



★ Dear Iyanaga-san,

I am very convinced of your theory on Daikoku's rats, which are, as you explain in your book, actually borrowed from Bishamonten and go back to the Indian mungoose, a symbol of wealth. Yet, as regards the modern iconography of Daikoku (our familiar Daikoku, so to speak), I am not sure whether the Indian connection is not overstressed. Looking at the first iconographic examples mentioned by Mark (the Kongōrinji and the Kanzeonji Daikokus, both Heian), there are no traces of the later Mahakala iconography, and even if Kongōrinji Daikoku has attributes of a Pure Land figure (rock, hankazō) and a protector (armour, staff->mallet), both figures have somehow the air of a native peasant. I could very well imagine that this is actually a native kami from a Buddhist (or rather either Tendai or Shingon) perception, probably the Miwa deity, where Okuninushi and Omononushi intersect. In this regard, I tend to believe the legend that connects Saichō's Daikoku with Miwa. While both Daikokus have a stern expression, this is completely in line with other early kami figures. And already in the Kamakura period we encounter the jolly Daikoku, again a native peasant. Mahakala iconography is added only later and modifies this figure (Sanmen Daikoku) but these traits are mostly lost in the classic fukujin representation ("our" Daikoku). Thus, I would say that the fukujin Daikoku has its name in common with Mahakala but only a few details of its appearance. The identification "Daikoku=Mahakala, an Indian krodha deity" must be put into perspective therefore, when we speak about the fukujin (as opposed to the rare full-scale mikkyo icons of Mahakala/Makakara). Rather, the native figure (indeed Okuninushi who is also venerated at the Hie Sannō Shrine) is probably the ancestor of the fukujin and must not be treated as a later interpretation. Or is this too much "Shintoized"?

As regards the original question, bales, we should not forget that this was money. Daikoku is standing or sitting on money ... money that could also be eaten.

Best

Bernhard

Von: pm...@googlegroups.com [pm...@googlegroups.com]" im Auftrag von "Nobumi Iyanaga [n-iy...@nifty.com]

Gesendet: Samstag, 24. Oktober 2015 18:11

An: pm...@googlegroups.com

Betreff: Re: [PMJS] Daikokuten: significance of sitting on bales vs standing on them?

Nobumi Iyanaga

Oct 25



★ Dear Scheid-san,

Thank you for your reply.

> On Oct 25, 2015, at 6:27 AM, Scheid, Bernhard <Bernhar...@oeaw.ac.at> wrote:

> Dear Iyanaga-san,

> I am very convinced of your theory on Daikoku's rats, which are, as you explain in your book, actually borrowed from Bishamonten and go back to the Indian mungoose, a symbol of wealth. Yet, as regards the modern iconography of Daikoku (our familiar Daikoku, so to speak), I am not sure whether the Indian connection is not overstressed. Looking at the first iconographic examples mentioned by Mark (the Kongōrinji and the Kanzeonji Daikokus, both Heian), there are no traces of the later Mahakala iconography, and even if Kongōrinji Daikoku has attributes of a Pure Land figure (rock, hankazō) and a protector (armour, staff->mallet), both figures have somehow the air of a native peasant.

Do you find thus? – Well, in my view, the seated iconography seems to represent a warrior god, and similar to some kind of Bishamon-ten icons. By the way, the figure which is very like this seated icon of Daikoku is that of Daishōgun. On the other hand, the Kanzeon-ji statue is very strange in that it is representing a clearly Japanese figure, but it seems rather as a noble man in journey, or something like that (he has an eboshi, which would be a noble's hat? And he has shoes, and seems to be walking).

> I could very well imagine that this is actually a native kami from a Buddhist (or rather either Tendai or Shingon) perception, probably the Miwa deity, where Okuninushi and Omononushi intersect.

The Kanzeon-ji image *may seem* to represent a Shinto deity (although it seems to be a faithful image based on Yōson-dōjō-kan's iconography, which is a clearly Buddhist, esoteric, source). But how can we identify it with Ōkuninushi or Ōmononushi? Is there any early medieval icon that can be surely identified as representing these deities? One point which seems very important in this regard is that early Shinto icons are generally very difficult to identify with any specific deities. Except Hachiman of monk style, what other deities are really represented...?? (in exhibitions, we have many 男神像, 女神像, etc., but very few with clear identifications).

On the other hand, as I said, Ōkuninushi seems to be very little known in the medieval period (probably because in the Nihon shoki, there is very few things told about him; and the Kojiki was almost not known in Middle Ages...). Izumo's deity in the Middle Ages is Susanoo...

> In this regard, I tend to believe the legend that connects Saichō's Daikoku with Miwa. While both Daikokus have a stern expression, this is completely in line with other early kami figures. And already in the Kamakura period we encounter the jolly Daikoku, again a native peasant. Mahakala iconography is added only later and modifies this figure (Sanmen Daikoku) but these traits are mostly lost in the classic fukujin representation ("our" Daikoku). Thus, I would say that the fukujin Daikoku has its name in common with Mahakala but only a few details of its appearance. The identification "Daikoku=Mahakala, an Indian krodha deity" must be put into perspective, therefore, when we speak about the fukujin (as opposed to the rare full-scale mikkyo icons of Mahakala/Makakara). Rather, the native figure (indeed Okuninushi who is also venerated at the Hie Sannō Shrine) is probably the ancestor of the fukujin and must not be treated as a later interpretation. Or is this too much "Shintoized"?

Well, I think that the fukujin style Daikoku derives from a different kind of Indian figure than the Tantric Mahākāla – as Mark-san has rightly indicated, its direct "ancestor" is certainly the "Mahāhāla" described by Yijing, which is in turn a derived form of Indian Kubera (holds a sack...). But in early medieval forms of these fortune deities, we can discern some remaining of fearful deities (for example Matara-jin which is clearly a variant form of Sanmen Daikoku).

And are you sure that Ōkuninushi (not Ōmononushi) was venerated at Hie Sannō shrine?

Best regard,

Nobumi Iyanaga