine,» which refers to the Ōtori shrine. In his 1976 article, Ishida Yoshihito reported that the Ōhara still had a collective with the same surname (dōmyō sō) and gathered at the Ōtori shrine once a year.

**Local Disputes and the Function of Oaths**

As mentioned above, local Kōga warriors developed a council system to adjudicate local disputes. For example, in Tenbun 2 (1533), seven local warriors, including the Saji, mediated in a dispute over mountain resources between Ushikai village and the four villages of Shiono, Yamagami, Ichihara, and Somanaka. Such local disputes concerned boundaries, irrigation water, and common areas such as mountains and fields. As villagers of the medieval period were armed, disputes often quickly escalated into significant and bloody disputes. This section discusses the use of oaths in these disputes.

---

31 Satō, Kishōmon no seishinshi, 22-62. For deities invoked in oaths, see also Chijiwa, Chūsei no kishōmon. Surprising for a western audience perhaps, but normal in Japan and in many societies observed by anthropologists, sacred buildings are symbiotic with and identified with the deities they house, and deceased Buddhist masters are divine «metapersons» thanks to their reincarnation trajectories (see Buc’s general introduction to this volume).

32 For the ceremonies conducted at the Aburahi shrine, see Miyajima, Sengokuki Ōmi; Fujita, Kyōdo to sairei. The Saji and other local warriors also supported the building of the main hall of the Aburahi shrine in Meiō 4 (1495). Kōkashishi hensan iinkai, Kōkashishi, vol. 2, 345-346.

33 For an introduction, see Castiglioni, Rambelli, and Roth, Defining Shugendō.


35 Hasegawa, Sengokuki no chiiki kennyoku, 85-94.

36 Ishida, Kōga gunchū sō to Ōhara, 144.

37 Ushikai kyōyū monjo.

38 One violent conflict in the same Ōmi province is analyzed in Satō, «Peace» or not?.

39 For the local disputes described in the Kosaji documents, see Yuzawa (Kurushima), Chūsei kōki zaichi ryōshu, 42-45; Hasegawa, Sengokuki no chiiki kennyoku, 233-271.
Figure 8: Kōga and local warriors in the Princeton oaths
Princeton oath (1) from Kōji 2 (1556), submitted by the Isano family collective\(^{40}\) to Saji Tarōsaemon no jō, deals with a dispute between Isano and Imajuku villages over wild grass in the riverside area called Kawaraomote. Its content clause reads:

\[\text{[Item]} \text{ The current dispute with Imajuku village is over the pasture grass in Kawaraomote in your landholdings. We will never assert any rights over Kawaraomote.} \]

\[\text{[Item]} \text{ We will never make unprecedented claims to your landholdings.} \]

\[\text{[Item]} \text{ We will never plot with the residents of Imajuku village or make unreasonable claims.} \]

\[\text{If we were to tell a lie, we would receive harsh punishment from this oath (kishōmon).} \]

The content clause (\textit{maegaki}) is thus.

Kōji 2 (1556) 6.20    [From:] The Isano family collective (sō)
[To:] Hon. (Saji) Tarōsaemon no jō

During their dispute with Imajuku village over the pasture grass of Kawaraomote, the Isano family collective raised the suspicion that it might claim ownership of Kawaraomote, which belonged to the Saji. In order to clear this suspicion, it submitted this oath and promised not to claim any rights to Saji’s landholdings in the future.\(^{41}\) The content clause in the Kosaji documents did not state the individual names of the Isano family collective, but Princeton oath (1) has the signatures of seven members. Of those members, Isano Tamenaga, Tameshige, Tametsuna, and Tameyoshi appeared in a document written in Tenbun 16 (1547).\(^{42}\) The Princeton oath is valuable in that it reveals the organizational structure of the Isano family collective, the smallest collective unit in Kōga.

Tension apparently existed between the Saji and the Isano before the writing of Princeton oath (1). In Tenbun 16 (1547), they disagreed over the common lands: three members from the Saji family collective handled this dispute, and it was settled that the Isano offered service labor to the Saji in exchange for using common lands.\(^{43}\) However, their dispute recurred in Eiroku 6 (1563), and Princeton oath (2) recounts as follows:

Concerning the current dispute between the Saji and the Isano over reclaimed rice paddies in Hachimen, we are told to handle it based on the merits of the claims as intermediaries. However, it is settled that the Saji shall continue to possess those rice paddies. There are no other settlements between us concerning your dispute. The Saji should agree to this settlement, and there should be no objection. If we were to tell a lie, we would receive harsh punishment from this oath (kishōmon). The content clause (\textit{maegaki}) is thus.

Eiroku 6 (1563) 6.25    [From:] The collective (sō)
[To:] Hon. Saji

---

\(^{40}\) The Isano is a branch family of the Saji in the north of the Kosaji village.

\(^{41}\) The Imajuku village collective also submitted an oath to the Saji in the following year. Kosaji monjo.

\(^{42}\) Kosaji monjo.

\(^{43}\) Kosaji monjo.
Previous scholars did not know who had mediated this dispute and issued this oath as it does not write the specific name and members of the collective. However, Princeton oath (2) has signatures of eleven local warriors from the Yamanaka, Tongū, Taki, Ikeda, Minobe, Taki, Ōno, Giga, and Oki families and thus reveals that local warriors mediated in the dispute and urged the Saji to agree to their settlement. The dispute between the Saji and the Isano was mediated by the villages and families involved in 1556, but this failed, and thus mediation by more important people, that is local warriors, was required in 1563.\textsuperscript{44}

However, the tension between the Saji and the Isano was not defused. Princeton oaths (3) and (4) are paired with the following document concerning the recurring dispute in Eiroku 12 (1569):

We convey our opinion concerning the current dispute between the Saji and the Isano families. [Item] From now on, when cutting grass on ridges [of rice fields] in Isano village, both the Kosaji and the Isano should be present. We believe our opinion to be fair and free from favoritism and prejudice. Therefore, we issue this document with our signatures. If we were to tell a lie, we would receive harsh punishment from two oaths (kishōmon) of Reisha [jōgan] and Daishi kanjō. The signed letter is thus.

Eiroku 12 (1569) 6.3 [From:]
Tomo Izu no kami Sukeyuki (monogram)
Iwamuro Sakyō no suke Sukekatsu (monogram)
Taki Shikibu no jō lemasa (monogram)
Yamanaka Yamato no kami Toshiyoshi (monogram)
Taki Naizen no suke Suketoshi (monogram)
Tomo Kai no kami Sukesada (monogram)

[To:] Hon. Saji Tarōsaemon no jō
Hon. Saji Mimasaka no kami
Kosaji village

The local warriors again mediated in the dispute and conveyed their judgment with an oath containing two invocation clauses: Reisha jōgan and Daishi kanjō. It is notable that, while one invocation clause would normally be enough to formalize an oath, this 1569 oath was supplemented by another invocation clause. Since the reference to the Daishi kanjō invocation was inserted in the text later, these local warriors likely thought the Reisha jōgan oath was insufficient to settle the recurring disputes between the Saji and the Isano and so added the Daishi kanjō oath.

\textsuperscript{44} Hasegawa Yasuko discusses the fact that local warriors did not mediate in local disputes until mediation by the involved families and villages was no longer possible or until local disputes escalated into violent conflicts. Hasegawa, \textit{Sengokuki no chiiki kenryoku}, 243-250.
Thus, local Kōga warriors used oaths in mediation and adjudication of disputes. Table 1 shows the existing oaths that were issued for such purposes. The fact that a template of the Reisha jōgan oath can be found in the Yamanaka documents (the Yamanaka was one of the leading members of the Kōga district collective) indicates how frequently they wrote oaths. Oaths conferred legitimacy on mediation and adjudication by local warriors and systematically functioned as a part of the legal process. The next question, then, is how and to what extent did local warriors fear the punishment provided for in oaths. The last section explores these questions.

**Social and Divine Sanctions**

There were two possible sanctions for breaking an oath: divine and social. For social sanctions, some oaths refer to banishment from the collective and ostracism. For example, an oath of the Tomo, Yamanaka, and Minobe families’ collective from Eiroku 9 (1566) (Table 1/12) states the following:

(Item 8) If one breaks this agreement even for one thing, he shall be banished from the same surname, and three families shall never support him.

In this case, these persons were responsible to their collective for breaking an oath. This makes more sense when one considers the actual scene of oath taking. The rules of the Ōhara family collective from Eiroku 13 (1570) (Table 1/15) illustrate how they wrote an oath:

(Item 14) In our landholdings, regardless of their status, the possession of poison should be banned. If one knows of the possession of poison, without doubt, he/she should inform the master of that person, whether he/she is on bad terms with or unfamiliar with that master. Then, the master should inform the [accused] person [about the accusation]. If that [accused] person claims to be innocent, he/she should write a [Reisha] jōgan oath and put his/her signature with blood in front of the members of the family collective (domyo chū) to clear the doubt. In cases where the accused person belongs to the bonge status [the status lower than warrior status], he/she should write an appropriate oath [other than a Reisha jōgan oath].

This rule provides that the accused person should write an oath in front of the members of the family collective. It also indicates he or she bore responsibilities to collective members. In the medieval period, most people relied on familial and regional bonds. Therefore, the banishment from collective is likely to have been a severe and effective sanction.

---

45 Yamanaka monjo, doc. 437
46 Miyajima, Sengoku ki ni okeru, 28-29.
47 Yamanaka monjo, doc. 235.
48 Hasegawa, Sengokuki no chiiki kenryoku, 86.
49 This item also shows that different types of oaths were selected, depending on the social status of oath takers.
For divine sanctions, most invocation clauses in these oaths refer to leprosy as punishment from deities. In pre-modern Japan, leprosy was believed to be a divine punishment resulting from bad behavior in a previous life. Princeton oath (3) reads as follows:

If we were to tell a lie, even for one thing, we would receive white and black leprosy in the current life, descend into unremitting hell in the afterlife, never to return, and receive harsh punishment into 84,000 pores and 42 joints.

However, as most medieval oaths mention leprosy, one might argue that these references may have been formulaic rather than the evidence that medieval people were afraid of divine punishment. The lack of historical sources means that it is obviously challenging to know the thoughts of those who wrote oaths. However, Yoshida Kanemi (1535-1610), a Shintō priest of the Yoshida shrine in Kyoto, left valuable information that enables us to answer this question.

The Yoshida lineage consisted of courtiers who specialized in Shintō rituals. They developed their teachings and practices throughout the medieval period. A major moment in this process was when Yoshida Kanetomo (1435-1511) organized them into a distinct structured doctrine (today known as Yoshida Shintō) and established himself and his descendants as the dominant Shintō leaders. The Yoshida also fostered ties with local shrines and communities by granting ranks and titles to these shrines, performing prayer rites, and adjudicating shrine affairs. An early example of Yoshida's connection with Kōga can be found in Tenbun 3 (1534), when at the request of Mikumo Suketane, one of the leading warriors of Kōga, Yoshida Kanemigi (Kanemi's father, 1516-1573) offered a schedule for building the entrance gate of the Suwa shrine in Kōga.

Table 2 tallies those entries from Kanemi's diary (Kanemi-kyō ki) featuring people of Kōga. They reveal that these men and women believed in curses and spirits and conducted various religious practices. The entry for the 24th day of the 9th month of Genki 3 (1572) (Table 2/5), translated below, demonstrates how one medieval person feared the punishment involved in an oath:

The 24th date. Mochizuki Bingo no kami Shigekiyo of Kōga, Ōmi province, sent Hachishirō of the same surname [as his messenger] and told me that he wrote an oath for a certain reason. Since then, he has not been feeling well. He cannot move his body as he wants. I asked for more details and accepted his request for a prayer.

Kuroda, Kyōkai no chūsei, 233-258.
For an overview of the Yoshida and their teachings, see Inoue, Yoshida Shintō. See in English, Grapard, Shintō of Yoshida Kanetomo; Hardacre, Shintō, 207-234; Horikawa, Diary of a Shintō Priest.
For transcription, see Yoshida Kanemi, Kanemigi-kyō ki, ed. Kaneko and Endō. Between parentheses, explanations, between brackets, what I had to add to the original entry to make sense of it.
The Mochizuki were one of the leading families of the Kōga district collective. In Tenshō 12 (1584), the Mochizuki family collective put their signature to the oath of the Kōga district collective.\(^{55}\) The Mochizuki also appeared in the entries for the 16th day of the 2nd month of Genki 2 (1571) (Table 2/2) and the 29th day of the 3rd month of Tenshō 13 (1585) (Table 2/20). In the former, Mochizuki Shimotsuke no kami asked Kanemi for a talisman to appease the deity Inari, the deity of foxes, which was haunting a woman and demanded that the Mochizuki build a shrine.\(^{56}\) In the latter, Mochizuki Tobimatsu asked Kanemi for a prayer for his wife, who had been sick since she had given birth.\(^{57}\) In the medieval period, childbirth was believed to be a defiling moment where evil spirits could inflict harm. It is safe to assume that the Mochizuki did indeed fear divine punishment. As noted in the introduction to this article, previous research characterized the Warring States period as “the age of secularization.” However, the analysis of Table 2 casts doubts on seeing the punishment mentioned in an oath as being merely a formulaic phrase.

The fact that people asked Kanemi for prayers means that they were trying to avoid divine punishments. Previous research has focused on the ritual called *kishō-gaeshi* or *kishō-yaburi*, which means the cancellation of an oath.\(^{58}\) The journal entry for the 11th day of the 9th month of Tenshō 11 (1583) reads as follows:

People from the southern capital [Nara] reported that an uncle and a nephew argued at the residence, and they swore to sever their ties. They have kept this oath and have never seen each other since then. Their relatives persuaded them to reconcile, but because of his oath, the uncle, Oki no kami, never agreed. For this reason, the relatives eagerly asked for an approval [that cancels their oath and allows them to reconcile]. I offered a prayer and sent a document [of approval].\(^{59}\)

\(^{55}\) Yamanaka monjo, doc. 2030. 
Likewise, on the 21st day of the 11th month of the same year, a man from Takashima in Ōmi province asked Yoshida Kanemi for the cancellation of an oath, although Kanemi did not record its content. On the 26th day of the 6th month of the following year, the people from Yawata in Kyoto told Kanemi that four men had written an oath not to drink alcohol (probably for purification). Although they kept this promise, they asked for the cancellation of the oath for some reason. On the 6th day of the 12th month of the same year, Aoyama Sukeyōe no jō from Echizen province (present-day Fukui prefecture) asked for the cancellation of an oath as follows:

The letter from Aoyama Sukeyōe no jō of Echizen province arrived. He and his wife wrote an oath to divorce but reconciled as a result of persuasion by their children and relatives. However, the punishment of the oath is more important than the persuasion of their children and relatives. Therefore, they asked [Kanemi] for a prayer and the cancellation of the oath.

Then, Kanemi performed the ritual of the cancellation of the oath: he chanted toward all the directions of heaven and performed ceremonies three times, with eight plates of food offerings.

Although Kanemi’s diary contains no entries about the cancellation of an oath dealing with Kōga, the following entry for the 9th day of the 12th month of Tenshō 12 (1584) (Table 2/19) shows that the people of Kōga attempted to avoid divine punishment, adopting the new practices of Yoshida Shintō:

Wakadayū, a Shintō priest of the Ox-head shrine in Giga estate, Kōga, said he had carried out the duties of the shrine since he had been appointed as head priest in recent years. He had to perform a purification ritual with [cold] water every morning, which he found unbearable. For this reason, Wakadayū eagerly asked for a judgment order, so I sent him a judgment order [which allows him to use hot water]. As for precedents, I allowed another priest of the Sakuradani shrine in Ōmi province to do the same. Using hot water for the purification ritual is the correct teaching.

Inoue Tomokatsu, who studies Yoshida Shintō, argues that this lineage invented new practices, such as the cancellation of an oath and Shintō saikyōjō (Yoshida’s licenses concerning Shintō affairs), and thus relieved the anxieties of people toward deities. These innovations undoubtedly influenced people’s attitudes toward oaths as Inoue and Chijiwa suggest, but it is also worth noting that the Yoshida was reluctant to perform the cancellation of an oath. Kanemi often used the word konmō (懇望), which means «earnest requests,« to describe demands for the cancellation of an oath. This expression shows that Kanemi performed the cancellation of an oath only when his clients requested it fervently.

---

64 Inoue, Yoshida Shintō, 38-50.
The same attitude clearly appears in the diary of Yoshida Kanemigi, Kanemi’s father. In Tenbun 3 (1534), Kanemigi performed the cancellation of an oath for Ōtsuka Zen’emon no jō, a retainer of the Mikumo of Kōga, but he confessed in his diary that he could not decline Ōtsuka’s request because Ōtsuka had helped him in restoring one of his landholdings. The entry for the 27th day of the 5th month of Tenbun 19 (1550), translated below, shows Kanemigi’s hesitation to cancel an oath:

Ozaki Hikoemon, a merchant of Shimogyō [in Kyoto], said that there are brothers named Yasutada and Yoshihisa who live near the Hikuma shrine in Tōtōmi province (present-day Shizuoka prefecture). They wrote an oath to swear to sever their ties due to a sudden argument. Ozaki asked for a talisman to reconcile them. Although the cancellation of an oath has been strictly prohibited in recent years, this is not a consequential oath. Also, the reconciliation of the brothers meets the spirit of mercy, so the gods will understand it as well.

To summarize, the people of Kōga had two attitudes toward the oaths and its divine punishment: On the one hand, they were indeed afraid of divine punishment, but on the other, they ultimately found ways to avoid divine punishments and thus felt less guilty for breaking promises to deities. The Yoshida also had the same attitude. They created the rites of the cancellation of an oath to fulfill people’s desire to cancel an oath, but at the same time, they tried to restrict its practice into limited and inconsequential occasions. These ambivalent attitudes suggest that the Warring States period cannot simply be characterized as either »the age of religion« or »the age of secularization.« This article must leave this problem to future research, but it is certain that we need a more nuanced understanding of to what extent people respected oaths and feared divine punishments. Perhaps this very framework could be reconsidered as well.

Epilogue: After the Kōga District Collective
The Kōga district collective came to an end in Tenshō 13 (1585) when Toyotomi Hideyoshi, who would reunite Japan in 1590, banished many local Kōga warriors as a punishment for their negligence during his military campaign against the Negoroji temple of Kii province, a monastic institution that maintained considerable autonomy. For example, Ōhara Kenmotsu, who frequently appeared in Yoshida Kanemi’s diary, was banished in 1585 from Kōga and forced to live in Ise province (Table 2/21). After this sudden banishment, called Kōga yure (»the Kōga Earthquake«), the Kōga district collective broke up for good.

---

66 Yoshida Kanemigi, Kanemigi-kyō ki, ed. Kishimoto and Sawai, Part 10, 81. In Tenbun 7 (1538), Kanemigi in fact declined a request from one courtier, saying »the cancellation of an oath has been entirely suspended.« Yoshida Kanemigi, Kanemigi-kyō ki, Tenbun 7 (1538). 3.13, ed. Kishimoto and Sawai, Part 6, 105.
Although some of these warriors maintained local influence, they were not classified as samurai, a distinct elite warriors status codified by Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and instead became classified merely as »commoners.« Nevertheless, their residual authority remained, in Keichō 16 (1611), three of them mediated a dispute over mountain resources in the same way as their ancestors had settled a similar dispute in Tenbun 2 (1533). However, their mediation apparently ceased after Keichō 19 (1614). It was replaced by mediation and adjudication by the Tokugawa bakufu and its officials. At the same time, a new type of oath, which seems to have been written by people of lower status, appeared in Kōga. An example is Princeton oath (5). Although its content is unclear, as its content clause is not present in the surviving Kosaji documents, this oath, which is filled with a number of simple signatures called ryakuō, a sign used by illiterate people, could well represent the decline of the local power of the Kōga warriors (see Figure 5).

Some of these former warriors, who had lost their privileged warrior status, petitioned the Tokugawa bakufu to serve, calling themselves Kōga koshi (»the Old Kōga Warriors«). The Old Kōga Warriors stressed the military merits of their ancestors to the Tokugawa bakufu and its founder Tokugawa Ieyasu. They also made claims of being stealthy specialists of ninjutsu, or ninja martial arts. Although their attempt to regain status never succeeded, the Kōga ninja became a part of Kōga’s regional symbol, and the origins of this very famous trope of ninja.

The Saji, one of the 21 houses of the Old Kōga Warriors, also experienced the same upheavals. In Bunsei 12 (1829), when Saji Tameyori organized his documents into a scroll, he wrote in the colophon that the Saji’s documents had been scattered after the destruction of the Kōga district collective. This description might explain why our Princeton oaths were lost to the Saji sometime prior to 1829. Thus, the Princeton oaths not only demonstrate how medieval oaths functioned in local disputes in Kōga but also tell us of the hardship one local warrior family experienced in the socio-political transition from the medieval to the Tokugawa period.

---

67 Ishida, Kōga gunchū sō to Iga, 365-367.
69 For the transformation from local warriors to ninja, see Fujita, Kōga ninja no jitsuzō. See in English Souyri, Autonomy and war; Turnbull, Ninja, Chapter 6.
70 Today, Kōga is best known as the birthplace of the Kōga ninja.
71 Kosaji monjo, Bunsei 12 (1829) Saji Tameyori’s colophon. This scroll of the Saji’s inherited documents does not contain the Princeton oaths, which indicates that the Princeton oaths were lost to the Saji before 1829. Miyajima Keichi points out that the oaths left in Kōga often lost their invocation clauses. Therefore, an alternative explanation that invocation clauses were considered less important than content clauses and were deliberately separated from the content clauses of these documents. Chijiwa Itaru assumes that missing invocation clauses would have been burnt during rituals of burning and consumption of oaths in front of temples and shrines. However, the new find of the Princeton oaths casts doubts on Chijiwa’s assumption. Miyajima, Sengoku ki ni okeru, 23; Chijiwa, Seiyaku no ba, 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Invocation Clause</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Daiei 2 (1522). 4.27</td>
<td>Kashiwagi three families (Tomo, Yamanaka, and Minobe) collective</td>
<td>Yamanaka Sadatoshi</td>
<td>A dispute over ceremonies at the Wakamiya shrine.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Kashiwagi jinja monjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Daiei 5 (1525). 6</td>
<td>Yamanaka Sadatoshi</td>
<td>Intermediaries (gohanshū)</td>
<td>Sadatoshi asks for a fair judgment on a dispute with Tomo Shinroku.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 204, 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tenbun 2 (1533). 7.26</td>
<td>Local warriors (Tomo, Saji, Yamanaka, Ikeda, Taki-Iwano, Usami, Tsuda)</td>
<td>Ushikai village</td>
<td>A dispute between Ushikai village and four other villages (Shiono, Yamagami, Ichihara, Somanaka) over mountain commons.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Ushikai kyōyū monjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Tenbun 7 (1538). 9.17</td>
<td>Yamanaka Hisatoshi</td>
<td>(Same as above)</td>
<td>(Same as above)</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tenbun 9 (1540). 12.10</td>
<td>Naiki Sanetoshi and two other warriors</td>
<td>Sugitani village collective</td>
<td>A dispute between Sugitani and Isō villages over mountains.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kōji 2 (1556). 6.20</td>
<td>Isano family collective</td>
<td>Saji Tarōsaemon no jō</td>
<td>A dispute between the Saji and the Isano families over grass.</td>
<td>Daishi</td>
<td>Kosaji monjo + Princeton (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Eiroku 8 (1565). 6.29</td>
<td>Kashiwagi three families (Tomo, Yamanaka, Minobe) collective</td>
<td>(Three villages of Ishibe?)</td>
<td>A dispute between the three villages of Ishibe and Himono village over irrigation water.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 [Eiroku 8 (1565). 6.29]</td>
<td>(Same as above)</td>
<td>(Himono village?)</td>
<td>(Same as above)</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Eiroku 8 (1565). 7.2</td>
<td>Collective of the eight villages of Takano</td>
<td>Himono village</td>
<td>(Same as above)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Eiroku 9 (1566). 12.15</td>
<td>Kashiwagi three families (Tomo, Yamanaka, Minobe) collective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>An agreement on punishments for criminals.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Invocation Clause</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yamanaka family collective's adjudicator(s)</td>
<td>Yamanaka Toshiyoshi, Kashiwagi village</td>
<td>A dispute between Yamanaka Toshiyoshi and the Minobe-Otani family.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Local warriors (Tomo, Iwamuro, Taki, Yamanaka)</td>
<td>Saji Tarōsaemon no jō, Saji Mimasaka no kami, Kosaji village</td>
<td>A dispute between the Saji and the Isano families over grass.</td>
<td>Reisha, Daishi</td>
<td>Kosaji monjo + Princeton (3, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ohara family collective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The rules of the Ōhara family collective.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kōga district collective</td>
<td>Handōji temple</td>
<td>A dispute between the Handōji temple and the Shingū and the Yagawa shrines.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yamanaka Toshiyoshi, Hachirōsaemon no jō, Hizen no kami</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Promises to mediate a dispute between Iwasaka village and (Yamanaka) Shin'ūemon.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kōga district collective, Iga province collective</td>
<td>Wada family</td>
<td>A dispute between the Wada and the Tsuge families over mountains.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Shimogō kyōsaikai shozō monjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Local warriors (Taki, Ōhara, Saji)</td>
<td>Ushikai village</td>
<td>A dispute between Ushikai village and the villages of Yamagami and Nakamura over mountains.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Sakaue Ichitarō shi shozō monjo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Former Kōga district collective</td>
<td>Yamanaka Toshiyoshi</td>
<td>A dispute between Yamanaka Toshiyoshi and the Naiki and the Kita-Oka families over the land.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Former Kōga district collective</td>
<td>Mochizuki-Fukuya family, Isō village</td>
<td>A dispute between the villages of Sugitani and Isō over the boundary of mountains.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Uda village collective</td>
<td>(Yamanaka Toshiyoshi?)</td>
<td>Promises to repay a debt.</td>
<td>Reisha</td>
<td>Yamanaka monjo, doc. 263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:
* Kōkashishi hensan iinkai, Kōkashishi, vol. 2, 384, fig. 263.  
** Shigaken Kōka gun kyöoku iinkai, Kōka gun shi, vol. 1, 276.  
*** Hasegawa, Sengokuki no chiki henryoku, 85-94.  
**** Kōkashishi hensan iinkai, Kōkashishi, vol. 2, 256, fig. 176.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genki 1 (1570). 6.5</td>
<td>A husband and wife from Kōga, who had already lost two sons, asked Kanemi for a prayer for a safe birth this month. Kanemi examined their astrological elements and found they had conflicting elements of fire and water. Kanemi gave them talismans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genki 2 (1571). 2.16</td>
<td>Mochizuki Shōgakajō no kami of Kōga, who lived in Shibukawa village of Kōga, asked Kanemi for a prayer to appease a spirit of a deceased monk named Ryoji. Kanemi gave him talismans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genki 3 (1572). 2.7</td>
<td>Uhyōe no jō, who lived in Aburahi village of Kōga, asked Kanemi for talismans to appease a spirit of a deceased monk named Ryōjun, who had brought a curse on the village. Kanemi gave talismans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genki 3 (1572). 7.23</td>
<td>Ōsakaya (lit. a big brewer) of Kōga asked Kanemi for three talismans for his daughter and sons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genki 3 (1572). 9.24</td>
<td>Mochizuki Shigekiyō of Kōga asked Kanemi to perform a prayer. He had felt ill after writing an oath for appeasing the spirit. (See also 1.24 and 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 3 (1575). 12.30</td>
<td>Maruoka Yoritaka, a Shintō priest of a shrine of Kōjibukuro, Kōga, did not usually eat fish or chicken from the new year to the eighth day of the first month. In recent years, Yoritaka had ordered lower priests to perform rituals while he frequently went out to serve Sakuma Nobumori (a commander of the Oda domain). Since he was offered meat at new year parties, he had a problem with the taboo against eating meat. Yoritaka earnestly asked Kanemi for permission to eat meat. Kanemi approved it and issued a judgment order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 4 (1576). 3.1</td>
<td>The head priest of the Ise shrine (Fujinami Yoshitada) sent a messenger to Kanemi concerning a god of water of Kōga. Kanemi answered Yoshitada that he wanted to see a map of the course of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 4 (1576). 3.18</td>
<td>Ōsakaya asked Kanemi for a yearly prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 7 (1579). 5.16</td>
<td>Ōhara Kenmotsu of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 8 (1580). 1.13</td>
<td>Ōhara Kenmotsu of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 10 (1582). 9.30</td>
<td>Takamine Kanroku of Kōga asked Kanemi to perform a prayer to appease an evil living spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenshō 11 (1583). 11.3</td>
<td>Ōhara Kenmotsu of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Kōga people in Yoshida Kanemi’s diary, source: Yoshida Kanemi, Kanemi-kyō ki, ed. Kaneko and Endō.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Tenshō 12 (1584). 1.17</td>
<td>Ōhara <em>Kenmotsu</em> of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer. Ōhara has asked for prayers in the first, fifth, and ninth months since the last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tenshō 12 (1584). 2.16</td>
<td>Ōhara <em>Kenmotsu</em> of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer for having a child. His wife, who was 41 years old, had no children, and she had not menstruated since last month. Kanemi gave him a talisman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Tenshō 12 (1584). 9.5</td>
<td>Ōhara <em>Kenmotsu</em> of Kōga asked for a [regular] prayer for this month. His wife was supposed to give birth this month, so <em>Kenmotsu</em> asked for a special prayer. Kanemi gave him talismans and performed a ritual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Tenshō 12 (1584). 12.3</td>
<td>Ōhara Jirōsaemon, a relative of <em>Kenmotsu</em>, consulted with Kanemi about his plan to worship the spirit of his ancestor, who had been killed 21 years before, as a god. Kanemi performed a Shintō ceremony and gave him a talisman to appease the spirit. (See also Tenshō 13.1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tenshō 12 (1584). 12.9</td>
<td>Wakadayū, a <em>Shintō</em> priest of the Ox-head shrine of Giga, Kōga, said that he had been appointed the head priest, so he had carried out duties related to the shrine in recent years. He had to perform a purification ritual with [cold] water every morning, which he found unbearable. For this reason, Wakadayū eagerly asked for a judgment order, so I sent it to him [and allowed him to use hot water].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Tenshō 13 (1585). 3.29</td>
<td>Mochizuki Tobimatsu of Kōga asked Kanemi for a prayer as his wife had become ill and had been unable to walk since she gave birth the previous month. Kanemi gave him talismans and performed special rituals for him. (See also the entries for 3.30, 4.3, and 4.4.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Tenshō 15 (1587). 1.26</td>
<td>Ōhara <em>Kenmotsu</em> of Kōga, who now lives in Ise province due to the last year's banishment, sent a letter about a regular prayer to Kanemi. <em>Kenmotsu</em> also asked for a talisman for his newborn son. Kanemi gave two talismans for Kenmotsu's son and daughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Tenshō 19 (1591). 8.3</td>
<td>Takenaka Kouemon <em>no jō</em> of Minakuchi, Kōga, aged 50, asked Kanemi for talismans to purify a building site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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