

# Buddhism in Central Asia II

*Practices and Rituals, Visual and Material Transfer*

*Edited by*

Yukiyo Kasai  
Henrik H. Sørensen



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
General Abbreviations	ix
Bibliographic Abbreviations	xi
List of Illustrations	xv
Notes on Contributors	xxi

Introduction—Central Asia: Sacred Sites and the Transmission of Religious Practices 1

*Yukiyo Kasai, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Haoran Hou*

## PART 1

### *Visual Material and Transfer*

- 1 Did the Silk Road(s) Extend from Dunhuang, Mount Wutai, and Chang'an to Kyoto, Japan? A Reassessment Based on Material Culture from the Temple Gate Tendai Tradition of Miidera 17  
*George Keyworth*
- 2 Representations of a Series of Large Buddha Figures in the Buddhist Caves of Kuča: Reflections on Their Origin and Meaning 68  
*Ines Konczak-Nagel*
- 3 Buddhist Painting in the South of the Tarim Basin: A Chronological Conundrum 97  
*Ciro Lo Muzio*
- 4 'Khotanese Themes' in Dunhuang: Visual and Ideological Transfer in the 9th–11th Centuries 118  
*Erika Forte*
- 5 The 'Sogdian Deities' Twenty Years on: A Reconsideration of a Small Painting from Dunhuang 153  
*Lilla Russell-Smith*

## PART 2

*Practices and Rituals*

- 6 Seeking the Pure Land in Tangut Art 207  
*Michelle C. Wang*
- 7 The Avalokiteśvara Cult in Turfan and Dunhuang in the  
Pre-Mongolian Period 244  
*Yukiyo Kasai*
- 8 Bridging Yoga and Mahāyoga: Samaya in Early Tantric Buddhism 270  
*Jacob P. Dalton*
- 9 Visualising Oneself as the Cosmos: An Esoteric Buddhist Meditation  
Text from Dunhuang 288  
*Henrik H. Sørensen*
- 10 Beyond Spatial and Temporal Contingencies: Tantric Rituals in Eastern  
Central Asia under Tangut Rule, 11th–13th C. 313  
*Carmen Meinert*
- 11 The Serlingpa Acala in Tibet and the Tangut Empire 366  
*Iain Sinclair*
- 12 Mahākāla Literature Unearthed from Karakhoto 400  
*Haoran Hou*
- 13 Practice and Rituals in Uyghur Buddhist Texts: A Preliminary  
Appraisal 430  
*Jens Wilkens*
- Bibliography 465
- Index of Deities and Buddhas 536
- Index of Dynasties, Kingdoms, and Empires 539
- Index of Personal Names 540
- Index of Places 544
- Index of Technical Terms 548
- Index of Text Names 555

**PART 1**

*Visual Material and Transfer*





# Did the Silk Road(s) Extend from Dunhuang, Mount Wutai, and Chang'an to Kyoto, Japan? A Reassessment Based on Material Culture from the Temple Gate Tendai Tradition of Miidera

George Keyworth

## 1 Introduction: Did the Silk Road(s) Reach Early or Medieval Japan?<sup>1</sup>

Beyond the marvelous cache of textiles, manuscripts, and other ritual paraphernalia from China, Korea, and Central Asia that testify to the cosmopolitan

---

1 This research is generously supported by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Partnership Grant. <http://frogbear.org/>. I would also like to thank Prof. Ochiai Toshinori, director of the Research Institute for Old Japanese Manuscripts at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies (ICPBS) in Tokyo for making it possible to access the digital archives at the ICPBS library. I would also like to express special thanks to former abbot Otowa Ryūzen Shōnin (音羽隆全 上人), Ms. Inoue Sachiko (井上幸子), and Ms. Hirose Mitsuko (広瀬美子) of Myōren Temple (Jap. Myōren ji 妙蓮寺), who have provided generous time and support for my many visits to this splendid Hokkeshū (法華宗) temple to see and learn about the Matsuno'o Shrine scriptures and their conservation. The following abbreviations are used throughout:

Z. *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 [Newly Revised Catalogue of Buddhist Scriptures Made during the Zhenyuan-Era, T. 2157], comp. 799 or 800 by Yuanzhao (d.u., 圓照). Nos follow the Nanatsudera ms in Miyabayashi Akihiko 宮林昭彦 and Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, “Jōgen shinjō shakukyō mokuroku nijūkyū sanjū 貞元新定釋教目錄 29 30 [On the *Newly Revised Catalogue of Buddhist Scriptures Made during the Zhenyuan-Era*]” in *Chūgoku Nihon kyōten shōsho mokuroku* 中國日本經典章疏目錄 [Catalogues of Scriptures and their Commentaries in China and Japan], ed. Makita Tairyō 牧田諦亮, et al. (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1998) and; Gakujutsu Furontia jikkō iinkai 學術フロンティア実行委員会 ed., *Nihon genson hasshu issaikyō taishō mokuroku tsuke Tonkō bukkyō bunken* 日本現存八種一切經対照目録 [付] 敦煌仏教文献 [Catalogue Comparing Eight Buddhist Canons Currently Available in Japan with Buddhist Literature from Dunhuang] (Tokyo: Kokusai bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku, 2006), rather than T. 2157.

Titles in Japanese and (reconstructed) Sanskrit in the Taishō Canon follow Paul Demiéville et al., *Répertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais, édition de Taishō (Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō): [fascicule annexe du Hōbōgirin]* (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1978). Lewis R. Lancaster and Sung-bae Park, ed., *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979) also provides translation and reconstructions for Sanskrit titles.

eye-opening ceremony held in 752 for the large image of Mahāvairocana Buddha in Great East Temple (Jap. Tōdai ji 東大寺) that were preserved in the Shōsōin (正倉院) in Nara (奈良), Japan, does sufficient material culture from the Silk Road(s) exist in Japan to substantiate the claim that the easternmost terminus was either Nara or Kyoto (京都)? Copious, sometimes much later records document how, during the 9th century, Enchin (814–891, 円珍, Chishō daishi 智証大師), among eight other famous pilgrims and envoys from Japan, visited and studied at the Green Dragon Temple (Chin. Qinglong si 青龍寺) in Tang (618–907, 唐) Chang’an (長安, modern Xi’an 西安) and received from Chinese or Central Asian teachers Esoteric Buddhist (Chin. *mijiao*, Jap. *mikkyō* 密教) ritual manuals, certificates, statues, and other symbols of transmission. Enchin is the patriarch for the Jimon (Jap. Jimonha 寺門派) or Temple Gate Tendai tradition (Jap. Tendaishū 天台宗) based at the Onjō Temple (Jap. Onjō ji 園城寺), a.k.a. Mii Temple (Jap. Miidera 三井寺). With the discovery of the cache of documents and art sealed around the beginning of the 11th century in Mogao Cave 17 (Chin. Mogao ku 莫高窟), also-called the Library Cave (Chin. Cangjing dong 藏經洞), near the city of Dunhuang (敦煌), in Eastern Central Asia (present-day Gansu (甘肅) province), and other archaeological finds at sites such as Turfan, Kuča, Khotan, and others in Eastern Central Asia and in present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan, the narrative of the decline of Buddhism—especially Esoteric—after the Huichang era (840–845, 會昌) in China and along the eastern Silk Road(s) has been subjected to considerable scrutiny by scholars from around the world. Manuscripts from Dunhuang in Sinitic,<sup>2</sup> Tibetan, and Uyghur from the 9th and 10th centuries also provide considerable evidence of a multilingual, cosmopolitan exchange of religion and culture in Central Asia that extended east to Mt. Wutai (Chin. Wutai shan 五臺山) and Chang’an and south to Hangzhou (杭州).

In this paper I take the two Tendai pilgrims to China who are central to the Jimon tradition of Mii Temple, Enchin, who remained in China from 853–858, and Jōjin, as bookends to address the question: did the Silk Road(s) extend to Japan through the Jimon Tendai tradition during the 9th–11th centuries? In the first section of the paper, I outline how the materials listed in travel diaries and catalogues (Jap. *shōrai mokuroku* 請来目録) of the books, statues, and ritual objects brought back by Enchin confirm that the Buddhism he imported from

2 On ‘Sinitic’ to refer to the written language of Chinese, rather than Classical or Literary Chinese, see Victor H. Mair, “Buddhism and the Rise of the Written Vernacular in East Asia: The Making of National Languages,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 53:3 (1994): 707–751; Peter Francis Kornicki, *Languages, Scripts, and Chinese Texts in East Asia* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 19–21.

the continent can be connected to cosmopolitan ritual practices that flourished along the eastern Silk Road(s) even after the Huichang era persecution of foreign faiths. One of the earliest statues of an indigenous *kami* (神) produced in Japan at Matsuno'o Shrine (Jap. Matsuno'o taisha 松尾大社) in Kyoto (and still housed there) is a key product from Enchin's experiences with cosmopolitan continental Buddhist rituals. In the next section, I investigate what Jōjin's diary that covers the years 1072–1073 during his travels, *Record of a Pilgrimage to Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Wutai*, tells us about his encounter with Central Asian and Indian teachers not only on Mt. Wutai but also at the *sūtra* translation bureau known as the Institute for Transmitting the Dharma (Chin. Chuanfayuan 傳法院) on the grounds of the imperially sponsored Monastery for Promoting Great Peace for the State (Chin. Taiping xingguo si 太平興國寺) in the Song (960–1279, 宋) capital of Bianjing (汴京, modern Kaifeng 開封). Several of the rituals that Jōjin describes performing for Song Emperor Shenzong (r. 1067–1085, 神宗) correspond to ceremonies we know were performed at the Daiun Temple (Jap. Daiun ji 大雲寺) and Jissōin (実相院) (located in the Iwakura (岩倉) section of northern Kyoto) and at key shrines like Matsuno'o, Kamigamo (上賀茂) and Shimogamo (下鴨) in Kyoto, and Atsuta (熱田) in Nagoya (名古屋) during the 12th–16th centuries. Finally, I describe how Buddhist—and Indic or Central Asian—rituals which were exchanged along the eastern Silk Road(s) during the 9th–11th centuries were employed in Japan with material culture (like statues and ritual paraphernalia) to venerate the *kami* by Tendai Jimon monastics using unambiguously cosmopolitan language to preserve the narrative of transmission along the Silk Road(s).

In the 2006–2007 issue of *Cahiers d'Extrême Asie*, Iyanaga Nobumi published a fascinating paper arguing that, fundamentally, elements of the indigenous religion of Japan, which scholars variously call Shintō (神道, lit. path or way of the gods), *kami* worship, (Jap. *jingi shinkō* 神祇信仰), *Jindō* (an alternative pronunciation for Shintō), or veneration of the gods of heaven and earth (Jap. *tenjin chigi sūhai* 天神地祇崇拜), has significant elements of Hinduism in it.<sup>3</sup> With (1) fire rituals (Skt. *homa*, Chin. *humo*, Jap. *goma* 護摩) performed inside—or outside—Shingon and Tendai Buddhist temples and by mountain

3 On *Jindō*, see Michael Como, *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009); Michael Como, "Immigrant Gods on the Road to *Jindō*," *Cahiers d'Extrême Asie* 16 (2006–2007): 19–48; cf. Donald F. McCallum, "Review of Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition. By Michael I. Como. Oxford University Press, 2008," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 36.1 (2010): 189–193; Richard Bowring, "Review of *Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan*. By Michael I. Como. University of Hawai'i Press, 2009," *Monumenta Nipponica* 65.1 (2010): 197–198; Iyanaga Nobumi, "Medieval Shintō as a Form of



ascetics (Jap. *yamabushi* 山伏; *shugendō* 修験道),<sup>4</sup> (2) shrines dedicated to Sarasvatī (Jap. Benzaiten 弁才天), the so-called Hindu goddess of knowledge, music, art, wisdom, and learning, (3) the *kami* of foxes (Jap. Inari 稲荷; a.k.a. Dakiniten 荼枳尼天) as Indian jackals (Jap. *yakan* 野干, Skt. *śṛgāla*),<sup>5</sup> (4) Sanskrit Siddham syllables written on grave markers, (5) and even *dhāraṇīs* inscribed on large and small stone pillars across Japan, it is little wonder that one way to approach the study of religion in Japan is to investigate the Indian aspects of worship in all manner of practices. Generally speaking, almost all traditions of Japanese Buddhism and most aspects of the practice of Shintō rest upon the notion of transmission (Jap. *denbō* 伝法) from the Asian continent of these so-called Indian—or ‘Hindu’—religious elements. Because ritual paraphernalia, let alone ritual manuals (Skt. *kalpa* or *vidhi*; Chin. *yigui*, Jap. *giki* 儀軌) or *sūtras* and commentaries translated from Sanskrit (or other Indic languages) into Sinitic came from the Asian continent and from interactions between human beings, we may wonder why so little research about the transmission of Indic religion across Central and East Asia considers the roles of person to person transmission? Furthermore, because Victor H. Mair, Peter

---

‘Japanese Hinduism’: An Attempt at Understanding Early Medieval Shintō,” *Cahiers d’Extrême Asie* 16 (2006–2007): 263–303.

Bowring provides clever analysis of the problem and correctly, I think, criticises Ooms in an otherwise meticulously researched monograph for inventing the term “Daoisant” to describe possible Daoist influences upon Shintō in ancient Japan: Herman Ooms, *Imperial Politics and Symbolics in Ancient Japan: The Tenmu Dynasty, 650–800* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2009), 132–153. See also Timothy Hugh Barrett, “Shinto and Taoism in Early Japan” in *Shinto in History: Ways of the Kami*, ed. John Breen and Mark Teeuwen (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2000), 13–31. Rather than Daoism, Como argues that continental influences encompassing popular religiosity on the continent in China and Korea, including animal sacrifice, spirit pacification, the search for immortality, and rites to deities of the household or sericulture are at play in early Shintō (he prefers *Jindō*); see Lori Meeks, “Review of Weaving and Binding: Immigrant Gods and Female Immortals in Ancient Japan. By Michael I. Como. University of Hawai’i Press, 2009,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 38.1 (2011): 216–219. I follow Hardacre’s use of Shintō, as discussed in Helen Hardacre, *Shinto: A History* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 41–45. On the more useful Japanese term *jingi Shinkō*, see Imahori Taitsu 今堀太逸, *Jingi shinkō no no tenkai to bukkyō shinkō no tenkai to tenkai to tenkai* [Development of the Worship of the Gods of Heaven and Earth and Buddhism] (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1990).

- 4 Hitoshi Miyake and H. Byron Earhart, *Shugendō: Essays on the Structure of Japanese Folk Religion* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies the University of Michigan, 2001); Miyake Hitoshi, “Japanese Mountain Religion: Shrines, Temples and the Development of Shugendō,” *Cahiers d’Extrême Asie* 18 (2009): 73–88.
- 5 “Dakini” in *Hōbōgirin* 法寶義林 [Encyclopedic Dictionary of Buddhism from Chinese and Japanese Sources] 8 (Tokyo: Maison franco-japonaise, 2003), 1100, cf. *Dari jingshu* 大日經疏 [Commentary to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*] 16, T. 1796.39,744a29.

Kornicki, and John Whitman, among others, have demonstrated that almost no Buddhist or Daoist or ‘Hindu’ or even ‘Shintō’ traveler in medieval times in Eastern Central Asia or Tang and Song China would have read texts or scriptures in the same vernacular language, we ought to wonder how communication was possible?<sup>6</sup>

If, as we know from Valerie Hansen’s research and to a lesser extent Peter Frankopan’s recent and popular new book, among others, that silk was probably among the least transported commodities across various trade routes that connected China with points west (or perhaps east), with precious gems, grains, glass, furs, ritual objects, and even slaves, not to mention books, ideas, and certainly languages, then one way to define the Silk Road(s) with far greater precision than Baron Ferdinand von Richthofen’s illusory terms ‘*Seidenstraße*’ and ‘*Seidenstraßen*’ (coined in 1877) is through the transmission of language. And not just any language, but Sanskrit and Indic *prākṛtās* (related vernaculars).<sup>7</sup> First, let us consider the conundrum that is the Sinitic language in East Asia as defined by Peter Kornicki:

What makes vernacular reading possible is the fact that Sinitic is a logographic written language: characters represent words not sounds. The phonetic realization of those words was not fixed, and in fact varied from one regional type of spoken Chinese to another [...] [C]haracters were open not only to a phonetic reading, that is, an approximation to the pronunciation in Chinese adapted to suit the phonology of the reader’s native language, but also a semantic reading using an equivalent word in that reader’s language.

An example of a semantic reading is the number 9 (Arabic numerals 1–9 are actually derived from Sanskrit), which can be read:

6 *Dari jingshu* 大日經疏 [Commentary to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra*] 16, T. 1796.39,744a29. See also John B. Whitman, “The Ubiquity of the Gloss,” *Scripta (International Journal of Writing Systems, The Hunmin Jeongeum Society, Korea)* 3 (2011): 95–121; John B. Whitman “Ratengo kyōten no dokuhō to butten no kundoku ラテン語經典の読法と仏典の訓読 [The Reading of Sacred Texts in Latin and Vernacular Reading of Buddhist Texts],” in *Bukkyō bunmei no tenkai to hyōgen: moji, gengo, zōkei to shisō* 仏教文明の転回と表現: 文字・言語・造形と思想 [Buddhism as Movement and Expression of Civilisation: Philosophy, Fabrications, Language and Writing], ed. Shinkawa Tokio 新川登亀男 (Tokyo: Bensei shuppansha, 2015).

7 On the name ‘Silk Road’ see Valerie Hansen, *The Silk Road: A New History* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 6. Peter Frankopan, *The Silk Roads: A New History of the World* (London: Vintage, 2017).

‘nine’, ‘nove’, ‘neuf’, ‘neun’[...] or the equivalent in any language, so the character (九), which represents the numeral 9, can be read in any East Asian language with the vernacular equivalent.<sup>8</sup>

Sanskrit—and Indic languages related to it—functions entirely differently. *Sam̐skṛta*, which literally means ‘perfectly formed,’ is, of course, a language organised around phonetics—with numerous rules governing how to correctly pronounce not only words but syllables, including the rules of *saṃdhi* (lit. joining) to govern necessary sound changes. Before the introduction of Buddhism to China, Chinese characters were used phonographically. As Kornicki points out, the opening line of the *Lunyu* 論語 [Analects] (1:1) reads:

子曰：「學而時習之，不亦說乎？」

The Master said, “To study and then repeatedly put into practice what you have learned—is that not what it means to have pleasure?”<sup>9</sup>

The character *shuo* (說) usually means ‘to say’ or ‘explain.’ As ancient commentaries written after the script reforms by Qin Shi Huangdi (r. 221–210 BCE, 秦始皇帝) had to inform readers then as now, *shuo* (說) and *yue* (悅) are homonyms (*yue* means ‘delight’).<sup>10</sup> But after the introduction of Buddhism and the many technical terms in Sanskrit that required phonetic readings, e.g., Buddha (Chin. *Fotuo* 佛陀), *bhikṣuṇī* (Chin. *biqiuni* 比丘尼), *yoga* (Chin. *yujia* 瑜伽) and so forth, and especially after the introduction of Buddhist spells or incantations called *dhāraṇī* (Chin. *tuoloni* 陀羅尼), the problem became evident to most East Asians who wished to correctly pronounce these terms without any knowledge of Kharoṣṭhī- or Brāhmī-derived scripts for writing the sounds of Sanskrit, rather than reading (problematical) transliterations in Sinitic. Phonetics and the process of what Kornicki calls “vernacularization” in communities where Sinitic was primarily used was not only stimulated by the process of chanting Buddhist *sūtras*, but it may very well be among the most valuable things transmitted across the Silk Road(s).<sup>11</sup>

There is considerable debate about when to date the invention of the *katakana* script for writing how to phonetically pronounce Japanese (and

8 Kornicki, *Languages, Scripts, and Chinese Texts in East Asia*, 163.

9 D.C. Lau, trans., *The Analects (Lun yü)* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1992), 11.

10 Kornicki, *Languages, Scripts, and Chinese Texts in East Asia*, 55.

11 Ibid., 157–186; Peter Francis Kornicki, “The Vernacularization of Buddhist Texts: From the Tangut Empire to Japan,” in *Rethinking East Asian Languages, Vernaculars, and Literacies, 1000–1919*, ed. Benjamin A. Elman (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), 29–57.

Sinitic characters). But we can be sure that what Gregory Schopen and others following him have called the ‘cult of the book’ (in the Mahāyāna) and the five practices of the preacher of the *buddhadharma* (Skr. *dharmabhāṇaka*)—preserving, reading, reciting, explaining, and copying *sūtras* or nonmeditational or meritorious acts (Skt. *kuśalena karmaṇā*)—has everything to do with it.<sup>12</sup> Along the Silk Road(s) to Dunhuang, Sui (581–618, 隋) and Tang Chang’an and Luoyang (洛陽), Mt. Wutai, and Mt. Tiantai (Chin. Tiantai shan 天臺山), Buddhist monastics had to learn how to pronounce the *sūtras* correctly. A lexicographer who assisted with Xuanzang’s (600/602–664, 玄奘) translation<sup>13</sup>

12 Eduard Naumovich Tyomkin, “Unique Fragments of the ‘Sūtra of Golden Light’ in the Manuscript Collection of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Russian Academy of Sciences),” *Manuscripta Orientalia (International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research, St. Petersburg)* 1.1 (1995): 29–38; Gregory Schopen, “The Generalization of an Old Yogic Attainment in Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtra Literature: Some Notes on *Jātismara*,” *Journal of the International Association for Buddhist Studies* 6.1 (1983): 114. On the cult of the book in the Mahāyāna, see Gregory Schopen, “The Phrase *sa prthivīpradeśas caityabhūto bhavet* in the *Vajracchedikā*: Notes on the Cult of the Book in the Mahāyāna,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17 (1975): 147–181. Updated for the 21st century by Gregory Schopen, “On the Absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at Gilgit,” in *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique*, ed. Gérard Colas and Gerdi Gerschheimer (Paris: École française d’Extrême-Orient, 2009), 189–212; Gregory Schopen, “Redeeming Bugs, Birds, and Really Bad Sinners in Some Medieval Mahāyāna Sūtras and Dhāraṇīs,” in *Sins and Sinners: Perspectives from Asian Religions*, ed. Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2012), 276–294; David Drewes, “Revisiting the Phrase ‘*sa prthivīpradeśas caityabhūto bhavet*’ and the Mahāyāna Cult of the Book,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 50 (2007): 101–143; Natalie D. Gummer, “Listening to the Dharmabhāṇaka: The Buddhist Preacher in and of the Sūtra of Utmost Golden Radiance,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80.1 (2012): 137–160; James B. Apple, “The Phrase *dharmaparyāyo hastagato* in Mahāyāna Buddhist Literature: Rethinking the Cult of the Book in Middle Period Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 134.1 (2014): 25–50. On the five practices, see Donald S. Jr. Lopez, *The Lotus Sūtra: A Biography* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016), 69; see also the earliest discussion of the text in a European language: Eugène Burnouf, Katia Buffetrille, and Donald S. Jr. Lopez, *Introduction to the History of Indian Buddhism* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 284–291.

13 There is, of course, a distinction to be made between a translation and a version of a text; Chinese or Tibetan translations “should not be regarded simply as ‘a translation’ of the text but as ‘a version’ representing a certain stage at which the text developed.” Seishi Karashima, *A Critical Edition of Lokakṣema’s Translation of the Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* 道行般若經校注 (Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, 2011), xii; Apple, “The Phrase *dharmaparyāyo hastagato* in Mahāyāna Buddhist Literature,” 27, n. 24. Furthermore, individual translators did not work alone; they worked often in elaborate teams; see Jinhua Chen, “Another Look at Tang Zhongzong’s (r. 684, 705–710) Preface to Yijing’s (635–713, 義淨) Translations: With a Special Reference to Its Date,” *Indotetsugaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* インド哲学仏教学研究 [Studies in

team named Xuanying (d. 661, 玄應) composed what looks like the first glossary of terminology used in Chinese Buddhist texts (those included in bibliographies of the canon as of 650),<sup>14</sup> which provides *fanqie* (反切), a method in traditional Chinese lexicography to indicate the pronunciation of a monosyllabic character by using two other characters, one with the same initial consonant as the desired syllable and one with the same remainder of the syllable (the final) readings, ca. 649, called *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義 [Pronunciations and Meanings in the Complete Buddhist Canon] (Z 1185) in 25 rolls; Huilin (737–820, 慧琳) enlarged Xuanying's text to 100 rolls in 807 (T. 2128.54).<sup>15</sup> When he catalogued the colophons to the Dunhuang manuscripts in the British Library collection, Lionel Giles observed that:

[...] for some reason with special frequency in copies of the *Chin kuang ming tsui sheng wang ching* (N. 126), is what I have ventured to call a phonetic glossary. This consists of just a few words selected from the preceding text, with their *fan-ch'ieh* (initial *plus* final) pronunciation.<sup>16</sup>

Zhang Yongquan and Li Lingling demonstrate that these glosses were on manuscripts of Yijing's translation (in 703) of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* (Z 158, T. 665.16.) at Dunhuang by 854 (P. 2274: roll seven). Therefore, it seems almost certain that these transcription notes or Chinese phonetic reading glosses

---

Indian Philosophy and Buddhism] 11 (2004): 3–27; Ming Chen, “Vinaya Works Translated by Yijing and their Circulation: Manuscripts Excavated at Dunhuang and Central Asia,” *Studies in Chinese Religion* 1 (2015): 229–268.

- 14 Regarding the order of texts included in the Chinese Buddhist Canons up to the compilation of the *Kaiyuan lu* 開元錄 [Record of Śākyamuni's Teachings, Compiled During the Kaiyuan Era (713–741)] in 730, see Fuhua Li, “An Analysis of the Content and Characteristics of the Chinese Buddhist Canon,” *Studies in Chinese Religions* 2.2 (2016): 107–112.
- 15 On the Kōshōji ms. Canon, see Utsunomiya Keigo 宇都宮啓吾, “Kōshōji issaikyō ni okeru kunden shiryō ni tsuite: Sono sujō o megutte 興聖寺一切經における訓点資料について: その素性を巡って [On the Features of Studying the Features of the Kōshōji [Manuscript Buddhist] Canon],” *Kamakura jidai go kenkyū* 鎌倉時代語研究 [Studies of Kamakura Period Language] 23 (2000): 662–690 and; Ochiai Toshinori, “Découverte de manuscrits bouddhiques chinois au Japon.” See also Chen Wuyun 陳五雲, Xu Shiyi 徐時儀, and Liang Xiaohong 梁曉虹, ed., *Fojing yinyi yu Hanzhi yanjiu* 佛經音義與漢字研究 [A Study of the Sounds and Meanings of Sinitic Logographs in Buddhist Scriptures] (Nanjing: Fenghuang chubanshe, 2010); Xu Shiyi 徐時儀, *Xuanying he Huilin Yiqiejing yinyi yanjiu* 玄應和慧琳《一切經音義》研究 [Study of the *Yiqiejing yinyi* by Xuanying and Huilin] (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2009).
- 16 Lionel Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Chinese Manuscripts from Tunhuang in the British Museum* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 1957), xi.

were mostly copied—or added—during the late 9th and early 10th centuries at Dunhuang.<sup>17</sup> I have not found these phonetic reading glosses on any other Dunhuang texts.

In Japan, however, the situation is quite different. There are reading marks (Jap. *kunten* 訓点) of a sort on rolls of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* dated to 889 from Ishiyama Temple (Jap. Ishiyamadera 石山寺) which have received considerable attention.<sup>18</sup> There are also marks to facilitate reading in Japanese on an 8th century *Saishōōkyō* 最勝王經 [*Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*] sponsored by Kudara no Toyomushi (白濟豐虫) preserved at the Saidai Temple (Jap. Saidai ji 西大寺) in Nara.<sup>19</sup> There is also a marvelous example of an even earlier *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* copied in gold ink on indigo paper (it looks red today) from Kokubun Temple (Jap. Kokubun ji 国分寺) in Hiroshima that can be dated to 742 and has been displayed at Nara National Museum (DO26284).<sup>20</sup> Roll 2 has corresponding *fanqie* (Jap. *hansetsu*) marks with the exemplars from Dunhuang and on the roll from Matsuno'o Shrine in Kyoto, which was copied either during the 3rd or 5th lunar month of 1115. The only other texts I have seen anywhere with these phonetic reading marks are Yijing's translations of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinayavibhaṅga* (Z 1010,

- 
- 17 See nos. 2052, 2130–2131, 2156–2157, 2269, 2377, 2390, 2452–2456 in *ibid.* See also Giles, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 53–60. For their research, Zhang and Li looked at a sample of 257 out of a total of 436 manuscript fragments of the *Jingguangming zuishengwang jing* 金光明最勝王經 [*Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*] found at Dunhuang: Zhang Yongqian 张涌泉 and Li Lingling 李玲玲, “Dunhuang ben *Jingguangming zuishengwang jing yin yanjiu* 敦煌本《金光明最胜王经音》研究,” [Research of Phonetic Notation Marks on Dunhuang Editions of Yijing's Translation of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra*], *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 *Dunhuang Research* 6 (2006): 151.
- 18 Hironuma Mei 蛭沼芽衣, *Ishiyamadera kyūzō Konkōmyō saishōōkyō* 石山寺旧藏『金光明最勝王經』 [On the Manuscript Copy of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* Translated by Yijing from the Ishiyama Temple Archives] (Kyushu: Kyūshū University Institutional Repository, 2015). Cf. Ryuichi Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 394–395.
- 19 Sōhon Saidaiji 総本西大寺 et al., *Kokuhō Saidaijihon Konkōmyō saishōōkyō Tenpyōhōji rokumen Kudara no Toyomushi gankyō* 国宝西大寺本金光明最勝王經天平宝字六年百濟豐虫願經 [Kudara no Toyomushi's Vowed Scriptures [of Yijing's Translation of] the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* from 762, National Treasures from Saidaiji] (Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2013).
- 20 On the establishment of Kokubun Temple in 741 as state temples to promote ritual recitation of the *Saishōōkyō* according to a strict [ritual] calendar, see Marinus Willem de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan: Sutras and Commentaries in Use in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries AD and their History in Later Times*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1935), 443–446; Asuka Sango, *The Halo of Golden Light: Imperial Authority and Buddhist Ritual in Heian Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 1–23; cf. roll 10, accessed August 5, 2019. [http://web1.kcn.jp/west\\_fields/kokuho/kokuho\\_nara.htm](http://web1.kcn.jp/west_fields/kokuho/kokuho_nara.htm).



T. 1442.23.), *Mūlasarvāstivādinayakṣudrakavastu* (Z 1012, T. 1451.24.) and \**Mūlasarvāstivādinayasaṃgraha* (Z 1053, T. 1458.24.) from the Shōgozō (聖語藏), which dates to the first day of the fifth luni-solar month of the Tenpyō 天平 reign period (740), and means they were part of the manuscript canon copying project that Empress Kōmyō kōgō (701–760, 光明皇后) sponsored using the Buddhist canon (Skt. *tripiṭaka*) recently brought to Japan from Tang China in 736 by Genbō (d. 746, 玄昉).<sup>21</sup>

Do these phonetic reading marks demonstrate that either Nara during the 8th century or Kyoto during the 12th was the terminus of some node of the Silk Road(s) on the Eurasian continent? No, of course not. But these marks suggest much more tangible evidence of sustained influence from the linguistic culture that must have flourished along the Silk Road(s) during the 8th–12th centuries than can be gleaned from the magnificent treasures of Central Asian fabrics or ritual objects which were apparently gifts from guests who attended the opening ceremony for Tōdai Temple (752) from far-flung kingdoms that are preserved in the Shōsōin in Nara. Apart from the material culture of Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhism on the so-called ‘periphery’ of the borders of the People’s Republic of China today, unlike in Japan, for example, there is scant, though nevertheless intriguing, evidence of the Indic elements of Buddhism in China.<sup>22</sup> The same can be largely said for Korea. We know from medieval

21 Bryan Lowe, for example, published a ground-breaking book on the topic of copying scriptures with special—and well deserved—attention to the treasure trove of documents from the Shōsōin and the scriptorium at Tōdai Temple; see Bryan Lowe, *Ritualized Writing: Buddhist Practice and Scriptural Cultures in Ancient Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2017). See also Bryan Lowe, “Buddhist Manuscript Cultures in Premodern Japan,” *Religion Compass* 8–9 (2014): 287–301; Bryan Lowe, “Rewriting Nara Buddhism: Sutra Transcription in Early Japan” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2012); Bryan Lowe, “The Discipline of Writing: Scribes and Purity in Eighth-Century Japan,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 39.2 (2012): 201–239; Bryan Lowe, “Contingent and Contested: Preliminary Remarks on Buddhist Catalogues and Canons in Early Japan,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 41.2 (2014): 221–253.

22 *Dhāraṇī* pillars are one example, which primarily exist from the Tang period if in China proper and in Khitan (907–1125, in Chinese sources known as Liao 遼), Jurchen Dynasty (1115–1234, in Chinese sources known as Jin 金) territory before we find copious evidence of Tibetan and Mongolian religion in stone across China later. See Liying Kuo, “Dhāraṇī Pillars in China: Functions and Symbols,” in *China and Beyond in the Mediaeval Period: Cultural Crossings and Inter-Regional Connections*, ed. Dorothy C. Wong and Gustav Heldt (Amherst, New Delhi: Cambria Press and Manohar, 2014), 351–385; Sasaki Daiju 佐々木大樹, “Butchō sonshō darani kyōdō no kenkyū 仏頂尊勝陀羅尼經幢の研究,” [A Study of Sūtra Pillars of the *Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇī*], *Chisan gakuho* 智山学報 [Journal of Chisan Studies] 57 (2008): B41–B67. On Khitan sites, see, for example, Sekino Tadashi 關野貞 and Takeshima Takuichi 竹島卓一, ed., *Ryō kin dai no kenchiku to sono butsumō* 遼金時代ノ建築ト其佛像. *Zuhan* 圖版 [Architecture and Buddhist Sculptures of the Liao and

accounts written in Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, Tibetan, Khotanese, Uyghur, Tangut, and certainly Japanese that travelers and pilgrims encountered Indians and Indic culture in China.<sup>23</sup> It is, therefore, often and with good reason that in order to investigate the medieval period of the Silk Road(s) in East Asia we look to Japan for proof not only that Japanese pilgrims imported the Indic religion, but also to discover who they learned it from. The documents concerning two particular pilgrims, Enchin and Jōjin, who visited Song China during the mid-9th and mid-11th centuries, respectively, are particularly revealing because they demonstrate not only that these pilgrims sought out Indian teachers and to visit sites where Indic practices were most likely to be found, but also because some of what these accounts discuss looks strikingly familiar to some of the evidence from Sanskrit manuscript fragments found in Eastern Central Asia, Afghanistan, and Pakistan that Gregory Schopen, Oskar von Hinüber, and the late, great Karashima Seishi have devoted their academic lives to exposing.<sup>24</sup>

---

Jin Periods. Illustrated Edition] (Tokyo: Tōhō bunka gakuin Tōkyō kenkyūjo, 1934–1935); Nancy Shatzman Steinhardt, *Liao Architecture* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997). The facsimile set is: Zhongguo fojiao xiehui 中国佛教协会 ed., *Fangshan shijing: Liao Jin kejing 房山石经 辽金刻经* [Fangshan Stone [Buddhist] Canon: Scriptures Cut during the Liao and Jin Dynasties], 22 vols. (Beijing: Zhongguo fojiao tushu wenwuguan, 1986–1993). On the Fangshan Stone Canon, see Jung-hsi Li, “The Stone Scriptures of Fang-shan,” *The Eastern Buddhist* 12 (1979): 104–113; Lewis R. Lancaster, “The Rock Cut Canon in China: Findings at Fang-shan,” (paper presented at the The Buddhist Heritage: Papers delivered at the Symposium of the same name convened at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, November 1985, 1989); He Mei 何梅, “Fangshan shijing yu Suihan lu Qidanzang Kaiyuanlu de guanxi zhi de tantao 房山石经与《随函录》《契丹藏》《开元录》的关系之探讨 [On the *Suihan lu* Edition from the Fangshan Stone Scriptures, the Khitan Buddhist Canon, and the *Kaiyuan lu*],” *Foxue yanjiu 佛学研究* [Buddhist Studies Research] 5 (1996): 262–268; Endymion Porter Wilkinson, *Chinese History: A Manual* (Cambridge: Harvard Council on East Asian Studies, 2000), 579, no. 533. Evidence for sponsored carving of scriptures during the Khitan is abundant; for examples from 965, 1110, 1117, 1118, a *dhāraṇī* pillar in 1136, and an undated list of newly carved *dhāraṇī* scriptures, see Yunjusi wenwu guanli chu 云居寺文物管理处 et al., ed., *Yunjusi zhenshi lu 云居寺贞石录* [Stone Records from Yunju Temple] (Beijing: Beijing yanshan chubanshe, 2008), 80–86.

23 See, for example, Imre Galambos and Sam van Schaik, *Manuscripts and Travellers: The Sino-Tibetan Documents of a Tenth-century Buddhist Pilgrim* (Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2012).

24 For example from Schopen's oeuvre, Gregory Schopen, “On the Absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas,” Oskar von Hinüber, “On the Early History of Indic Buddhist Colophons,” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture (Korea)* 27.1 (2017): 45–72; Oskar von Hinüber, “The Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra at Gilgit: Manuscripts, Worshippers, and Artists” [*Indo kokuritsu kōbunsho-kan shozō Girugitto Hokkekyō shahon-ban* インド国立公文書館所蔵ギルギット法華經写本一写本版], in *Gilgit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the National Archives of India*, ed. National Archives of India and Soka Gakkai Institute of



Furthermore, the type of Buddhism that Enchin and Jōjin sought in China is intimately connected to the transmission of phonetics to the extent that one of the documents I investigate in this paper has Sanskrit Siddham writing to dedicate the merit from copying a catalogue to the *dharma* and the Buddhist *saṃgha*.

Before I address the matter of Indic religion taken to and perhaps even knowingly transplanted in Japan from the Silk Road(s), let me tackle the obvious question: did the Silk Road(s) extend to early or medieval Japan? The short answer, in my opinion, is emphatically no. To begin with, putting aside the problematical spotlight on silk as a commodity which did, of course, reach Japan in significant quantities, just as it did points west in Central Asia from China, despite how uncomfortable I am with assigning value to terms like ‘centre’ and ‘periphery,’ especially when addressing the history of medieval East Asian Buddhism, it is nearly impossible to demonstrate bidirectional trade between China and Japan as can be deduced from archaeological, art historical, and textual analysis concerning the trade in all manner of goods and ideas between China and Persia or India and certainly Central Asia. During the medieval period Japan was, like Ireland in Europe, a small, ‘peripheral’ archipelago set quite apart from the broad trade networks that linked China with Eastern Central Asia. But, again like Ireland in terms of the preservation of medieval Christian manuscripts and religious regalia,<sup>25</sup> the fact that in Japan we have abundant material cultural evidence of the influence of Silk Road(s) culture, ideas, religion, and perhaps even—as Iyanaga postulates—a proclivity for the

---

Oriental Philology (Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Philology, 2012), 35–59; Oskar von Hinüber, *Die Patola Śāhis: Ihra Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan 5* (Mainz: von Zabern, 2004); Oskar von Hinüber, “The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research,” in *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research, Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford, June 15–19, 2009*, ed. Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014), 79–135. Seishi Karashima, “Some Folios of the *Tathāgataḡaṇaḡāṇācīntyaṇiṣayāvātāra* and *Dvādaśaḡaṇḡakanāmāṣṭaṣṭatav imalikaraṇā* in the Kurita Collection,” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture (Korea)* 27.1 (2017): 11–44; Seishi Karashima, “Stūpas described in the Chinese translations of the *Vinayas*,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 21 (2017): 439–469; Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille, ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*, 3 vols. (Tokyo: Meiwa Printing Company, 2006).

25 See Burnigh Eltjo and Jan Luiten van Zanden, “Charting the ‘Rise of the West’: Manuscripts and Printed Books in Europe, A Long-Term Perspective from the Sixth through Eighteenth Centuries,” *The Journal of Economic History* 69.2 (2009): 409–445.

reception of Indic religious norms does not mean that the Japanese were part or perhaps even a terminus of the medieval Silk Road(s).

Yet, as I demonstrate in this paper, it is uniquely through first-hand Japanese sources that we find evidence of how intent two of the more famous medieval pilgrims to China were to encounter Indian teachers and the latest Indic religious culture and perhaps even Sanskrit there. The Silk Road(s) as viewed through the lens of manuscripts that reveal what Enchin and Jōjin did and sought out in Tang and Song China not only demonstrates that the route(s) seem to have flourished during the post-An Lushan (703–757, 安祿山) and Shi Siming (703–761, 史思明) rebellions, the rebellion of Huang Chao (835–884, 黃巢) and the Huichang era suppression of the faith, but at least on Mt. Wutai and in Bianjing, well into the late 11th century. I definitely cannot subscribe to Iyanaga's (exaggerated) analysis of elements of the Shintō religion as Hinduism, but I will show that the practices these Mii Temple Tendai monastics brought back to Japan and seem to have been applied to the veneration of the indigenous *kami* at eight specific shrines can be fruitfully connected to the culture of the Silk Road(s).

## 2 Sacred Transmitted Documents and Calalogs of Items Brought Back from China Concerning Enchin in Tang China

The Japanese term *shōgyō* (聖教) is used to refer to religious, though not always, documents preserved in monastic libraries in medieval Japan that were catalogued locally. As in medieval Europe, xylographic printing technology, including the Buddhist canons in Sinitic (classical Chinese), was not widely adopted from the Eurasian continent, we have extensive documentation of the contents of several monastic libraries. The most extensive library from medieval Japan holds manuscript documents from the library of Mt. Kitano Shinpuku Temple Hōshōin (Jap. Kitanosan Shinpukuji Hōshōin 北野山真福寺宝生院), today known as Ōsu Kannon (大須観音) in Nagoya, which Abe Yasurō has shed more light upon than anyone else. There are now three book series of documents from Shinpuku Temple from Rinsen shoten (臨川書店).<sup>26</sup> Less than five per cent of more than 15,000 manuscripts from Shinpuku Temple have been published. In 2017, Bensei publishers (Jap. Bensei shuppan 勉誠出版) released two series of *shōgyō* documents from Mt. Amano Kongō Temple

26 Abe Yasurō 阿部泰朗 and Yamazaki Makoto 山崎誠, ed., *Shinpukuji zenpon sōkan* 真福寺善本叢刊 [Meritorious Books from Shinpukuji], Series 1, 1998–2004: 12 vols.; Series 2, 2003–2009: 12 vols.; and Series 3: 4 vols. as of 2019, Kyoto: Rinsen shoten.

(Jap. Amanosan Kongōji 天野山金剛寺) in Osaka under the title *Amanosan Kongōji zenpon sōkan* 天野山金剛寺善本叢刊 [Collected Works from the Meritorious Books kept at Amanosan Kongō Temple]. Ochiai Toshinori and his team at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies (ICPBS) in Tokyo have brought considerable attention to the manuscript Buddhist canon from Kongō Temple, as well as from seven other sites, including most notably Nanatsu Temple (Jap. Nanatsu dera 七寺) in Nagoya.<sup>27</sup> But these *shōgyō* documents reflect aspects of the history of medieval Japan that do not seem to correspond with contemporary developments in China or Korea, including the roughly 40,000 mostly Buddhist manuscripts which were found at the turn of the 20th century in the so-called Library Cave near the city of Dunhuang.

In Northern Song (960–1126, 北宋) China, xylographic and perhaps metal-type printing was sufficiently widespread by the late 11th century that one of the most famous poets and statesmen, Huang Tingjian (1045–1105, 黃庭堅), meant it when he said that he had over 10,000 books in his library.<sup>28</sup> Based upon the fact that during the 10th–12th centuries the Sinitic Buddhist Canon was printed by the Khitan (907–1125, in Chinese sources known as Liao 遼), the *Qidan zang* 契丹藏 [Khitan Canon] (printed ca. 1031–1064), Koryō Koreans (936–1392, 高麗國, printed ca. 1011–1087), and Jurchen Dynasty (1115–1234, in Chinese sources known as Jin 金), the *Zhaocheng zang* 趙城藏 [Zhaocheng Canon] (printed ca. 1149–1173), who primarily followed the Song xylographic edition entitled *Shuban da zangjing* 蜀版大藏經 [Shu (Sichuan) Canon] or *Kaibao zang* 開寶藏 [Kaibao Canon] (compiled 983), scholars have mostly presumed that Buddhist texts on the continent were, like secular works

27 Ochiai Toshinori, et al., ed., *The Manuscripts of Nanatsu-dera. A Recently Discovered Treasure-House in Downtown Nagoya* (Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies, 1991); Ochiai Toshinori, Frédéric Girard, and Li-Ying Kuo, “Découverte de manuscrits bouddhiques chinois au Japon [Conférence prononcée par Monsieur Ochiai Toshinori],” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 83 (1996); Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, ed., *Kongōji issaikyō no sōgōteki kenkyū to Kongōji shōgyō no kisoteki kenkyū* 金剛寺一切經の総合的研究と金剛寺聖教の基礎的研究 *Heisei 16–18 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū* (A) *kenkyū seika hōkokusho* [General Research Report on the Kongōji Manuscript Canon and a Basic Survey of the Kongōji Sacred Texts] 平成 16–18 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) 研究成果報告書 [2004–2006 Grant-in-Aid Scientific Research (Category A) Research Report], 2 vols. (Tokyo: Kokusai Bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku, 2007), vol. 1. Cf. Gakujutsu, *Nihon genson hasshu issaikyō taishō mokuroku tsuke Tonkō bukkyō bunken*, op. cit.

28 Yugen Wang, *Ten Thousand Scrolls: Reading and Writing in the Poetics of Huang Tingjian and the Late Northern Song* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011). On typography during the Song and afterward, see Michela Bussotti and Qi Han, “Typography for a Modern World? The Ways of Chinese Movable Types,” *East Asian Science, Technology and Society* 40 (2014): 9–44.

such as collections of poetry, encyclopedias like the *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記 [Extensive Records from the Taiping Era], and so forth, kept, read, and used for a variety of purposes in printed editions.<sup>29</sup> For Shingon documents, because we have caches of manuscript documents from libraries, which we do not from China or Korea earlier than the late Ming (1368–1644, 明)—from sources preserved in Japan—and Chosŏn (1392–1897, 朝鮮) Dynasties, the situation in medieval Japan—as in Europe—looks quite different.<sup>30</sup> But the situation is far more complex when investigating the history of the Tendai of Enryaku Temple (Jap. Enryaku ji 延曆寺) and Onjō Temple (alt. Miidera). The *shōgyō* documents from Shinpuku Temple and Kongō Temple reveal much,

29 The most extensive survey in English with details about the printed editions of the Buddhist Canons in Sinitic is Florin Deleanu, “The Transmission of Xuanzang’s Translation of the *Yogācārabhūmi* in East Asia: With a Philological Analysis of Scroll XXXIII,” in *Kongōji issaikyō no sōgōteki kenkyū to Kongōji shōgyō no kisoteki kenkyū: kenkyū seika hōkokusho* 金剛寺一切經の総合的研究と金剛寺聖教の基礎的研究：研究成果報告書 [General Research Report on the Kongōji Manuscript Canon and a Basic Survey of the Kongōji Sacred Texts, vol. 1] Heisei 16–18 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū (A) kenkyū seika hōkokusho 平成 16–18 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) 研究成果報告書 [2004–2006 Grant-in-Aid Scientific Research (Category A) Research Report vol. 1], ed. Ochiai Tshinori 落合俊典 (Tokyo: Kokusai Bukkyōgaku daigakuin daigaku, 2007), 1–44; 632–589. See also Chōnen (983–1016 喬然, in China 983–986) returned to Japan in 986 with a copy of the newly printed *Kaibao Canon* and an additional forty rolls of newly translated texts (for a total of 5425 texts he brought back to Japan). The esteemed statesman Fujiwara no Michinaga (966–1028, 藤原道長) acquired this canon during the early 11th century, when he oversaw the construction of a lavish, private temple for his clan in Kyoto called Hōjō Temple (Jap. Hōjō ji 法成寺). See Yoritomi Motohiro 頼富本宏, *Nicchū o musunda bukkyōsō: hatō o koete kesshi no tokai* 日中を結んだ仏教僧：波濤を超えて決死の渡海 [Connections between Chinese and Japanese Buddhist Monks who Crossed the Surging Sea Prepared for Death] (Tokyo: Nōsan Gyoson bunkakyōkai, 2009), 420–425. On the history of the *First Koryō Canon*, see Sem Vermeersch, “Royal Ancestor Worship and Buddhist Politics: The Hyōnhwa-sa Stele and the Origins of the First Koryō Tripitaka,” *Journal of Korean Studies* 18 (2014). Li Fang 李昉, *Taiping guangji* 太平廣記 [Extensive Records from the Taiping Era] (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1961).

30 Three revealing studies are on the book trade between late Ming and early Qing (1644–1912, 清) China and Korea: Wang Yong 王勇, Chen Xiaofa 陳小法, and Ge Jiyong 葛继勇, *Zhong-Ri ‘shuji zhi lu’ yanjiu* 中日「書籍之路」研究 [Study of the Sino-Japanese ‘Book Road’] (Beijing: Beijing tushuguan chubanshe, 2003); Benjamin A. Elman, “Sinophiles and Sinophobes in Tokugawa Japan: Politics, Classicism, and Medicine During the Eighteenth Century (*Shiba shiji zai Dechuan Riben Songhuazhe he Bianhuazhe de wenti: Yi Zhongyi ji Hanfang weizhu* 十八世紀在德川日本‘頌華者’和‘貶華者’的問題—以中醫及漢方為主),” *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal* 2 (2008): 93–121; Richard D. McBride II, “Wish-Fulfilling Spells and Talismans, Efficacious Resonance, and Trilingual Spell Books: The Mahāpratisarā-dhāraṇī in Chosŏn Buddhism,” *Pacific World, Third Series* 20 (2018): 55–93.

much more information. Although, because there are so many more Buddhist texts than there are books in the *Vulgate*, historians of Japanese religion, literature, and textual editions and language (Jap. *bunkengaku* 文献学) are just beginning to piece together conclusions like Eltjo Buringh and Jan Luiten van Zanden about European books, and even then about only the textual world of Shingon Esoteric Buddhism (Jap. *tōmitsu* 東密), as in the esoteric teachings of the Eastern Temple in Kyoto (Jap. Tōji 東寺) in medieval Japan, contrasted with Tendai so-called *taimitsu* (台密, the esoteric teachings of the Tendai tradition), leaving aside for the moment other traditions including Zen (禪), Pure Land, and so forth.<sup>31</sup>

What I hope to eventually investigate by looking at *shōgyō* documents from Shinpuku Temple and Kongō Temple is what *shōgyō* documents may have once been within the library at Matsuno'o shrine-temple complex or multiplex (Jap. *jingūji* 神宮寺, alt. *jinguji* 神供寺 or *miyadera* 宮寺) in Kyoto during the 12th–16th centuries.<sup>32</sup> My research into the manuscript canon kept there until the mid-19th century, which was sponsored and vowed by father and son shrine priests (Jap. *kannushi* 神主) Hata no Chikatō 秦親任 (Chief shrine proest or *kannushi* 神主 on 1076/2/20) and Hata no Yorichika 秦頼義 (*kannushi* on 1128/8/12) over 23 years (1115 to 1138), demonstrates that much of that manuscript canon was copied from the library of the Bonshaku Temple (Jap. Bonshakuji 梵釈寺), a Tendai library-temple that was established between 783

31 Burnigh Eltjo and Jan Luiten van Zanden, “Charting the ‘Rise of the West’: Manuscripts and Printed Books in Europe, A Long-Term Perspective from the Sixth through Eighteenth Centuries,” *The Journal of Economic History* 69.2 (2009). On the genre but will scant attention to Tendai Esoteric—Taimitsu (台密)—monks, see Ian Astley, “Esoteric Buddhism, Material Culture, and Catalogues in East Asia” in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 709–718. For an overview of the Taimitsu tradition in Japan, see Lucia Dolce, “Taimitsu: The Esoteric Buddhism of the Tendai School”, in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 744–767.

32 On *jingūji* and *miyadera*, see Sagai Tatsuru 嵯峨井建, *Shinbutsu shūgō no rekishi to girei kūkan* 神仏習合の歴史と儀礼空間 [History of Shintō-Buddhist Syncretism and Ritual Space] (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 2013), 105–110. For the term ‘multiplex’ see Allan Grapard, “Institution, Ritual, and Ideology: The Twenty-Two Shrine-Temple Multiplexes of Heian Japan,” *History of Religions* 27.3 (1988): 246–269; and his synopsis in Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough ed., *The Cambridge History of Japan, Vol. 2, Heian Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chap. 8. See below and Neil McMullin, *Buddhism and the State in 16th Century Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 8–32; Peter Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1998; repr., Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 2001), 252–253; cf. George A. Keyworth, “Apocryphal Chinese Books in the Buddhist Canon at Matsuo Shintō Shrine,” *Studies in Chinese Religions* 2.3 (2016): 1–2.

and 792 by Emperor Kanmu (737–806, r. 781–806, 桓武) when he renamed the southern ridge Bonshaku Temple of what had been called Sūfuku Temple (Jap. Sūfuku ji 崇福寺). This temple was located just northwest of the city of Ōtsu (大津), on the lower ridges of Mt. Hiei (Jap. Hiei zan 比叡山).<sup>33</sup> It appears this temple once held a copy of the Kaiyuan-era Chinese Buddhist canon that Genbō returned from Tang China with and his disciple Segyō (d. 807, 施暁) may have copied it. These scriptures were augmented by scriptures brought back from China by Eichū (alt. Yōchū, 743–816, 永忠), a Buddhist monk who studied in China for nearly thirty years at Ximing Temple (Chin. Ximing si 西明寺) in the Tang capital of Chang'an, met Kūkai (774–835, 空海, Kōbō daishi 弘法大師, in China 804–806) there, and returned to Japan on the same ship as Saichō (767–822, 最澄, Dengyō daishi 傳教大師, in China 804–805); Eichū was made abbot of Bonshaku Temple by Emperor Kanmu sometime around 806.<sup>34</sup> The edition of Annen's (841–915?, 安然) *Shō ajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku* 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類惣録 [Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings of the [Eight] Ācāryas] (T. 2176.55., hereafter *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*) from Shinpuku Temple, as we will see, shows that this library was still a well-respected library when he compiled this catalogue. Based on colophons describing how scriptures were copied for Matsuno'o during the 12th century by Hata no Chikatō and Yorichika and also between 1159 and 1165, when Ryōkei (d.u., 良慶), the abbot of Myōhō Temple (Jap. Myōhō ji 妙法寺), one of two known temples in the southern valley (Jap. Minamidani 南谷) of the Matsuno'o Jingū Temple precincts, vowed and added scriptures, I believe that Matsuno'o was once a Tendai-linked centre, unlike either Shinpuku Temple or Kongō Temple which are clearly associated with the medieval Shingon temples like the Daigo Temple (Jap. Daigo ji 醍醐寺),

33 *Jimon denki horoku* 寺門傳記補録 [Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch], *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書 [Complete Buddhist Works of Japan] no. 787, vol. 86, comp. Shikō (1662–1720, 志晃), 6; *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86,145b–148a contains a brief history of Sūfukuji called *Sūfukuji engi fu sangō* 崇福寺縁起付山号 [Chronicle of the Origins of Sūfukuji and the Naming of the Temple]. On the dating of Shikō's compilation, see Miyake Hitoshi 宮家準, "Shugendō no kyōten keisei to Tendaishū 修験道の教典形成と天台宗 [On the Formation of Shugendō Scriptures and the Tendai Tradition]," *Tōkyō daigaku shūkyōgaku nenpō* 東京大学宗教学年報 [Annual Report of Religious Studies Research of Tōkyō University] 32 (2015): 33. This text cites *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀 [Continued Chronicles of Japan] 38, and the date 792 comes also from Kokan Shiren's (1278–1346, 虎関師鍊) *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書 [Buddhist History of the Genkō Era [1321–1324]], chap. 23: Fujita Takuji 藤田琢司, *Kundoku Genkō shakusho* 訓読元亨釈書 [Japanese Reading of Kokan Shiren's Buddhist History of the Genkō Era [1321–1324]] (Kyoto: Zen bunka kenkyūjo, 2011), 2, 380.

34 *Genkō shakusho* 16, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 470.6, 149b–c.



the Eastern Temple, and other sites in the Kinki (近畿) region.<sup>35</sup> Investigating extant *shōgyō* documents related to particularly the Tendai tradition of Mii Temple runs through Enchin and the surprisingly prominent role he may have played even in so-called ‘rival’ Shingon communities.<sup>36</sup>

Only one of the five extant catalogues written by Enchin specifically tallies books by a temple in the western Tang capital Chang’an and two cover temples named Kaiyuan Temple (Chin. Kaiyuan si 開元寺, common practice during the Tang after the Kaiyuan-era) in Fuzhou (福州), Wenzhou (温州) and Taizhou (台州). Table 1.1 provides a list of these catalogues.

Although Ennin’s *Nittō guhō junrei kōki* [alt. *gyōki*] 入唐求法巡礼行記 [Record of a Pilgrimage to Tang China in Search of the Dharma] is well-known today, and we have a catalogue by the Shingon ‘patriarch’ Kūkai, [*Go-*] *Shōrai mokuroku* 御請来目錄 [(Kūkai’s) Catalogue of Items Brought Back [to Japan]] (T. 2161.55), it looks like Enchin may have been the most attentive to the project of cataloguing the treasures he found in Tang China.<sup>37</sup>

The situation looks different if we pay close attention to Annen’s *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*, and especially if we briefly examine the Shinpuku Temple edition. Compiled at roughly the same time as the eminent Japanese literatus Miyoshi no Kiyoyuki’s (847–918, 三善清行) *Enchin oshō den* 円珍和尚伝 [Biography of Preceptor or Upādhyāya Enchin] (hereafter *Biography of Enchin*, ca. 902) but well after Enchin’s diary, *Gyōrekishō* 行歴抄 [Travel Notes], Annen’s *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings* not surprisingly favors texts brought back to Japan by Ennin, whom he studied with before his ‘official’ teacher Henjō (816–890, 遍照). Like the Taishō edition, the Shinpuku Temple edition contains information attached to many texts listed in Annen’s catalogue which shows that the libraries of Shūei’s (809–884, 宗叡, in China 862–865) Engaku Temple

35 Keyworth, “Apocryphal Chinese Books in the Buddhist Canon at Matsuo Shintō Shrine;” George A. Keyworth, “Copying for the Kami: On the Manuscript Set of the Buddhist Canon held by Matsuno’o Shrine,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 44.2 (2017): 161–190.

36 On how late the distinction of a distinct Shingon tradition, let alone traditions tied to specific temples such as Daigo Temple or Ninna Temple (Jap. Ninna ji 仁和寺), and so forth is briefly discussed in Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra*, 424–426; Ryūichi Abé, “Scholasticism, Exegesis, and Ritual Practice: On Renovation in the History of Buddhist Writings in the Early Heian Period,” in *Heian Japan, Centers and Peripheries*, ed. Mikael S. Adolphson, Edward Kamens, and Stacie Matsumoto (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2007), 179–211.

37 Ennin’s diary is distinguished today because of Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin’s Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1955); Edwin O. Reischauer, *Ennin’s Travels in Tang China* (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1955).

TABLE 1.1 Enchin's Catalogues of Books in Chinese Monastic Libraries<sup>a</sup>

	Title	Length	Date	Source in <i>Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho</i> /Taishō canon
1	<i>Kaigenji gūtoku kyōsho ki mokuroku</i> 開元寺求得經疏記目錄 [Catalogue of Scriptures and Commentaries Collected from Kaiyuan Monastery [Fuzhou]] (alt. <i>Kaigenji guhō mokuroku</i> 開元寺求法目錄 [Catalogue of Books Found at Kaiyuan Temple])	1 roll	Friday, 27 October, 853 (Dazhong 大中 7.9.21):	vol. 95, no. 863, 252 T. 2169
2	<i>Fūkushū Onshū Taishū gūtoku kyōritsuronsho ki gaishotō mokuroku</i> 福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄 [Catalogue of Sūtras, Abhidharma, Śāstras, and Commentaries from [Kaiyuan Temples] in Fuzhou, Wenzhou, and Taizhou] (alt. <i>Fūkushū Onshū Taishū guhō mokuroku</i> 福州溫州台州求法目錄 [Catalogue of Books Found in Fuzhou and Taizhou (Temples)])	1 roll	854 (Dazhong 8)	vol. 95, no. 865, 253–256 T. 2170
3	<i>Seiryūji guhō mokuroku</i> 青龍寺求法目錄 [Catalogue of Searching for Scriptures at Qinglong Monastery [Chang'an]]	1 roll	Wednesday, 4 December, 855 (Dazhong 9.10.21)	vol. 95, no. 865, 257–258 T. 2171
4	<i>Chishō daishi shōrai mokuroku</i> 智証大師請來目錄 [Catalogue of Books Enchin Brought Back to Japan]	1 roll	Wednesday, 29 June, 858 (Dazhong 12.5.15)	T. 2173
5	<i>Nihon biku Enchin nittō guhō mokuroku</i> 日本比丘圓珍入唐求法目錄 [Catalogue of Scriptures Found [in China] by the Japanese Bhikṣu Enchin]	1 roll	859 (Tenan 天安 3) <sup>b</sup>	vol. 95, no. 866, 259–264 T. 2172

a See also, Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō tekusuto taikai* 中世日本宗教テキスト体系 [The System of Medieval Japanese Religious Texts] (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2013), 202.

b This text contains *Kokuseiji guhō mokuroku* 國清寺求法目錄 (Catalogue of Scriptures Found at Guoqing monastery [Mount Tiantai]), 1 roll, and has the date 857 (Dazhong 11).



(Jap. Engakuji 円覚寺, today's Mizuoyama dera 水尾山寺, not to be confused with the Zen temple in Kamakura) and Bonshaku Temple were checked, along with the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* 貞元新定釋教目錄 [Newly Revised Catalogue of Buddhist Scriptures Made during the Zhenyuan-Era, T. 2157], comp. 799 or 800 by Yuanzhao (d.u., 圓照). Using the CBETA online edition with its many errors of T. 2176.55,<sup>38</sup> there are roughly thirty texts attributed to Saichō in the first roll with 18 in the second. For Kūkai, there are approximately 150 in roll 1 and 81 in roll 2. The tabulation for Ennin, Jōgyō (d. 867, 常暁, in China 838–839), Engyō (799–852, 円行, in China 838–839), Eun (798–869, 惠運, in China 842–847), and Shūei is as follows, respectively: 280 in roll 1, 189 in roll 2; 10 in roll 1, 23 in roll 2; 90 in roll 1, 39 in roll 2; 89 in roll 1 and 73 in roll 2; 83 in roll 1 and 15 in roll 2. Annen lists 78 texts from Enchin in roll one and 51 in roll two. The Taishō edition also lists 154 texts in roll one and 37 in roll two checked against the library of Bonshaku Temple; 206 in roll one and 50 in roll two were checked (many against both editions) with the library of Engaku Temple.

There are nine extant editions of the *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*. The earliest dates to 965; the latest (T. 2176.55) is an Edo (1603–1868, 江戸) period reprint of a 10th century manuscript edition.<sup>39</sup> Despite the fact that Annen was a Tendai monk and it is often presumed that this catalogue favors Tendai monk-pilgrims and may reflect nascent sectarian tensions, these editions come from Shingon libraries, including Shinpuku Temple. This edition has a special colophon, which reflects not only how to read the notes about which texts Annen assigns to each traveler, but also how broad the scope of transmission was understood to be during the 10th century. As in the order I listed the number of texts assigned to each pilgrim above, Saichō is defined as Dengyō daishi from Mt. Hiei; Ennin and Enchin are listed in the same fashion. Kūkai is assigned to Mt. Kōya, Engyō to the Reigon Temple (Jap. Reigon ji 靈巖寺, in Yamashiro (山城), western Kyoto today), Eun to the Anshō Temple (Jap. Anshō ji 安祥寺), and Shūei, a.k.a. Engaku, is listed as a first rank official monk (Jap. *sōjō* 僧正). A scribe by the name of Kōkaku (fl. 12th c. 光覺)

38 <http://cbetaonline.dila.edu.tw>.

39 Tomabechi Seiichi 苔米地誠一, "Shō ajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku kaidai 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類惣録開題 [Guide to [the Shinpukuji Edition] of Annen's Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings of the [Eight] Ācāryas]," in *Shinpukuji komokurokushū 2* 真福寺古目錄集二 [Guide to [the Shinpukuji Edition] of Annen's Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings of the [Eight] Ācāryas], ed. Abe Yasurō 阿部泰朗 and Yamazaki Makoto 山崎誠 (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, 2005), 608.

of the Jimyōbō (慈明房) checked this manuscript against two others (Engaku Temple and Bonshaku Temple);<sup>40</sup> the manuscript was copied on the 27th day of the 10th luni-solar month of 1126.<sup>41</sup> Then, in Sanskrit Siddham letters we find the syllables for *prakṣa dharma saṃgha ko* or *ka*. *Prakṣa* is a mistake for *prarakṣa*, which makes the phrase mean: “[copied] to protect the *dharma* and the *saṃgha*.”<sup>42</sup> Tomabechi Sei’ichi thinks the difficult to read letter must be *ko* because of the first character in Kōkaku’s name. But it could be *ka*, which is a syllable often written to refer to protector of the *dharma* monastics.<sup>43</sup>

What is clear however we read the Siddham letters is it must have been important for Kōkaku to have let readers know that there were eight Japanese monastics who brought Esoteric Buddhist ritual texts back to Japan with them during the 9th century. The world we now read about in most textbooks concerning the history of Esoteric Buddhism (Jap. *mikkyō*) in Japan with two putative founders, Kūkai and Saichō, if the latter is mentioned at all, was still far in the future when the Shinpuku Temple edition of *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings* was copied. It should be noted that the Nanatsu Temple Canon contains another edition of *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*, copied on the seventh day of the 12th luni-solar month of 1178 by Ekaku (late 12th c., 榮覺) and checked or proofread by Eshun (late 12th c., 榮俊); there is a dedication or vow, which reads as follows: “presented for future worthies to together, at that time, attain the seed of Buddhahood.”<sup>44</sup>

Almost as if Ekaku or Eshun’s vow was realised, in the catalogue of *shōgyō* documents from the Katsuo Temple (Jap. Katsuo ji 勝尾寺) in Osaka kept at Shinpuku Temple, *Shōgyō mokuroku higashi Katsuojiiryū mokuroku* 聖教目録東勝尾寺流目録 [Catalogue of Sacred Transmitted Documents from the Lineage of the East Katsuo Temple], we find another interesting colophon: diagrams listing the transmission lineages of four, not eight, of the Tang monk-pilgrims listed in *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*. Here, Saichō comes first, followed by Kūkai, Ennin, and Enchin as follows:

40 以兩本比較了慈明房光覺。

41 大治元年年□十月二十七日書寫了。

42 Abe Yasurō and Yamazaki Makoto ed., *Shinpukuji komokurokushū* 2, 511, 605–605.

43 Tomabechi, “Shō ajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku kaidai,” 206.

44 贈後賢□共期佛果. Nanatsudera issaikyō hozonkai 七寺一切經保存会, *Owari shiryō Nanatsudera issaikyō mokuroku* 尾張史料七寺一切經目録 [Catalogue of the Natsudera Scriptures] (Nagoya: Nanatsudera issaikyō hozonkai 七寺一切經保存会, 1968), 127.

*Saichō:*

[*Taizō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana (Jap. Dainichi Nyorai 大日如來)—Vajrapāṇi  
(Jap. Kongō shu 金剛手)—Dharmagupta (Jap. Daruma kikuta 達摩  
掬多)

Śubhakarasiṃha (637–735, Jap. Zenmui 善無畏)—Yixing (ca. 683–727,  
Jap. Ichigyō 一行)—Shunxiao (ca. 805, Jap. Jungyō 順曉)

Saichō

[*Kongō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Samantabhadra (Jap. Fuken 普賢)—  
Mañjuśrī (Jap. Manju shuri 曼殊室利)

Nagārjuna (Jap. Ryūmyō 龍猛)—Nagabodhi (Jap. Ryūchi 龍智)—  
Vajrabodhi (671–741, Jap. Kongōchi 金剛智)

Śubhakarasiṃha—Shunxiao—Saichō

*Kūkai:*

[*Taizō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Vajrapāṇ—Dharmagupta  
Śubhakarasiṃha—Xuanchao (ca. 768?, Jap. Genchō 玄超)—Huiguo  
(746–806, Jap. Keika 惠果)

Kū—[空—]

[*Kongō(kai)*] Samantabhadra—Mañjuśrī—Nagārjuna

Nagabodhi—Vajrabodhi—Amoghavajra

Huiguo—Shunxiao—Kū

□ [様?] 別カ

Mahāvairocana—Vajra[sattva] (Jap. Kongō sata 金剛サタ)—Nagārjuna  
Nagabodhi—Vajrabodhi—Amoghavajra

Huiguo—Kū

*Ennin:*

[*Taizō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Vajrapāṇi—Dharmagupta

Śubhakarasiṃha—Xuanchao—Huiguo

Yicao (9th c., Jap. Gisō 義操)—Yizhen (ca. 781–833,

Jap. Gishin 義真)—Ennin

[*Kongō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Samantabhadra—Mañjuśrī

Nagārjuna—Nagabodhi—Vajrabodhi

Amoghavajra—Huiguo—Huize (9th c., Jap. Esoku 惠則)

Yuanzheng (9th c., Jap. Gensei 元政)—Ennin

*Enchin:*

[*Taizō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Vajrapāṇi—Dharmagupta  
 Śubhakarasiṃha—Xuanchao—Huiguo  
 Yicao—Farun (9th c., Jap. Hōjun 法潤)—Faquan (fl. 800–870, Jap.  
 Hassen 法全)  
 Enchin  
 [*Kongō(kai)*] Mahāvairocana—Samantabhadra—Mañjuśrī  
 Nagārjuna—Nagabodhi—Vajrabodhi  
 Amoghavajra—Huiguo—Yicao  
 Faquan

The order seems to reflect historical chronology of these monastics' journeys to China. But otherwise we find a list of transmission that favors full transmission of these two lineages back to putative Indian patriarchs. By the 13th day of the second luni-solar month of 1355, when Yūe (born 1321, 宥惠) copied this catalogue and declared himself to be a disciple of the Diamond Buddha Mahāvairocana as *Kongō bussū* (金剛佛子), it appears that which Indian teachers and Chinese disciples Saichō (Shunxiao in Yuezhou (越州) on his way home), Kūkai (Huiguo), Ennin (Yicao, Yizhen, and Yuanzheng), and Ennin (Faquan) were understood to have received transmission from had become central to the transmission of Esoteric Buddhist lineages and very likely *shōgyō* documents to study the ritual manuals with the 'correct' lineages' teachers, three of whom were still understood to be Tendai, with Kūkai singled out.<sup>45</sup> How did these teachers in China come to receive such particular attention? And who was Faquan?

45 On these lineages, and Kūkai, see Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra*; Jinhua Chen, "The Construction of Early Tendai Esoteric Buddhism: The Japanese Provenance of Saichō's Transmission Documents and Three Esoteric Apocrypha Attributed to Śubhākarasiṃha," *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21.1 (1998): 21–76; Jinhua Chen, *Making and Remaking History: A Study of Tiantai Sectarian Historiography* (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies, 1999). For fuller detail about competing claims of transmission and these Chinese Esoteric Buddhist teachers, see Chen Jinhua, *Crossfire: Shingon-Tendai Strife as Seen in Two Twelfth-Century Polemics, with Special References to Their Background in Tang China* (Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 2010).

### 3 Kongō Temple Edition of Miyoshi no Kiyoyuki's Biography of Enchin on Enchin in China

As an historical document, the edition we have of Enchin's diary *Travel Notes* was kept at Ishiyama Temple (Jap. Ishiyama dera 石山寺) and was copied with some corrections made on the 17th day of the tenth luni-solar month of 1197 from a previous copy produced by Chikan (12th c., 智勸) in 1195 of a copy by one Raikaku (頼覚) in 1049 of the short diary that Enchin finished writing after he had returned to Japan on the 23rd day of the first luni-solar month of 859.<sup>46</sup> The edition we have in the *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 [Complete Buddhist Works of Japan] has some commentary or notes added by Raikaku. What concerns me most from the *Travel Notes* is that it explains that Enchin received transmission of the teachings of the Diamond-realm and Womb-realm *maṇḍalas* at Qinglong Temple (Chin. Qinglong si 青龍寺) in Chang'an from Faquan (fl. 800–870, 法全), but it does not accord with what is recorded in *Biography of Enchin*. *Travel Notes* says that Enchin arrived in Chang'an on the 20th day of the fifth luni-solar month of 855 (July 7th) and met the Esoteric Dharma Master Faquan on the 28th day of the fifth luni-solar month. On the 15th day of the seventh luni-solar month (August 31st, 855). Faquan gave him a consecration ritual for the Womb *maṇḍala* at Qinglong Temple. Faquan then gave him the consecration ritual for the Diamond *maṇḍala* on the third day of the tenth luni-solar month (November 16th). Finally, on the fifth day of the 11th luni-solar month, Enchin was given a conferral of transmission consecration by Faquan. Enchin ends this section of the diary during the first month of Dazhong (大中) 10 (856). The next entry begins during the second lunar month of 858 with his return to Dazaifu (太宰府) in Japan.<sup>47</sup>

The biography of Enchin by Miyoshi no Kiyoyuki is a curious document with a revealing textual history of its own that lies beyond the scope of this paper. I hope it will suffice to say here, however, that it was written by a fascinating figure who was once a member of the Japanese equivalent of the famous Hanlin (翰林, Jap. Kanrin) Academy in China, and is tied to the curious figure of Sugawara no Michizane (845–903, 菅原道真) who was exiled and became Tenman Tenjin (天満天神).<sup>48</sup> I will add that the edition of *Biography of*

46 *Gyōrekishō Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 572.72, 191b–c, 192a1–3.

47 *Gyōrekishō Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 572.72, 190b–c, esp. c3–5, 17–19. With some disagreement because Chen consults additional, later sources from Japan, trans. in Chen, *Crossfire*, 138.

48 Robert Borgen, *Sugawara no Michizane and the Early Heian Court* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986); Francine Hérail, *La cour et l'administration du Japon à l'époque de Heian* (Genève: Droz, 2006).

*Enchin* in the *Complete Buddhist Works of Japan* is unreliable, though intriguing, because it contains large blocks of additional text, primarily concerned with portents by *kami* concerning key events in his life and oddly placed references to sectarian debates not mentioned in the manuscript I have consulted from Mt. Amano Kongō Temple. There are three other extant manuscript editions of the text: an edition kept at Ishiyama Temple dated to the 21st day of the fourth luni-solar month of 1108; a manuscript dated to the 25th day of the fourth luni-solar month of 1220 from the Manshuin (曼殊院) now at the Tokyo National Museum (no. B-1402 and reproduced in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* as discussed below); and one from the Kanchi'in (觀智院) of Tō Temple dated 1185. The Kongō Temple manuscript is a copy completed on the 11th day of the 12th luni-solar month of 1230 at the Rengeō'in Sanjūsangendō (蓮華王院三十三間堂) of an edition copied on the 18th day of the first luni-solar month of 1182 from an edition copied on the 27th day of the tenth luni-solar month of 1140 at the Shanain (舍那院) Nagahama (長島), Shiga prefecture (Jap. Shiga ken 滋賀県),<sup>49</sup>

In order to deepen our understanding of the history of the transmission of key texts in medieval East Asia and to provide further context about the sources that Chen Jinhua and I use to address the narrative of Enchin's voyage to Tang China, it is important to note that in his biography of Enchin in *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書 [Buddhist History of the Genkō Era [1321–1324]], Kokan Shiren (1278–1346, 虎関師錬) follows Kiyoyuki's biography conspicuously.<sup>50</sup>

Enchin's own diary records that he received Esoteric Buddhist transmission solely from Faquan and only in Chang'an. The narrative of lineage transmission between Faquan and Enchin in Chang'an is similar in the *Biography of Enchin*, but Kiyoyuki adds some key information that Enchin left out of the *Travel Notes*. Kiyoyuki records that the conferral of transmission consecration took place not on the fifth day of the 11th month, but instead on the fourth day and was followed by conferral of the title of *ācārya* (Chin. *asheli* 阿闍梨) after he received the *samaya* precepts (Chin. *sanmeiye jie*, Jap. *sanmaya kai*

49 Gotō Akio 後藤昭雄 et al. ed., *Amanosan Kongōji zenpon sōkan, Dai ichi ki Dai ichi kan Kangaku* 天野山金剛寺善本叢刊, 第一期第一卷漢学 [Collected Works from the Meritorious Books Kept at Amanosan Kongōji. Volume 1.1 Sino-Japanese [Language] Studies] (Tokyo: Bensei shuppan, 2017), 744–746.

50 On Kokan Shiren and the *Genkō shakusho*, see Carl Bielefeldt, "Kokan Shiren and the Sectarian Uses of History," in *The Origins of Japan's Medieval World: Courtiers, Clerics, Warriors, and Peasants in the Fourteenth Century*, ed. Jeffrey P. Mass (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Bruce E. Carpenter, "Kokan Shiren and the Transformation of Familiar Things," *Tezukayama daigaku ronshū* 手塚山大学論集 [Report from Tezukayama University] 18 (1978), 183–198. For the biography of Enchin, see Kokan Shiren (1278–1346) and Fujita Takuji, *Kundoku Genkō shakusho*, 1, 69–76.

三昧耶戒) and performed a ceremony honoring the sages (patriarchs). Then Enchin is said to have proceeded to the monastery of Da Xingshan Temple (Chin. Da Xingshan si 大興善寺), where he bowed and made ritual offerings to the relics of Amoghavajra (705–774, Chin. Bukong Jin'gang 不空金剛, Jap. Fukū kongō) and met with Amoghavajra's third generation disciple, *śramaṇācārya* Huilun (d. 876, 惠輪). According to *Biography of Enchin*, Huilun transmitted to Enchin the secret meaning of the two division *maṇḍalas* and a new translation of his called the *Chinian jingfa* 持念經法 [Method for Reciting [Spells] from the Scriptures].<sup>51</sup>

In a recent article about this Zhihuilun (Jap. Chierin 智慧輪) and in his *Crossfire* book, Chen presents the narrative of the transmission from Zhihuilun to Enchin as a key component in his quest to recover lost traces of the Esoteric Buddhist masters from the post-An Lushan and Shi Siming rebellions, the rebellion of Huang Chao and the Huichang era suppression of the faith. Chen provides careful notes about the texts he read to conclude that Enchin must have met Zhihuilun. One of these is a letter that Enchin addressed to Zhihuilun on the 15th day of the seventh luni-solar month of 882 from Japan with a list of questions for his former teacher requesting additional books to be dispatched.<sup>52</sup> Other letters examined by Chen from Enchin to Zhihuilun address the portraits of the three celebrated esoteric masters Amoghavajra, Śubhakarasiṃha (in China 719–735, Chin. Shanwuwei 善無畏) and Vajrabodhi (662–732, Chin. Jin'gangzhi, 金剛智) that Enchin saw when he was in China and speak to the matter of which lineage Zhihuilun may or may not have been assigned to when Enchin was in China. Chen also makes a convincing case that the biography of Zhihuilun in Zanning's (919–1001, 贊寧) *Song gaoseng zhuan* 宋高僧傳 [Biographies of the Eminent Monks of the Song] (T. 2061.50, 722c) mistakenly suggests that he was an Indian monk with the name \*Prajñācakra, 'Wheel of Wisdom', transcribed into Chinese with the varying characters 般若斫迦 or 般若惹羯羅 or 般若斫羯羅, when his father was almost certainly Chinese—with the surname Ding (丁)—although his mother may have come from India or Central Asia.<sup>53</sup>

51 See lines 88–93 in Gotō Akio et al. ed., *Amanosan Kongōji zenpon sōkan Dai ichi ki Dai ichi kan Kangaku*, 652.

52 Jinhua Chen, "A Chinese Monk under a 'Barbarian' Mask? Zhihuilun (?–876) and Late Tang Esoteric Buddhism," *T'oung Pao* 99.1–3 (2013): 100–105, esp. 100, nos. 126–128; Chen Jinhua, *Crossfire*, 177–178.

53 Chen, "A Chinese Monk under a 'Barbarian' Mask?," 100–105, esp. 128–129. Kokan Shiren and Fujita Takuji, *Kundoku Genkō shakusho*, 1, 72.



If Chen is correct, and I suspect that he is, about the connection between Zhihuilun and Enchin, then I wonder why there is no mention of Zhihuilun in *Travel Notes* as we have the text today? There is another—possibly Indian or Central Asian—monk that Kiyoyuki's *Biography of Enchin* connects Enchin to, not one he encountered in the capital, but when he was in Fuzhou. The *Biography of Enchin* records that when Enchin first arrived in China in 853 and went to the Kaiyuan Temple in Lianjian country (連江縣) in Lingnan circuit (嶺南到), he met a monk by the name of Boredaluo (般若怛羅, Jap. Hannyatara) from the monastery of Nālandā in Magadha in Central India from whom he received several texts. The first is *Fanzi xiitan zhang* 梵字悉曇章 [Chapter of (How to Study) Sanskrit Siddham (Letters)] or *Bonji shittanshō*, followed by the Diamond and Womb *maṇḍalas*, the *Mahāvairocanasūtra*, and at least two other Esoteric Buddhist ritual manuals in Sanskrit (Chin. *fanqie*, Jap. *bonkyō* 梵箴, Skt. *pustaka* or *poṭhī*).<sup>54</sup> The encounter with Boredaluo is not mentioned in the *Travel Notes*, where far clearer dates are provided concerning when he arrived in China (on the 15th day of the eighth luni-solar month of 853) and how quickly he proceeded to Mt. Tiantai and the Guoqing Temple (Chin. Guoqing si 國清寺).<sup>55</sup>

Who was Boredaluo and is there any other evidence of an Indian monk by this name residing at a monastery in Fuzhou? Kūkai's *Catalogue of Items Brought Back (to Japan)* (T. 2161.55, 1063c24) records that he brought back a copy of the Guide to Studying Sanskrit Siddham Letters in one roll, as does the *Catalogue of Scriptures Found [in China] by the Japanese bhikṣu Enchin* (T. 2172.55, 1098b20).<sup>56</sup> Prajñā is an Indian Esoteric master well-known to have been a teacher to Kūkai when he was in Chang'an studying Esoteric Buddhism

54 On *fanqie*, see “Bonkyō” in *Hōbōgirin* 2: 120. See lines 63–68 in Gotō et al., *Amanosan Kongōji zenpon sōkan Dai ichi-ki Dai ichi-kan Kangaku*, 650. It seems likely that one of these texts is a ritual manual devoted to Mañjuśrī (here the name is given as Chin. Mansushili, Jap. Mansoshiri 曼素室利) and Saptakoṭibuddhamātr (Chin. Qijudi fomu, Jap. Shichikutei butsumo 七俱胝仏母) or Cundī (Chin. Zhunti, Jap. Juntei 準[准]提); see Kokan Shiren and Fujita Takuji, *Kundoku Genkō shakusho*, 71.

55 *Gyōrekishō*, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 572.72, 188a–b.

56 The transmission of Siddham by this Indian monk, whose name is rendered as Boreduoluonantuo (Jap. Hannyataramananta 般若多羅難陀), and the possible transmission concerns with Kūkai and Enchin are addressed in Tendaishū Jimon-ha Goonki Jimukyoku 天台宗寺門派御遠忌事務局, *Chishō Daishi* 智證大師 [Great Master Chishō] (Shiga-ken Ōtsu-shi: Onjō ji, 1937), 84–89. On Kūkai's *Catalogue* and problems with 20th century Japanese sectarian accounts of Esoteric Buddhism, see Astley, “62. Esoteric Buddhism,” 709, 716–718.



during the beginning of the 9th century.<sup>57</sup> It seems highly unlikely, however, that the same individual would have moved to Kaiyuan Temple in Fuzhou by the 850s, unless we consider that he may have been one of the representatives of the ‘Chang’an Buddhist traditions’ Benjamin Brose posits;<sup>58</sup> yet I highly doubt this is the same monk. Because Enchin completed the *Catalogue of Scriptures Found [in China] by the Japanese bhikṣu Enchin* after he had returned to Japan, it is possible that he included a copy of the text that Kūkai brought back and records in (Kūkai’s) *Catalogue of Items Brought Back (to Japan)*. It seems equally likely that Enchin acquired a copy of the Guide to Studying Sanskrit Siddhaṃ Letters when he arrived in Fuzhou, along with the Sanskrit texts alluded to in *Biography of Enchin*. Two Sanskrit manuscripts are recorded in the *Kaigenji gūtoku kyōsho ki mokuroku* 開元寺求得經疏記目錄 [Catalogue of Scriptures and Commentaries Collected from Kaiyuan Monastery [Fuzhou]] (T. 2169.55, 1092b15): (1) Sanskrit *mantra*(s) on a palm leaf manuscript from Nālandā in Central India<sup>59</sup> (2) and a Sanskrit text of the *Great Compassion dhāraṇī*<sup>60</sup> which is recorded as having been copied by a *brāhmaṇa tripiṭaka ācārya* named Liyemansuxidaluo (已上婆羅門三藏阿娑阿哩耶曼蘇悉怛羅捨授). Enchin records the same entry in *Fūkushū Onshū Taishū gūtoku kyōritsuronsho ki gaishotō mokuroku* 福州溫州台州求得經律論疏記外書等目錄 [Catalogue of Sūtras, Abhidharma, Śāstras, and Commentaries from [Kaiyuan Temples] in Fuzhou, Wenzhou, and Taizhou] (T. 2170.55, 1093b2). *Catalogue of Scriptures Found [in China] by the Japanese bhikṣu Enchin* is, moreover, the only one of Enchin’s extant catalogues which lists 22 Sanskrit texts that he brought back to Japan. Therefore, although it seems highly suspicious and improbable that Enchin may have met the same Prajñā that Kūkai did nearly fifty years earlier in Chang’an, it is probable that he found Sanskrit manuscripts in the Kaiyuan Temple in Fuzhou when he first arrived—and may have met a man from India who copied Buddhist texts for monastics. If Brose and others are correct that the effects of the Huichang era anti-Buddhist suppression were decreased far from the Tang capitals, then it seems reasonable to conclude that Indian monks or Brahmins who could write Sanskrit were active in the south as late as the mid-9th century.<sup>61</sup>

57 Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra*, 119–120.

58 Benjamin Brose, *Patrons and Patriarchs: Regional Rulers and Chan Monks during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015), 35–41.

59 中天竺大那蘭陀寺貝多葉梵字真言一夾。

60 梵字無礙大悲心陀羅尼一夾。

61 Brose, *Patrons and Patriarchs*, 31.

#### 4 Statues and Kami Associated with Enchin and the Tendai Tradition

In 2004, the curatorial staff at Kyoto Nation Museum launched a special exhibition called “The Sacred World of Shinto Art in Kyoto.” Chief among the objects on display was a ‘seated male deity’ (Jap. *danshin zazō* 男神座像) from Matsuno’o (alt. Matsuo) Shrine. The statue is 99.6 cm high, was apparently carved from a single block of Hinoki (檜) cypress wood, and art historians have reached consensus that it can be dated to the mid-9th century.<sup>62</sup> Details provided by the accompanying exhibit catalogue describe the statue as a Buddhist protector deity (Jap. *gohōjin* 護法神), and it is most likely an image of the male Ōyamakui no kami (大山咋神, alt. Ōyamagui), who was enshrined at Matsuno’o alongside his wife, Ichikishimahime no mikoto (市杵島姫命, alt. Okitsushima), no later than 866.<sup>63</sup> What makes this statue unique is its status as the oldest so-called ‘Shintō’ statue from Kyoto, and the fact that it is the primary—or larger—one in a triad of Shintō statues on display in a building called the Shinzōkan (神像館), on site at Matsuno’o Shrine in western Kyoto since 1975, when a major renovation of the shrine precincts was completed.

In a study published in 2011 of the ‘Shintō statues’ (Jap. *shin’e* or *mikage* 神影) of Matsuno’o Shrine that are on display within the Shinzōkan, Itō Shirō, an eminent art historian and current director of the Wakayama Prefectural Museum (Jap. Wakayama kenritsu hakubutsukan 和歌山県立博物館), agrees that the ‘seated male deity’ lent to Kyoto National Museum in 2004 is a statue of Ōyamakui. But he postulates that it may have been commissioned by Enchin before he departed for China in 853.<sup>64</sup> Or, perhaps, it is simply a statue of the revered true body (Jap. *mishōtai* 御正体) that was enshrined at Matsuno’o, following 8th century precedents in historical accounts that discuss offerings

62 Kyoto National Museum, *Kamigami no bi no sekai: Kyōto no shintō bijutsu* 神々の美の世界: 京都の神道美術 [Special Exhibition: The Sacred World of Shinto Art in Kyoto] (Kyoto: Sankei Shinbunsha, 2004), iv, 22. Itō Shirō 伊東史朗 ed., *Matsuno’o taisha no shin’ei* 松尾大社の神影 [Matsuno’o Taisha Shrine: The Spread of Shinto Art from Ancient Times] (Osaka: Matsuno’o Taisha, Fukamoto Publishers, 2011), 83 gives the height as 99.6 cm, whereas the 2004 catalogue lists the height as 97.3 cm.

63 On *gohōjin*, see “Chingo kokka” (鎮護國家) and esp. “Chinju dokkyō” (鎮守読経) in Sylvain Lévi et al., *Hōbōgirin*, IV: 325–328. Kyoto National Museum, *Kamigami no bi no sekai*, 210.

64 Itō, *Matsuno’o taisha no shin’ei*, 56–57, 84–85. Still perhaps the most comprehensive study of Onjō Temple and Enchin is Miyagi Nobumasa 宮城信雅 and Tendaishū Jimon-ha Goonki Jimukyoku 天台宗寺門派御遠忌事務局, *Onjōji no kenkyū* 園城寺之研究 [A Study of Onjōji] (Ōtsu-shi, Shiga-ken: Urisabakijo hoshino shoten, 1931; repr., Kyoto: Dōhōsha shoten, 1978). A more readily available yet brief discussion of Enchin’s travels in China can be found in Yoritomi, *Nicchū o musunda bukkkyōsō*, 149–160.

being made to statues at shrine-temple complexes in the provinces, such as at Iwasahiko jingan Temple (Jap. Iwasahiko jingan ji 若狭比古神願寺) in Obama city (小浜市), Fukui prefecture (福井県), during the Yōrō period (717–724, 養老) or Tado jingū Temple (Jap. Tado jingū ji 多度神宮寺) in Kuwana city (桑名市), Mie prefecture (三重県), in 763. Both of Itō's hypotheses are tenable because Temple Gate Tendai Buddhist chronicles, contemporary diaries penned by eminent statesmen and scholars Fujiwara no Munetada (1062–1141, 藤原宗忠) and Minamoto no Morotoki (1077–1136, 源師時), and medieval historiographical records from the court and Matsuno'o Shrine confirm that Enchin—or his disciplines and associates who honored him—venerated Ōyamakui as the ancestral home of the same *kami* worshipped at the main shrine associated with Mt. Hiei: Hie—or Hiyoshi, as it is pronounced today—Shrine (Jap. Hiyoshi taisha 日吉大社), in Ōtsu city, Shiga prefecture.

I am not an Art Historian. So please forgive me for making a pronouncement about medieval Japanese guardian-cum-*kami* statues without the proper training to do so: If we compare the composition of the so-called 'Shintō' statues at Matsuno'o Shrine with perhaps the most famous guardian deity statue that is legendarily associated with Enchin, Shinra Myōjin (新羅明神), I am struck by how different these deities look. To begin with, the *kami* statues from Matsuno'o seem to resemble peaceful Buddhist deities—bodhisattvas or buddhas. Shinra Myōjin, on the other hand, seems idiosyncratically 'alien' and wild: the sort of deity who could ward off pestilence if, indeed, Shinra Myōjin is a manifestation in Japan as guardian deity of Mii Temple of the King of Mt. Song (Chin. Song shan 嵩山), Shaolin Temple (Chin. Shaolin si 少林寺), in China.<sup>65</sup> Shinra Myōjin's name suggests a Korean orientation.<sup>66</sup> Like Gozu Tennō (牛頭天王), he is also associated with Susano'o (素戔嗚), the indigenous *kami* of storms and seas. Shinra Myōjin is understood to have been brought to Japan from China by Enchin when he returned from his productive time in the Jiangnan (江南) region and at Qinglong Temple in Chang'an. Christine M.E. Guth, whose research closely follows Itō's scholarship, as I have done here, concludes that the famous image of Shinra Myōjin enshrined within the Shinra Zenshindō (新羅善神捨堂) of Mii Temple and is rarely on display probably dates from 1052. She examines several 11th century Temple-Gate tradition Tendai chronicles to show that Tendai monastics probably already associated Enchin with veneration of Shinra Myōjin as early as the

65 Bernard Faure, "From Bodhidharma to Daruma: The Hidden Life of a Zen Patriarch," *Japan Review* 23 (2011): 59–60.

66 Sujung Kim, *Shinra Myōjin and Buddhist Networks of the East Asian 'Mediterranean'* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2020), 15–31.

10th century.<sup>67</sup> In this section I examine several of these chronicles and come to a slightly different conclusion: it appears Enchin was definitely connected with worshipping several types and examples of *kami* at shrines within the precincts of Mii Temple—and Enryaku Temple—and at shrines in Kyoto and across Japan, including, but not necessarily limited to, Shinra Myōjin.

I will confine my discussion here of Enchin and veneration of *kami* statues at shrines to three Buddhist sources: (a) *Biography of Enchin*; (b) *Onjōji denki* 園城寺傳記 [Transmission Record of Onjōji], comp. 13th century; and (c) *Jimon denki horoku* 寺門傳記補錄 [Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch].<sup>68</sup> Because there is ample evidence for connections between Matsuno'o *kami* shrine-temple complex and Mii Temple, and Enchin, in particular, from the 12th through the 16th centuries as discussed above, let me work chronologically backwards through these texts. Rolls three, four, and five of the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* present information about the tutelary shrines (Jap. *shibyō* 祠廟) associated with Mii Temple. It may surprise experts in the study of Chinese religion to learn that the primary ancestral temples in China (Chin. *cimiao* 祠廟) at Onjō Temple are devoted to the two protectors of the Buddhist *dharma*: the aforementioned Shinra Myōjin and Kishimojin (鬼子母神, Skt. Hārītī). Hārītī is venerated within the Gohō zenshindō (護法善神堂, Hall of the Meritorious Guardian Deities who Protect the Dharma) every year on the sixteenth day of the fourth lunar month.<sup>69</sup> It is in roll five, however, that we

67 Christine M.E. Guth, "Mapping Sectarian Identity: Onjōji's Statue of Shinra Myōjin," *Anthropology and Aesthetics* 35 (1999): 112–118.

68 Anna Andreeva, "Saidaiji Monks and Esoteric Kami Worship at Ise and Miwa," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33.2 (2006): 361 mentions the *Transmission Record of Onjōji* and some of the terms discussed here, as does Kim, *Shinra Myōjin and Buddhist Networks of the East Asian 'Mediterranean'*, 24–30. On the dating of Shikō's compilation, see Miyake Hitoshi 宮家準, "Shugendō no kyōten keisei to Tendaishū," 33. According to Umehara Takeshi 梅原猛, *Kyōto hakken 9: Hieizan to Honganji* 京都発見九比叡山と本願寺 [Discovering Kyoto 9: Hieizan and Hongan ji] (Tokyo: Shinchosha, 2007), 57–62, the *Transmission Record of Onjōji* covers the history of Mii dera from 662–1397 and *Jimon denki horoku* covers 888–1302. We know *Jimon denki horoku* was compiled ca. 1394–1428.

69 *Jimon denki horoku* 4, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 133a–134b provides a synopsis of Hārītī within various East Asian Buddhist scriptures; 134b–135b copies a short, probably apocryphal, scripture, *Foshuo guizimu jing* 仏説鬼子母經 (Jap. *Bussetsu kishimokyō*) [Book Spoken by the Buddha on Hārītī, T. 1262]; 135b–136a copies another likely apocryphon, the *Fohua guizimu yuan* 仏化鬼子母緣 (Jap. *Butsuke kishimo en*) [Avadāna Tale the Buddha Converting Hārītī], xzj 961.57, 105b15–106a13, which is available only in Northern Song Dynasty Tiantai master Zongxiao's 宗曉, *Shishi tonglan* 施食通覽 [Survey of Food-Bestowing Rituals]; 136a–137c reproduces Amoghavajra's translation of the ritual manual *Dayaocha nühuanximu bing'aizi chengjiufa* 大藥叉女歡喜母并愛

find ample evidence to support my earlier claim of a medieval religious system whereby monastics from the Jimon branch of the Tendai order organised and maintained a network of offerings to deities at prominent, so-called ‘Shintō’ shrines in Kyoto, which was, in turn, integrated into the ritual calendar of Onjō Temple (Mii Temple) and its sub-temples.<sup>70</sup>

Roll five of the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* is devoted to shrines to protective *kami* (Jap. *chinju shinshi* 鎮守神祠). Beginning with the three *kami* (red, white, and black deities) of Mio shrine (三尾神社), the landlord clan deity shrine established at Onjōji Temple before the shrine to Shinra Myōjin, we learn that there is an interesting connection with the Hata clan (Jap. *hata shi* 秦氏) and *kami* venerated by Mii Temple monastics. It appears that Hata no Kawakatsu (秦河勝), the Hata clan member to whom the founding of the Kōryū Temple (Jap. Kōryū ji 廣隆寺) is attributed, and his sons are also associated with the veneration of Mio myōjin (三尾明, bright or powerful *kami* of Mio shrine) as a powerful, wild bright *kami* (Jap. *Ōare myōjin* 大荒明神).<sup>71</sup> Next, we learn that there are eighteen tutelary deities of the monastic compound (Jap. *garanjin* 伽藍神, lit. gods of the *saṃghārāma*), conveyed in the apocryphal *Matou luocha foming jing* (Jap. *Batōrasetsu butsumyōkyō*) 馬頭羅刹仏名經 [Book of Buddha Names Recited by Horse-Head (Hayagrīva) Rākṣasa] (Z 1167, not included in the Taishō).<sup>72</sup>

---

子成就法 (Jap. *Daikyushanyo kangimo byōaishi jōkuhō*) [Ritual to Achieve the Results [Sādhana] Yakṣiṇī Joyful Mother Loving All Her Children, T. 1260]; 137c–138a reproduces another ritual manual translated by Amoghavajra, *Helidimu zhenyanfa* [jing] 訶梨帝母真言法 [經] (Jap. *Kariteimo shingonhō* [kyō]) [Ritual of the Mantra for Hārītī], T. 1261. On these rituals from an informed perspective in English, see Hei Rui, “Hārītī: From Demon Mother to a Protective Deity in Buddhism—A History of an Indian Pre-Buddhist Goddess in Chinese Buddhist Art” (Macau: University of Macau, 2010), 8–17. Gozu Tennō can also be seen as a manifestation of Hārītī.

70 Kim, *Shinra Myōjin and Buddhist Networks of the East Asian ‘Mediterranean’*, 58–60.

71 *Jimon denki horoku* 5, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 130c–140a.

72 *Jimon denki horoku* 5, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 140a–b. The *Butsumyōkyō* has been studied by Kuo Liying (郭麗英) and received considerable attention when the Matsuno’o and Nanatsu dera scriptures were copied: this scripture is rolls 3509–3520 of the Matsuno’o scriptures. When the Nanatsu dera canon was rediscovered this scripture received considerable attention because a liturgy with this scripture remains an important practice within Shingon temples still today Liying Kuo, “Sur les apocryphes bouddhiques chinois,” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 87.2 (2000): 677–705; Kuo Li-Ying, “La récitation des noms de buddha en Chine et au Japon,” in *Chūgoku senjutsu kyōten: shiryōhen* 中國撰述經典 資料篇 [Scriptures Compiled in China: Research Materials [16 roll *Butsumyōkyō* 佛名經]], ed. Magara Kazuto 真柄和人 et al. (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1995), 688; Toshinori et al., *The Manuscripts of Nanatsu-dera*; Whalen

Apparently when Shinra Myōjin was newly enshrined on site at Onjō Temple in 860 the Sannō Shrine (Jap. Sannō jinja 山王神社), as it was called in the 16th and 17th centuries when the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* was compiled, but was referred to as Hiei Shrine earlier (and today), was given a face lift. Ōyamakui is enshrined there. The *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* reminds the [premodern] reader that Hiei Shrine was one of the twenty-two official shrines that received ‘oblations’ from the imperial lineage during the Heian (794–1185, 平安) period.<sup>73</sup> And then we learn that there were five separate sites in and around Mt. Hiei—including two different small palaces for the *kami* (Jap. *miya* 宮)—for veneration of Ōyamakui.<sup>74</sup>

Almost everything I have discussed in the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* thus far is not included in the 13th century *Transmission Record of Onjōji*. We do find a much shorter enumeration of the eighteen tutelary deities from the *Book of Buddha Names Recited by Horse-Head (Hayagrīva) Rākṣasa*, but nearly the entire lengthy discussion of Shinra myōjin, Mio myōjin, and the five distinct shrines to Ōyamakui is absent from this text. What is essentially the same in both chronicles is the discussion of the eight *myōjin* worshipped at prominent Shintō shrines, mentioned in *Procedures from the Engi Era. Transmission Record of Onjōji* also has a helpful diagram which maps a *maṇḍala* of the spatial—or cosmographical—relationship between the inner *garanjin* (shrines) and the outer, *kami* shrines.<sup>75</sup> Both texts essentially present the same list of eight *kami* shrine-temple complexes:

---

Lai, “The *Chan-ch’a ching*: Religion and Magic in Medieval China,” in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1990), 175–206.

73 *Jimon denki horoku* 5, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 140b–141b.

74 *Jimon denki horoku* 5, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 141b–141c.

75 *Onjōji denki* 2, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 786.86, 61b; John Rosenfield and Fumiko E. Cranston, “The Bruno Petzold Collection of Buddhist and Shinto Scrolls,” in *Treasures of the Yen-ching: Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Harvard-Yenching Library Exhibition Catalogue*, ed. Patrick Hanan (Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Library of the Harvard College Library, 2003), 227–228 discusses a 19th century *maṇḍala* of Onjō ji, which features many of the deities discussed below. For alternate ways to conceptualise *kami* and the buddhas and bodhisattvas, see Fabio Rambelli, “Before the First Buddha: Medieval Japanese Cosmogony and the Quest for the Primeval Kami,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 64.2 (2009): 235–271.



TABLE 1.2 Eight Kami Shrines in the *Transmission Record of Onjōji* and the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch*

	Shrine/Deity	Scripture in Transmission Record of Onjōji
1	Hachiman (八幡)	* <i>Vikurvaṇarājapariprcchā</i> (Chin. <i>Zizaiwang pusa jing</i> , Jap. <i>Jizaiōbosatsukyō</i> 自在王菩薩經) [Book of Questions to Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara], (T. 420.13)
2	Kamo	<i>Renwang boreboluomi jing</i> (Jap. <i>Ninnō hannya haramitsukyō</i> ) 仁王般若波羅蜜經 [Scripture on the Humane Kings] (T. 245.8, Z 21)
3	Matsuno'o	<i>Suvarṇaprabhāsottamasūtra</i> (Chin. <i>Jin'guangming zunshengwang jing</i> , Jap. <i>Konkōmyō saishō ōkyō</i> 金光明最勝王經) [Most Victorious King's Sūtra of Golden Light] (T. 665.16, Z 158)
4	Hieizan Sannō	<i>Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra</i> [Lotus Sūtra]
5	Kasuga 春日	<i>Vajracheddikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra</i> (Chin. <i>Jin'gang jing</i> /Jap. <i>Kongōkyō</i> 金剛經) [Diamond Sūtra]
6	Sumiyoshi 住吉	<i>Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra</i> (Chin. <i>Dabannihuan jing</i> , Jap. <i>Daihatsunaiongyō</i> 大般泥洹經) [Sūtra (of the Buddha's) Supreme Enlightenment], 6 rolls (T. 376.12, Z 137)
7	Shinra [Myōjin]	<i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i> (Chin. <i>Weimojie jing</i> , Jap. <i>Yuimakitsukyō</i> 維摩詰經) [Teaching of Vimalakīrti] (T. 474–475.14, Z 150–151)
8	Iwakura 岩座 <sup>a</sup>	<i>Guanwuliangshou jing</i> 觀無量壽經 (Jap. <i>Kammuryōjubutsukyō</i> ) [(Amitāyus) Contemplation Sūtra] (T. 365.12, Z 223)

a With a slightly different character with the same reading, this almost certainly refers to a *jingū-ji* in the northern Iwakura (岩倉) part of northern Kyoto. I am grateful to James Robson for locating this site.

The *Transmission Record of Onjōji* provides little more than this list of shrines and the scriptures which are either recited on behalf of each shrine during ritual occasions, or, perhaps, the sort of exegetical expertise monastics might lecture about when they travel to these shrines to make offerings and perform rituals. The *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch*, on the other hand, provides the relevant historiographical data about each shrine and information about why there is a special connection to Mii Temple monastics.

It is difficult to imagine that any association between one of these *kami* shrine-temple complexes and Mii Temple could be more significant than the legendary connection between Enchin and the Ōyamakui statue of Matsuno'o Shrine. Not only does the *Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch* contain the story of when Enchin visited Matsuno'o, which we know may have resulted in the commissioning of the larger Ōyamakui statue, but we also have Enchin's biography, which was evidently completed less than ten years after Enchin's death.<sup>76</sup> The substance of the story is as follows:

During the tenth month of 846, Enchin made a visit to Matsuno'o Shrine and made a vow that on the eighth day of the fifth and tenth lunar months, the head of Hiei Shrine would visit Matsuno'o and give lectures on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* [Lotus *sūtra*], the *Book of Buddha Names Recited by Horse-Head (Hayagrīva) rākṣasa*, and various other Mahāyāna *sūtras*. Because he remembered this vow throughout his life, he went [to Matsuno'o] and gave a lecture to commence the lecture series. They celebrate this occasion at Matsuno'o during the 4th and 11th months on the 1st *shin* [(申)] day.<sup>77</sup>

One of the copies of a document written by Enchin in 863 (Monday, 27 December, 863 (Jōgan 5.11.13)), *Enchin kō denpō kugen wo kō sōshōan* 円珍請伝法公驗奏状案 [Legal Travel Document Submitted to the Throne for Enchin who Seeks the Dharma], seems to contain further evidence that because he had visited Matsuno'o on (Saturday, 4 December, 840 (Jōgan 7.11.7)) and made

76 Itō, *Matsuno'o taisha no shin'ei*, 57. The full title of this biography is *Enryakuji zasu Enchin den* 延暦寺座主円珍傳 [Biography of the Abbot of Enryaku Temple, Enchin], accessed on August 10, 2019. [http://www.emuseum.jp/detail/100360/000/000?mode=detail&d\\_lang=ja&s\\_lang=ja&class=&title=&c\\_e=&region=&era=&century=&cptype=&owner=&pos=473&num=2](http://www.emuseum.jp/detail/100360/000/000?mode=detail&d_lang=ja&s_lang=ja&class=&title=&c_e=&region=&era=&century=&cptype=&owner=&pos=473&num=2). It suggests a date of 902; the manuscript copy dates to the 20th day of the fourth luni-solar month of 1220.

77 *Jimon denki horoku* 5, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 142a. The Sinitic characters read as follows: 智證大師實錄曰。承和十三年冬十月。和尚為上翊聖主下鎮率土。於松尾明神社發誓願云。願我每年五月八日十月八日。於比叡明神社頭講演法華佛名等大乘經。以為一生之事。自於彼社始修講事。當社祭祀每年四月上申。臨時祭十一月同日。 This portion of the text is reproduced in *Enchin den*, *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 568.72 and the manuscript preserved at the Tokyo National Museum no. B-1402. This manuscript was copied in its present form on the eighth day of the luni-solar month of 1437 [Eikyō 永享 9 *hinoto* 巳丁 *utsugi* 卯月.8]. Further research is required to address the variant editions of this section of *Enchin den*.



offerings to the deity enshrined at Hiei Shrine and had made a vow there, he was visited three times while in China by Ōyamakui.<sup>78</sup>

In their diaries written a little more than a century after Enchin had returned from China, apparently motivated to visit Matsuno'o Shrine and deliver lectures there because he had been visited by Ōyamakui while looking for books and Esoteric Buddhist teachings on the continent, both scholar-nobles Fujiwara Munetada (1062–1141, 藤原致忠) and Minamoto no Morotoki (1077–1138, 源師時), in *Chūyūki* 中右記 [Diary while Minister of the Right] and *Chōshūki* 長秋記 [Diary during a Lengthy Autumn], respectively, mention strange happenings connected to the statue “commissioned by Chishō daishi” at Matsuno'o Shrine.<sup>79</sup> Whether or not these eminent statesmen's musing can be viewed as proof that Enchin had had the statue of Ōyamakui commissioned upon his return from China and subsequent visit to follow through on his vow to lecture there is, of course, almost impossible to verify. On the one hand, the fact that the larger Ōyamakui statue is considerably older than other statues associated with Enchin (e.g., Shinra Myōjin and a possible image of Fudō Myōō (不動明王, Skt. Acalanātha)), coupled with the noticeably more sublime composition of the image, certainly seems to suggest the distinct possibility that we are looking at an image from an earlier stage in the development of Esoteric Buddhist-inspired Buddhist art in Japan. On the other hand, everything the Temple-Gate Tendai tradition has to say about what Enchin learned and obtained in China would indicate that the larger Ōyamakui image from Matsuno'o Shrine could not have been commissioned by an advocate or practitioner of Esoteric Buddhist rituals, which figure so significantly in the catalogues he is given credit for compiling in the monastic libraries of 9th century Tang China when his relative compatriot, Ennin, seems to have found this task quite challenging, only two decades earlier.

I discuss these statues from Matsuno'o and Hiei Shrine to show why the *shōgyō* documents of Mt. Amano Kongō Temple probably kept an edition of *Biography of Enchin*: Enchin was not only a key figure in the institutional and religious world of late Heian Japan because of the political religious power of Mii Temple and associated temples and shrines, like Matsuno'o and the other seven listed above, but he was also a Buddhist figure connected to the world of indigenous *kami*. If, as I suspect, Mt. Amano Kongō Temple also functioned as a shrine-temple complex in medieval Japan, then it stands to reason that like Kūkai, with texts attributed to him virtually filling the libraries of Shinpuku Temple and Kongō Temple, Enchin was a figure well worth reading about

78 *Enchin den, Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 568.72, 58.

79 *Jimon denki horoku 5, Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 787.86, 56–58.

for a variety of reasons that were probably vital to the monastics at even a Shingon establishment. The category of *shōgyō* documents with documents like Kiyoyuki's *Biography of Enchin* and Annen's *Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings* may become a vital tool with which to think about and consider how we should approach manuscripts and other mostly Buddhist religious paraphernalia found in archaeological excavations across present-day Xinjiang (新疆) and into Afghanistan and Pakistan.<sup>80</sup>

## 5 Jōjin in the Capital Lending Commentaries by Ennin and Enchin, and the Buddhist Canon

During the second day of his stay in Hangzhou when he visited the Xingjiao Temple (Chin. Xingjiao si 興教寺) on the 29th day of the luni-solar month of 1072, Jōjin's *Record of a Pilgrimage to Mount Tiantai and Wutai* records that he met an eminent Chan master who was 74 years old by the name of Daguān (達觀). One might think that Jōjin met Daguān Tanying (985–1060, 達觀曇穎), author of the *Wujia zhuan* 五家傳 [Chronicles of the Five Houses].<sup>81</sup> Either other records of his life are incorrect or Jōjin could have written this monk's name down incorrectly. Or perhaps he saw some sort of tribute to him that day and made an honest mistake; Jōjin could not speak any vernacular Chinese. In any case, the rest of the entry records the lavish halls of the monastery,

80 Oskar von Hinüber's research on both the 7th century manuscript folios in Sanskrit on birch bark from Gilgit (Or. 11878B) and 8th or 9th century Khotanese manuscript fragments from Khādaliq (115 kilometres east of Khotan) of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* and Karashima Seiji's research overall testifies to the lived context of manuscripts. For a synopsis of the Central Asian *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtras* found to date, see Seishi Karashima, "Vehicle (*yāna*) and Wisdom (*jñāna*) in the Lotus Sutra—the Origin of the Notion of *yāna* in Mahāyāna Buddhism," *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 18 (2015): 167. Cf. Karashima and Wille, *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia*; Noriyuki Kudo, "Gilgit *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* Manuscript in the British Library, Or.11878B–G," *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 18 (2015): 197–213. On the Khotanese *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra*, see Oskar von Hinüber, "Three *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* Manuscripts from Khotan and Their Donors," *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 18 (2015): 215–234.

81 See Juefan Huihong's 覺範惠洪 (1071–1128) collected works, *Shimen wenzi chan* 石門文字禪 [Stone Gate's Literary Chan], 25; Kakumon Kantetsu 廓門貫徹 ed., *Chū Sekimon mojizen* 註石門文字禪 [Commentary to the *Shimen wenzichan*], vol. 5 (Kyoto: Rinsen shoten, 2000), 15, 651–652. There its title is *Ti wuzong lu* 題五宗錄 [On the Record of the Five Lineages].

including a hall dedicated to the five hundred Arhats, another dedicated to Hārīti (Chin. Guizimu tang 鬼子母堂), a statue of Sarasvatī that captured his attention, and listened (?) to a lecture about roll 6 of Zhanran's (711–782, 湛然) commentary to the *Lotus Sūtra: Fahua xuanyi shiqian* 法華玄義釋籤 [Explanation of the *Profound Meanings of the Lotus Sūtra*] (T. 1717.33).<sup>82</sup> Nearly a year later when he was in the capital of Bianjing staying at the Institute for Transmitting the *dharma* at Taiping Xingguo Temple on the 15th day of the fourth luni-solar month of 1073, an obscure Chan monk named Desong (d.u., 德嵩) gave him a copy of the *Damo Liuzu tan jing* 達摩六祖壇經 [Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch] (T. 2008.48).<sup>83</sup> Based on the fact that he brought Chōnen's (983–1016, 喬然) diary with him to China, the *Zaitō ki* 在唐記 [Diary in China] and perhaps his *Nissō gūhō junrei ki* 入宋求法巡礼記 [Record of a Pilgrimage to Song China in Search of the Dharma], and shared it with the translation team on his first day there, scholars have concluded that Jōjin sought to visit the newly translated texts from the Institute for Transmitting the *dharma* to acquire newly translated texts.<sup>84</sup>

82 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 1 Xining 熙寧 5 (1072) 4.29; Fujiyoshi Masumi 藤善眞澄, *San Tendai Godaisanki ue* 參天台五臺山記上 [Record of Travels to Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Wutai, First Part] (Osaka: Kansai Daigaku shuppanbu, 2007), 65–70. I provide references to two critical editions of the *San Tendai Godaisan ki*; see below.

83 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 8 1072.4.15; *San Tendai Godaisanki shita* 參天台五臺山記下 [Record of Travels to Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Wutai, Second Part] (Osaka: Kansai Daigaku shuppanbu, 2011), 451–451; Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究 [Researches on the Historiographic Works of the Early Chan School] (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967), chap. 3–4. On Xingguo Temple, see Alexander C. Soper, “Hsiang-Kuo-ssu, An Imperial Temple of Northern Sung,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 68 (1948): 19–43; Jinhua Chen, “Images, Legends, Politics, and the Origin of the Great Xiangguo Monastery in Kaifeng: A Case-study of the Formation and Transformation of Buddhist Sacred Sites in Medieval China,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 125.3 (2005): 353–378; Tansen Sen, *Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade: the Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), chap. 3; Fujiyoshi Masumi 藤善眞澄, “Sōchō yakukyō shimatsu kō 宋朝訳経始末攷 [Examination of the Beginning and Termination of Translation [Activities] during the Song Dynasty],” *Kansai daigaku Bungaku ronshū* 関西大学文学論集 [Report of the Kansai University Literature Department] 36.1 (1986): 399–428; Nakamura Kikunoshin 中村菊之進, “Sō Denpōin yakukyō sanzō Yuijō no denki oyobi nenpu 宋伝法院訳経三蔵惟淨の伝記及び年譜 [The Legend and Chronology of the Eminent Translator Weijing at the Song Institute for the Transmission of the Dharma],” *Bunka* 文化 [Culture] 41.1–2 (1977): 1–59; Takeuchi Kōzen 武内孝善, “Sōdai honyaku kyōten no tokushoku ni tsuite 宋代翻訳経典の特色について [On the Characteristics of the Song Dynasty Translations of Buddhist Books],” *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 [Esoteric Buddhist Culture] 113 (1975): 27–53.

84 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 14th day of the tenth luni-solar month of 1072; Fujiyoshi Masumi, *San Tendai Godaisanki I*, 415, 439. On fragments of Chōnen's diary, including the fragments

Chōnen returned to Japan in 986 with a copy of the newly printed Kaibao-era Buddhist canon and an additional forty rolls of newly translated texts (for a total of 5425 rolls he brought back to Japan), including an apparently incomplete copy of the Chan lamp or flame history, *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (Jap. *Keitoku dentō roku*) [Jingde-era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp [or Flame]] (T. 2076.51, ca. 1004).<sup>85</sup> The esteemed statesman Fujiwara no Michinaga (966–1028, 藤原道長) acquired this canon during the early 11th century, when he oversaw the construction of a lavish, private temple for his clan in Kyoto called Hōjō Temple (Jap. Hōjō ji 法成寺). We can only speculate whether or not the *Jingde-era Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* was kept at Hōjō Temple.

Because his father was a member of the Fujiwara clan (Jap. Fujiwara shi 藤原氏), most likely the son of Sanekata (d. 998, 実方), a distinguished man of letters in his own right, Jōjin must have been aware of Chōnen's copy of the Kaibao Canon at Hōjō Temple. His family background provides further perspective when we consider the entry in the *Record of a Pilgrimage to Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Wutai* for the 25th day of the tenth luni-solar month of 1072, just twelve days after he arrived in at the Institute for Transmitting the *dharma* on the grounds of Taiping Xingguo Temple. It took him 65 days to reach the capital from Guoqing Monastery on Mt. Tiantai. According to Jōjin's diary, two monks from India—Richeng (1017–1073, 日稱, Skt. either Sūryayaśas or Sūryakīrti?) and Tianjixiang (d.u., 天吉祥, Skt. Devaśrī?)—supervised a translation team of nineteen.<sup>86</sup> In the morning of the 25th day of the tenth

---

found inside a statue of Śākyamuni Buddha he brought back to Japan and placed in Seiryō Temple (Jap. Seiryō ji 清涼寺) in Kyoto, see Gregory Henderson and Leon Hurvitz, "The Buddha of Seiryōji," *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1956): 5–55; Zhenping Wang, "Chōnen's Pilgrimage to China, 983–986," *Asia Major, Third Series* 7 (1994): 73, ns 26–27; Benjamin Brose, "Crossing Thousands of Li of Waves: The Return of China's Lost Tiantai Texts," *Journal of the International Association for Buddhist Studies* 29.1 (2006 (2008)): 47, n. 56; Teshima Takahiro 手島崇裕, "Nissō sō Chōnen no sekai kan ni tsuite 入宋僧齋然の世界観について [On the Historical Significance of the Japanese Monk Chōnen's World Views]," *Nichigo Nichibun gakkai kenkyū* 日語日文學研究 [Korean] *Japanese Journal of Language and Literature* 88 (2014): 225–244. See also the essays in: GBS Jikkō iinkai 実行委員会 ed., *Ronshū: Nissō kōryūki no Tōdaiji: Chōnen shōnin issennen daionki ni chinan de* 論集: 日宋交流期の東大寺—齋然上人一千年大遠忌にちなんで [Conference Volume: On the Role of Tōdai Temple in Cultural Exchange between Song China and Japan: On the Occasion of the 1000th Year Commemoration of the Priest Chōnen] (Nara, Kyoto: Kabushiki kaisha Hōzōkan, 2017).

85 Yoritomi Motohiro, *Nicchū o musunda bukkyōsō*, 420–425.

86 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 4 for the 14th day of the tenth luni-solar day of 1072. The jobs at the Institute include masters of the *tripitaka* (Chin. *sanzang fashi* 三藏法師), see Antonino Forte, "The Relativity of the Concept of Orthodoxy in Chinese Buddhism:

luni-solar month, Sanskrit scholar Huizuo (fl. 11th c., 惠琢) sent Jōjin some soup and he was invited to have tea with scribe Dingzhao (fl. 11th c., 定照). During the afternoon, Jōjin and assistant translator Huixun (fl. 11th c., 惠詢), also known as Fancai sanzang (梵才三藏), master of the canon (Skt. *tripiṭaka*) who is talented with the Sanskrit script, and later joined by textual appraiser Zhipu (d.u., 智普, a.k.a. Wenhui dashi 文惠大師), looked at seven other books that Jōjin had brought from Japan. These include three commentaries by Enchin to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* (T. 848.18) (Jap. *Dainichikyō gishaku* 大日經義積) and Vasubandhu's (ca. 4th–5th c.) commentary to the *Lotus Sūtras* (\**Saddharmapundarikasūtropadeśa*; Jap. *Hokke ronki* 法華論記) in 20 rolls, and a glossed commentary to Yijing's translation of the *Suvarṇabhāṣottamasūtra* in ten rolls (Jap. *Saishō'ōkyō monku* 最勝王經文句).<sup>87</sup> They also examined Ennin's commentaries to the *Vajrasekhara* (Jap. *Kongōchōkyō sho* 金剛頂經疏, T. 2223.61), and *Susiddhikara* (Jap. *Soshitchikyō sho* 蘇悉地經疏, T. 2227.61), *sūtras*, both in

---

Chih-sheng's indictment of Shih-li and the Proscription of the *Dharma Mirror Sutra*," in *Chinese Buddhist Apocrypha*, ed. Robert E. Buswell Jr. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990), 243. Then we have assistant translators (Chin. *tongyijing* 同譯經), Sanskrit scholars (Chin. *zhengfanxue* 正梵學), philological assistants (Chin. *zhengyi* 證義), textual appraisers (Chin. *zhengwen* 證文), textual composers (Chin. *zhuiwen* 綴文), proof-readers (Chin. *canyijing* 參譯經), editors (Chin. *panding* 判定), stylists (Chin. *runwen* 潤文), and scribes (Chin. *bishou* 筆受). See also the description of the process during the Tang for Yijing in Chen, "Another Look at Tang Zhongzong's (r. 684, 705–710) Preface to Yijing's (635–713) Translations: With a Special Reference to Its Date;" Chen, "Vinaya Works Translated by Yijing and Their Circulation: Manuscripts Excavated at Dunhuang and Central Asia;" cf. T. 2035.49, 398b7–19 for a canonical description of those involved in the translation process.

- 87 *Shō ajari shingon mikkyō burui sōroku* 諸阿闍梨真言密教部類惣録 [Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings of the [eight] *ācāryas*] (T. 2176.55) lists eight separate editions of Yixing's (683–727, 一行) commentary to the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* brought by each of the *Nittō hakke*; see Shimizu Akisumi 清水明澄, "Dainichikyō no chūshaku-sho no shoshigakuteki kenkyū 「大日經」の注釈書の書誌学的研究 [A Bibliographical Study of the Chinese Commentaries on the *Mahāvairocanābhisambo dhisūtra*]," *Mikkyō bunka* 密教文化 [Esoteric Buddhist Culture] 219 (2007): 25–35. On Enchin's commentary to Vasubandhu's commentary to the *Saddharmapundarikasūtra*, see Maegawa Ken'ichi 前川健一, "Enchin no Hokkeron-ki no in'yō bunken: Mishō bunken no kaimei o chūshin ni 円珍『法華論記』の引用文献: 未詳文献の解明を中心に [Identifying Some Citations in Enchin's *Hokkeron-ki*]," *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究 *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 3 (1995): 89–103; Fujii Kyōkō 藤井経公 and Ikebe Kōshō 池辺宏昭, "Seshin Hokkeron yakuchū 世親『法華論』訳注 [A Study of Vasubandhu's *Saddharmapundarikōpadeśa* (*Fahua lun*) with Translation and Notes]," *Hokkaidō Daigaku bungaku kenkyūka kiyō* 北海道大学文学研究科紀要 [Journal of the Hokkaido University Literature Studies Centre] 105, 108, 111 (2001–2003): 21–112, 111–195, 111–170. Enchin's glossed commentary to the *Saishō'ōkyō* is no longer extant.

seven rolls, and Genshin's (942–1017, 源信) *Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集 [Essentials of Rebirth in the Pure Land] (T. 2682.84).<sup>88</sup>

These commentaries written by Ennin and especially Enchin demonstrate why, following Kuroda Toshio, we refer to Esoteric Buddhism—and especially Tendai Esoteric Buddhism or Taimitsu as opposed to Shingon Esoteric Buddhism or Tōmitsu as in Tō Temple—as *Kenmitsu* Buddhism (Jap. *kenmitsu taisei* 顯密体制): Exoteric and Esoteric Buddhism.<sup>89</sup> Esoteric Buddhist masters who assumed the distinction of *ācāryas* were lineage holders who had received transmission through consecrations or initiations (Chin. *guanding*/Jap. *kanjō* 灌頂, Skt. *abhiṣeka*) to perform the rituals prescribed in manuals outlining performances in ritual spaces (Chin. *daochang*, Jap. *dōjō* 道場, Skt. *bodhimaṇḍa*) according to specific diagrams (Chin. *mantuluo*/Jap. *mandara* 曼荼羅, Skt. *maṇḍala*) and were concomitant experts in the study of Buddhist *sūtra* and commentarial treaties, and the contents and arrangement of the (Kaiyuan-era manuscript) Buddhist canon. Just as Heian-era Esoteric Buddhist teachers in Japan received transmission of the *maṇḍalas* of the two worlds (Jap. *ryōbu mandara* 兩部曼荼羅) or two divisions of the *garbhadhātu* (Chin. *taizang jie*/Jap. *taizōkai* 胎藏界) and *vajradhātu* (Chin. *jin'gang jie*/Jap. *kongōkai* 金剛界) or womb and diamond realms, even within the context of their study of exoteric Buddhist literature (Jap. *kengyō* 顯經 or Jap. 顯教), *ācāryas* viewed exoteric *sūtras* and teachings as advantageous ritual tools for the protection of the state and aristocratic clans (Jap. *Chingo kokka* 鎮護國家).<sup>90</sup> Clearly

88 Fujiyoshi Masumi, *San Tendai Godaisanki I*, 490, 492–493.

89 Toshio Kuroda, “The Development of the Kenmitsu System As Japan's Medieval Orthodoxy,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23.3–4 (1996): 233–271.

90 On these two *maṇḍalas* in the Tōmitsu esoteric tradition, see Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra*. For philological context, see Rolf W. Giebel, *Two Esoteric Sutras: The Adamantine Pinnacle Sutra and The Susiddhikara Sutra* (Translated from the Chinese, Taishō Volume 18, Numbers 865, 893) (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2001); Rolf W. Giebel, “3. Taishō Volumes 18–21,” in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard K. Payne (Leiden: Brill, 2011). The full title of the *Vajrasēkharasūtra* is *Jin'gangding yiqie rulai zhen-shi dasheng xianzheng dajingwang jing* 金剛頂一切如來真實攝大乘現證大經王經 [\**Sarvatahāgattavasamgrā-hamahāyānābhisamayamahākāparāhasūtra*], attributed to Amoghavajra (705–774, Chin. Bukong/Jap. Fukū 不空). See also the translation by Vajrabodhi (662–732, Jin'gangzhi 金剛智), *Jin'gangding yujia zhonglüe chu niansong jing* 金剛頂瑜伽中略出念誦經 [Ritual Manual for Recitations from the Diamond Crown Yoga (Texts)] (Z 516, T. 866.18), and Rolf W. Giebel, trans., “The Chin-kang-ting ching yü-ch'ieh shih-pa-hui chih-kuei: An Annotated Translation,” *Journal of Naritatan Institute for Buddhist Studies* 18.107–201 (1995): 107–201; Giebel, *Two Esoteric Sutras: The Adamantine Pinnacle Sutra and The Susiddhikara Sutra*; Giebel “3. Taishō Volumes 18–21.” The full title of the *Dari jing* is *Dapiluzhena chengfo shenbian jiachi jing* 大毘盧遮那成



based upon models of practice Japanese monks witnessed in Chang'an and Luoyang during the early Tang or even the Sui Dynasty, specific temples in Japan performed state protection rituals with special attention to ritualised readings—either chanting (Jap. *dokuju* 読誦) or revolve-reading (Jap. *tendoku* 転読)—of three scriptures: (1) Xuanzang's colossal translation of the *Da bore boluomiduo jing* 大般若波羅蜜多經 [*\*Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*], i.e. the *Daihannyaharamittakyō* (Z 1, T. 220), (2) the *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* (specifically Yijing's edition), and (3) the *Scripture on the Humane Kings* (Z 21 T. 245.8 and Z 22, T. 246.8): *Shin'yaku ninnōkyō* 新訳仁王經 [New Translation of the Scripture on the Humane Kings]<sup>91</sup>—usually on behalf of the *kami*

---

佛神變加持經 [*Mahāvairocanābhisambodhīvikurvitāadhiṣṭhānasūtra*]; in trans., *The Vairocanābhisambodhi Sūtra: Translated from the Chinese (Taishō Volume 18, Number 848)* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 2005).

- 91 See “*Chingo kokka*” and “*Chinju*” in Lévi et al., *Hōbōgirin*, 322–327. The former entry explicitly points out that protection from or for *kijin* (鬼神, a blanket term in Chinese for ‘gods’) almost always involved *dhāraṇī*, and particularly from the *Ninnōkyō* (see T. 245.8, 829c29–830a4 (chap. 2) and 246.8, 834c25 (chap. 1) or *Konkōmyōkyō* (T. 663.16, 341b13–c3 (chap. 2); 664.16, 382c3–21 (chap. 5), and 665.16, 427c6–27 (chap. 6)). Not only does de Visser pay ample attention to matters of ‘state protection’ Buddhism (Jap. *Chingo kokka* 鎮護国家), but he provides the most thorough summary in English of the history of offerings of a complete manuscript Buddhist canon (Jap. *issaikyō* 一切經) in Japan from 651 to 1323; De Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, 226, 605–615. Furthermore, de Visser provides the first clue in any European language that I know of about shrines where a complete copy of the manuscript Buddhist canon was offered or vowed to the *kami*, “From the beginning of the twelfth century the *Issaikyō* festivals were often held in Shintō sanctuaries (Hiyoshi, Kumano, Iwashimizu, Gion, Kamo)” (ibid., 611–612). His study also contains obliging references to how Enchin, see below, in particular, played an especially prominent role in promoting Tendai rituals—and orientated doctrines at debates and lectures—within the ritual system of Heian Japan.

On ritual readings of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*, see Sagai Tatsuru, *Shinbutsu shūgō no rekishi to girei kūkan*, 139–142; Abe Yasurō, *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō tekusuto taikei*, 430–450 and 196–198. The precedent for ritual readings of this large compendium in Japan comes from a hagiographical biography of Xuanzang, *Da Cien sanzang fashi zhuan* 大慈恩三藏法師傳 [Biography of the Great Trepiṭaka Cī'en (Xuanzang)] 10 (T. 2053.50, 276b5–22), which says that a special lecture was delivered on this scripture and it was read at a ceremony on during the tenth luni-solar month of 663. Cf. Komine Michihiko 小峰未彌彦, Katsuzaki Yūgen 勝崎祐彦, and Watanabe Shōgo 渡辺章悟, *Hannyakyō taizen* 般若經大全 [Encyclopedia of *Prajñāpāramitā* Scriptures] (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 2015), 372–382. On the ritual of the manuscript Buddhist canon (Jap. *issaikyō-e* 一切經会), see Heather Blair, “Rites and Rule: Kiyomori at Itsukushima and Fukuhara,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 73.1 (2013): 6; Heather Blair, *Real and Imagined: The Peak of Gold in Heian Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2015), chap. 1.2 and 1.3. See also D. Max Moerman, *Localizing Paradise: Kumano Pilgrimage and the Religious Landscape of Premodern Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), chap. 4 cited in Blair, and D. Max Moerman, “The Archaeology of Anxiety: An Underground History of



(Jap. *shinzen dokyō* 神前読經) to avert natural disasters and calamities and protect the state and powerful clans.

We have scant sources with which to investigate the tools used and mechanisms by which Buddhist monastics performed state protection rituals that Japanese pilgrims such as Kūkai, Ennin, Enchin, Shūei and others reported they received from Esoteric Buddhist teachers in specific monasteries in Tang Chang'an and Luoyang, which explains Brose's Chang'an Buddhist Traditions. After the An Lushan, Shi Siming, and Huang Chao rebellions and the Huichang-era anti-Buddhist suppression, as Chen has expertly demonstrated in his *Crossfire: Shingon-Tendai Strife as Seen in Two Twelfth-century Polemics, with Special References to Their Background in Tang China*, how nearly our entire understanding of what Tang Esoteric Buddhism may have looked like comes from the perspective of the Tendai and Shingon Esoteric Buddhist traditions.

What Jōjin's diary has to tell us about the world of 11th century state protection and/or Esoteric Buddhism in the capital of Bianjing at the Institute for Transmitting the *dharma* is problematical to unpack. We know from his background in Japan and certain *Lotus Sūtra*-orientated rituals (Jap. *Hokkehō* 法華法) he mentions again and again beginning on the first day of his diary, as well as recitation of the *Budong zunzhou/Fudō sonju* 不動尊咒 [The Venerable Spell of Acalanātha], how he arrived in China with a highly developed understanding of Esoteric Buddhist discourse, practice, and knowledge of how these practices were integrated with the *Lotus Sūtra* in Temple Branch Exoteric-Esoteric Buddhist (Jap. *kenmitsu* 顕密) practice and study.<sup>92</sup> Just as he loaned out copies of Ennin's and Enchin's commentaries to *sūtras* and commentaries, on the twenty-sixth day of the first lunar month of 1073, he loaned out copies of four Tang translations of ritual texts he had brought with him from Japan. One of these was Amoghavajra's translation of the *Chengju Miaofa lianhua jingwang yuqie guanzhi yigui/Jōju myōhō renekyō ō yuga kanchi giki* 成就妙法蓮華經王瑜伽觀智儀軌 [Manual to Achieve [Skt. *siddhi*] Visualisation and Knowledge

---

Heian Religion," in *Heian Japan, Centers and Peripheries*, ed. Mikael S. Adolphson, Edward Kamens, and Stacie Matsumoto (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007), 245–271. On the *Scripture on the Humane Kings* (Chin. *Renwang jing*/Jap. *Ninnōkyō*) in China, see Charles D. Orzech, *Politics and Transcendent Wisdom: The Scripture for Humane Kings in the Creation of Chinese Buddhism* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998).

92 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 1 for the 15th day of the third luni-solar month of 1072. Fujiyoshi Masumi, *San Tendai Godaisan ki* I, 3–13 Cf. Lucia Dolce, "Reconsidering the Taxonomy of the Esoteric," in *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion*, ed. Bernhard Scheid and Mark Teeuwen (London, New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2006), 130–171.

of the King of the *Lotus Sūtra* through Yoga] (T. 1000.19) with perhaps Ennin's commentary *Hokke shidai* 法華次第 [Ritual Procedures of the *Lotus Sūtra*] to it, and Enchin's commentary to the *Daihannyakyō kaidai* 大般若經開題 [Questions about the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*] that Kūkai brought back to Japan and Enchin appended in one roll.<sup>93</sup> Jōjin also appears to have let Huixun borrow his copy of a *maṇḍala* diagram (Jap. *bonjizu mandara* 梵字圖曼荼羅).

Jōjin also found newly translated texts in China. At the Institute for Transmitting the *dharma* on the 28th day of the second luni-solar month<sup>1073</sup>, for example, we learn that he was able to see a range of rare commentaries that are otherwise primarily catalogued in Ūich'on's (1055–1101, 義天) catalogue to the supplement to the First Koryō (918–1392, 高麗) printed canon (ca. 991–1101) called *Sinp'yōn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok* 新編諸宗總錄 [New Catalogue of the Teachings of All the Schools].<sup>94</sup> On the twenty-ninth day, he was shown a newly compiled primer for learning the origins of the Sanskrit alphabet and Sanskrit words called *Jingyou Tianzhu ziyuan* 景祐天竺字源 [Jingyou-era (1034–1038) Book on the Source of Indian [Writing]] and copied down in the *Record of a Pilgrimage to Mt. Tiantai and Mt. Wutai* two imperial prefaces written to commemorate the translation of it by Dharmapāla (963–1058, Chin. Fahu 法護) and Weijing (d. ca. 1051–1052, 惟淨). The scribe Dingzhao showed him more than 400 rolls of texts previously translated at the Institute, including \*Dharmabhadra's (d. 1000, Chin. Faxian 法賢) translation of the *Ratnaguṇasaṃcaya* (Chin. *Fomu baodezang bore boluomi jing* 佛母寶德藏般若波羅蜜經 [Perfection of Wisdom Treasured and Virtuous Storehouse of the Mother of All buddhas], T. 229.8) with imperials prefaces (written in Chinese).<sup>95</sup> The entry for the ninth day of the fourth luni-solar month of 1073 when he was still in the capital at the Institute explains that he was given a copy of newly translated Esoteric Buddhist text. He records the title as *Dajiaowang jing* 大教王經 [(perhaps the) *Māyājālamahātāntra* or *sūtra* of Regal Great Teachings] in thirty rolls, which means it could have been \*Dānapāla's (Chin.

93 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 6 for the 27th day of the third luni-solar month of 1072. Fujiyoshi Masumi, *San Tendai Godaisan ki II*, 277–278.

94 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* for the 28th day of the second luni-solar month of 1073, *ibid.*, 280–283. On the *Sinp'yōn chejong kyojang ch'ongnok*, see Chikusa Masaaki 竺沙雅章, ed. *Sō-Gen Bukkyō bunkashi kenkyū* 宋元佛教文化史研究 [Studies in the Cultural History of Buddhism during the Song and Yuan dynasties] (Tokyo: Kifuko shoin, 2000), 69–70, 112–140, 271–292; Brose, “Crossing Thousands of *Li* of Waves: The Return of China's Lost Tiantai Texts,” 39–41; Richard D. McBride II, *Doctrine and Practice in Medieval Korean Buddhism: The Collected Works of Ūich'ōn*, ed. Robert E. Jr. Buswell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 4–5.

95 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* for the 29th day of the second luni-solar month of 1073. Fujiyoshi Masumi, *San Tendai Godaisan ki II*, 283–290.

Shihu, d. 1017, 施護) retranslation of the *Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgrahasūtra* (alt. *Vajraśekharasūtra*, Chin. *Yiqie rulai zhen shishe dasheng xianzheng sanmei dajiao wang jing* 一切如來真實攝大乘現證三昧大教王經 [Mahāyāna Sūtra of Regal Great Teachings about the Genuine, Evident, Verified Samādhi of All the Thus Come Ones], T. 882.18).<sup>96</sup>

I will restrict my discussion here of Jōjin's background knowledge of Esoteric Buddhism from Japan to the example of the 'copying the *Lotus Sūtra* according to the prescribed method' (Jap. *nyohōkyō* 如法經) and invoking the thirty *kami* (Jap. *sanjūbanjin* 三十番神) who protect the *Lotus Sūtra* (Jap. *Hokekyō shugo no kami* 法華經守護の神 or *shotenzenjin* 諸天善神 or *nyohōgyō zenjin* 如法經善神) during the 'end times' (Jap. *mappō* 末法).<sup>97</sup> In his *Nyohōgyō genshūsahō* 如法經現修作法 [Procedures for Presently Copying [the *Lotus*] *Sūtra* According to the Prescribed Method], comp. ca. 1236 (T. 2730.84), ritual *sūtra*-chanting expert (Jap. *shōmyō* 声明) Shūkai (d.u., 宗快) lists the invocation of the thirty *kami* starting with Amaterasu Ōmikami (天照大神), deity of Ise Shrine (Jap. Ise jingū 伊勢神宮), Mie prefecture, on the tenth lunar day, Atsuta Shrine (Jap. Atsuta jingū 熱田神宮) in Nagoya on the first day of the next lunar month, concluding with Kifune (貴船, of Kibune near Kyoto) on the 9th lunar day.<sup>98</sup> In a mountain branch Tendai Esoteric Buddhism manual in which "the core of cultic practice and thought on Mt. Hiei consisted primarily of Shintō-Buddhist combinations" compiled by ritual expert Kōshū (alt. Kōsō, 1276–1350, 光宗), *Keiranshūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集 [A Collection of Leaves Gathered in Stormy Streams], the thirty *kami* are similarly evoked as guardians of the *Lotus Sūtra* tied to a practice initiated by Ennin.<sup>99</sup> Enchin is the putative founder of the Tendai temple branch; Ennin is assigned the same role for the mountain branch of the Tendai tradition. But Kōshū offers a new twist about one of the shrine-temple complexes or multiplexes that seems to have been of particular significance for the Tendai tradition: Atsuta Shrine is not recorded as the shrine to 'the imperial sword' (Jap. *Kusanagi no tsurugi* 草薙劍 or *Yatsurugi* 八剱), the name of a *kami*, but is instead the site where Tang Emperor Xuanzong's (r. 713–755, 玄宗) favorite consort Yang Guifei

96 *San Tendai Godaisan ki* 6 for the ninth day of the third luni-solar month of 1072, *ibid.*, 439–440.

97 Lucia Dolce, "Hokke Shinto: kami in the Nichiren tradition," in *Buddhas and Kami in Japan: Honji Suijaku as a Combinatory Paradigm*, ed. Fabio Rambelli and Mark Teeuwen (London, New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003), 225–226.

98 T. 2730.84, 896c25–897a9.

99 Allan G. Grapard, "Keiranshūyōshū: A Different Perspective on Mt. Hiei in the Medieval Period," in *Re-visioning 'Kamakura' Buddhism*, ed. Richard Karl Payne (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998), 55.

(719–756, 楊貴妃)—depicted at Sennyū Temple (Jap. Sennyū ji 泉涌寺) in Kyoto as Yōhiki Kannon (楊貴妃觀音)—descended to as part of the cultivation of the *vajradhātu* or diamond realm *maṇḍala* from the *Vajrasāekharasūtra*.<sup>100</sup> Daiun Temple, where Jōjin was abbot before he left for China, played an important role in temple branch Tendai rituals to the *kami*. And the connection between devotion to local gods, Esoteric Buddhist rituals and the Tendai tradition runs not through pilgrims' experiences in the Tang capitals, but with Mt. Tiantai in Taizhou (台州) near Hangzhou, where the Mountain King tutelary deity is said to have been brought from to Mt. Hiei by Saichō—or more likely Enchin.<sup>101</sup>

## 6 Conclusion: Transmission along the Silk Road(s) in Japan in Practice

As I mentioned at the outset, apart from the so-called Library Cave where the Dunhuang cache of documents were discovered at the turn of the 20th century, we do not have libraries like Shinpuku Temple or Mt. Amano Kongō Temple in China—or anywhere else in East Asian for that matter. With the *Biography of Enchin, Comprehensive Catalogue of the Shingon Esoteric Teachings*, various travel diaries and catalogues, and *Record of a Pilgrimage to Mount Tiantai and Wutai*, we can reconstruct the means by which the transmission of Esoteric Buddhist rituals made their way from Tang (and Song) China to Japan and specifically to Matsuno'o, Hiei, and other shrines in the region. Colophons on scriptures from the Matsuno'o and Nanatsu Temple manuscript Buddhist canons reflect how lay people and monastics used these scriptures to achieve not only soteriological ends, but perhaps more significantly, to protect themselves from all manner of misfortune and calamity. And because “colophons containing more or less the same information can be found everywhere,” and the

100 *Keiranshūyōshū* 6, T. 2410.76, 518c26–519a16. On Yang Guifei and Sennyūji, see Hillary Eve Pedersen, “The Five Great Space Repositories Bodhisattvas: Lineage, Protection and Celestial Authority in Ninth-Century Japan,” (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2010), 185.

On the Three Imperial Regalia and the sword, in particular, see below and Fabio Rambelli, “Texts, Talismans, and Jewels: the *Reikiki* and the Performativity of Sacred Texts in Medieval Japan,” in *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Richard K. Payne and Taigen Daniel Leighton (Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 2006), 52–78. On *jingūji* and *miyadera*, see Sagai, *Shinbutsu shūgō no rekishi to girei kukan*, 105–110; Kornicki, *The Book in Japan*, 252–253. Cf. Keyworth, “Apocryphal Chinese Books in the Buddhist Canon at Matsuo Shintō Shrine,” 1–2.

101 Allan G. Grapard, “Linguistic Cubism: A Singularity of Pluralism in the Sannō Cult,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14.2–3 (1987): 211–234.

word and concept “colophon” has existed since classical antiquity around the globe, colophons not only mark the “victorious achievement of the scribe,” but they also provide perhaps the only first-hand window we have into what the people actually did with particular books.<sup>102</sup> Or, in our case, with books and statues and texts to be read in as perfect Sanskrit as may have been possible in medieval Japan. The phonetic reading marks I briefly mentioned on rolls of the Yijing’s translation of the *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* from Matsuno’o Shrine and from Dunhuang affirm as much. It seems to me that these colophons are not that far removed from the manuscript fragments that von Hinüber and Karashima studied on the other end of the Silk Road(s). Von Hinüber states:

[...] particularly in very rich and sometimes even voluminous colophons a lot of cultural knowledge is hidden. For, much of the common cultural background of scribes and donors at the period when the copy was prepared is also unintentionally preserved in these texts [...]. [C]olophons gradually gained importance as invaluable sources of information on cultural history otherwise lost.<sup>103</sup>

Von Hinüber has found what he calls “the beginning of a long tradition” of inserting a colophon to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* in Sanskrit which says:

And the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* has come to an end, the discourse on the Dharma, the *Sūtrānta*, the great extensive one, the instruction of the bodhisattvas, [...] the secret of all buddhas, the mystery of all buddhas, the elucidation bringing the highest goal within reach. If a son of a good family falls into a pit of burning coals or lies down on a bed of razors, he should go to a place where this *sūtra* is.<sup>104</sup>

102 Hinüber, “On the Early History of Indic Buddhist Colophons,” 47.

103 Ibid., 57.

104 Ibid., 55–57. The Sanskrit of reads as follows: [...] *abhyānandam iti. samāptam ca saddharmapuṇḍarīkaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ sūtrāntaṃ mahāvaiṣṭyaṃ bodhisattvāvādaṃ [...] sarvabuddharahasyaṃ sarvabuddhanigīṭhaṃ [...] paramārthanirhāranirdeśaṃ iti aṃgārakaśūṇ gāhitvā ākrāmya kṣurasamstaraṃ gantavyaṃ kulaputreṇa yatra sūtraṃ ida[m] bhavet.* An alternate translation of these verses is provided in von Hinüber, “The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*,” 36–41: “A son of a good family must go to where the *Sūtra* is (even) after having dived into pits (filled with) burning coals, having stepped upon scattered razors.” The first publication of this colophon was in Sylvain Lévi, “Note Sure Des Manuscrits Sanscrits Provenant De Bamiyan (Afghanistan), Et De Gilgit (Cachmere),” *Journal Asiatique* 220 (1932): 45.

Putting aside the risk of repeating something from a paper I delivered at a conference with Henrik Sørensen two years ago in Beijing, falling into a pit of burning coals or stretching out on a bed of razors seems to be a peculiarly Indic or perhaps even Central Asian fear, because I have yet to see such grisly—though perhaps tangible—concerns expressed in colophons to Buddhist manuscripts in Sinitic. But it goes without saying that the *Lotus Sūtra* is as associated with deliverance from unwelcome circumstances in East Asia as it apparently was in medieval India. Moreover, although the *Lotus Sūtra* probably deserves the title ‘King of *Sūtras*’ in medieval East Asia and certainly in 9th–10th century China and Heian Japan, where it is noticeably missing from the Matsuno’o Shrine canon, despite the fact that this canon owes its survival to a *Lotus Sūtra* orientated temple (Jap. Myōren ji 妙蓮寺 of the Hokkeshū 法華宗), a host of other scriptures—particularly those with propitious *dhāraṇī*—promise similar this worldly benefits. The aforementioned *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* is one of these with special attention to goddesses, and Sarasvatī in particular. In several guises she was as well-known across the Indian subcontinent and among Iranian speaking peoples prior to the introduction of Islam as the goddess of composition, learning, music (she plays the *vīṇā*) and poetry, and she preaches on behalf of the Buddha and offers several of her own *dhāraṇī* to coincide with a ritual bath (reconstructed from Khotanese-Sanskrit).<sup>105</sup> In Emmerick’s translation Sarasvatī continues:

105 See R.E. Emmerick, *Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, 3rd revised edition (London: Pali Text Society), 49. The Sanskrit here reads: *śame biśame svāhā / sagate bigaṭe svāhā / sukhatinate svāhā sāgarasambhūtāya svāhā / skandamātrāya svāhā nilakaṇṭhāya svāhā / aparājītabīryāya svāhā himabatasambhūtāya svāhā / animilabakrṭāya svāhā namo bhagabate brahmaṇe / namaḥ sarasvatyai debyai sidhyanta mantrapadā / taṃ brahmānumaryatu svāhā*. Catherine Ludvik, *Sarasvatī: Riverine Goddess of Knowledge; From the Manuscript-carrying Vīṇā-player to the Weapon-wielding Defender of the Dharma*, vol. 27 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 169–170.

T. 665.16, 435b23–c5 reads: 怛姪他□三謎□毘三謎□莎訶□索揭滯毘揭滯□莎訶□毘揭茶（亭耶反）伐底□莎訶娑揭囉□三步多也莎訶□塞建陀□摩多也莎訶□尼攞建佗也□莎訶□阿鉢囉市哆□毘嚧耶也□莎訶□呬摩槃哆□三步多也□莎訶□阿彌蜜攞 薄怛囉也□莎訶□南謨薄伽伐都□跋囉甜摩寫莎訶□南謨薩囉酸（蘇活）底□莫訶提鼻裔莎訶□悉旬觀漫（此云成就我某甲）曼怛囉鉢拖莎訶 怛嚧觀怛姪哆□跋囉甜摩奴末觀□莎訶。

The Taishō editors provide an alternate Sanskrit reading:

*Tadyathā samme visamme svāhā, sugate vīgate svāhā. Vīgata (蕃 pamgaci) vatisvāhā, Sāgarasambuddhāya svāhā, skandā mātāya svāhā, nilakaṇṭhāya svāhā, aparājita vīryāya svāhā, himavantāya svāhā, animilavāktāya svāhā, namo bhagavate Brah maṇi svāhā, namo Sarasvatī-mahā devye svāhā, siddhyantu māṃ mantrapāda svāhā dharata vacito Brahmānu manora (tha-vṛto) svāhā.*



At the act of bathing, for the sake of the monk who preaches the Law [*dharmabhāṇaka*], for the sake of those who listen to the Law and to those who write it down, I myself will go there. Together with the multitude of gods, I will cause the removal of every disease in that village, city, district, or dwelling.<sup>106</sup>

The *brāhmaṇa* Kauṇḍinya then praises Sarasvatī, beseeching her to utter another *dhāraṇī* (following Emmerick):

May my insight be unobstructed. May my knowledge prosper in such textbooks, verses, magic books, doctrinal books, poems. So be it: *mahāprabhāve hili hili, mili mili*. May it go forth for me by the power of the blessed goddess Sarasvatī. *karate keyūre, keyūrebatī, hili mili, hili mili, hili hili*. I invoke the great goddess by the truth of the Buddha, by the truth of the Indra, by the truth of Varuṇa [...]<sup>107</sup>

106 Emmerick, *Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, 27 and 49.

107 Ibid., 50, provides the Sanskrit as: *mure, cire, abaje, abajabati, hiṅgule, piṅgalabati, maṅgiṣe, marīci, samati, daśmatī, agrīmagrī, tara, citara, cabati, ciciri, śīri, miri, marīci, praṇye lokajyeṣṭhe lokaśreṣṭhe, lokapriye, siddhiprite, bhīnamukti śuci khari, apratihate, apratihatabuddhi, namuci namuci mahādebi pratiḡrṇa namastkāraṃ*. Cf. T. 665.16, 436a12–b7 reads: 怛姪他慕囉只囉□阿伐帝(貞勵)阿伐吒伐底(丁里,下同)馨遇嗽名具嗽□名具羅伐底□鶩具師 末喇只三末底□毘三末底惡近(入)□喇莫近喇囉只□怛囉者伐□底質質哩室里蜜里□末難地□疊(去)末喇只□八囉拏畢喇裔□盧迦逝瑟跏(丑世反)□盧迦失囉瑟趾□盧迦畢喇裔悉馱跋喇帝□毘麼目企(輕利反)輸只折喇□阿鉢喇底喝帝□阿鉢喇底喝哆勃地□南母只□南母只□莫訶提鼻鉢喇底近(入)喇昏(火恨)拏(上)南摩塞迦囉□我某甲勃地□達哩奢呬□勃地□阿鉢喇底喝哆 婆(上)跋靚□市婆謎毘輪姪靚□舍悉怛囉輸路迦□曼怛囉畢得迦□迦婢耶地數□怛姪他□莫訶鉢喇婆鼻□呬里蜜里呬里蜜里□毘折喇靚謎勃地□我某甲勃地輸提□薄伽伐點□提毘焰□薩羅酸(蘇活)點(丁焰[\*]反)羯囉(魯家)滯雞由囉雞由囉末底□呬里蜜里呬里蜜里□阿婆訶耶弭□莫訶提鼻勃陀薩帝娜□達摩薩帝娜□僧伽薩帝娜因達囉薩帝娜□跋嚩拏薩帝娜□裔[蘆>盧] 雞薩底婆地娜 毘釤(引)薩帝娜 薩底伐者泥娜阿婆訶耶弭□莫訶提鼻□呬哩蜜[\*]哩呬[\*]哩蜜[\*]哩□毘折喇靚□我某甲勃地□南謨薄伽伐底(丁利[\*]反)莫訶提鼻□薩羅酸底 悉甸靚□曼怛囉鉢陀彌□莎訶。

The Taishō editors provide an alternate Sanskrit rendering:

*Tadyathā miri cyore avate avajevati hiṅgule miṅgule piṅgalevati ankhuṣa māriḥye saṃmati visaṃmati(daśamati)agrati makhye taraci taracivati cīrsi cīri śīrimiri manandhi damakhe māriḥye praṇāpārye lokajyeṣṭhā loka śneṣṭhī lokāvīrye siddha parate bhīnamukhi śucicari apratihate apratihatabuddhi namuci(mahā)namuci mahādeveye prati-graha namaskāra mama buddhi darśabī(drasiki) buddhi apratihata bhavatu sirahame viśuddha cito śāstraśloka-mantra-piṭaka kapiyadiśo tadyathā mahāprabhava hili mili vicaratu vibuddhi mama buddhi (vi)-śuddhi bhagavatye deveyaṃ Sarasvatīm karati keyuramati*



Sarasvatī is not the only goddess who offers a *dhāraṇī* in the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsottama*; Śrī Mahādevī (Jap. *Kichijōten* 吉祥天) offers her own spell to provide treasures and spawn a bumper harvest.<sup>108</sup> Dṛḍhā, an earth goddess, also provides her spell,<sup>109</sup> which was also almost certainly particularly relevant to Hata clan members at Matsuno'o Shrine who followed the ritual procedures introduced by Enchin and later Jōjin's disciples. It is easy to imagine why a community whose primary focus was to venerate the *kami* of Matsuno'o, a mountain deity, Ōyama-gui, and a female *kami* 'goddess', Ichikishima, who protected the Kadono River (Jap. Kadonogawa 葛野川, today called Katsuragawa 桂川), might find spells to expel pollution via a ritual bath, boost the rice harvest, or to cure diseases caused by epidemics useful.

That female *kami* or goddesses played such a prominent role in this aspect of *kami* worship by means of Buddhist rituals may explain why Hata no Chikatō had another scripture vowed on the 19th day of the seventh luni-solar month of 1117, the *Dvādaśadaṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśatavimalīkaraṇāsūtra* (Z 623,

---

*hiri miri hiri miri abhaya me mahādevi buddha-satyena dharma-satyena saṅghasatyena Indrasatyena Varuṇasatyena yelokyasatyena te, sām satyena satyavacānyā abhaya me mahādevi hili mili hilimilivīcaratu mama buddhi no namo bhagavati mahādevi Sarasvatya siddhyantu mantra pada me svāhā.*

- 108 Emmerick, *Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, 27, and 52–53, gives the Sanskrit as: *pratipūrṇapāre, samantadarśane, mahābīhāragate, samantabedanāgate, mahākāryapratiprāṇe, satvārthasamantānuprapure, āyānadharmatāmāhābhogīne, mahāmaitrīpasamhīte, hitaiṣi, samgrihite, tesamarthānupālani*. Cf. T. 665.16, 439c2–12 reads: 南謨室唎莫訶天女□怛姪他□鉢唎脯啤拏折囉□三曼頰□達唎設泥(去聲, 下皆同爾)莫訶毘訶囉揭諦□三曼哆毘曇末泥□莫訶迦哩也□鉢唎底瑟佉鉢泥□薩婆頰□他娑彈泥□蘇鉢唎底啤囉 阿耶娜達摩多莫訶毘俱比諦 莫訶迷咄嚕 鄔波僧呬毘□莫訶頡唎使□蘇僧近(入聲)哩呬毘□三曼多頰他□阿奴波唎泥□莎訶。

The Taishō editors again provide an alternate Sanskrit:

*Namo śrī-mahādevī tadyathā paripūrṇa-care Samanta-darśanī mahāvīhāragare samanta pitamamati mahākārya pratīṣṭhapani sarvānṭhasamamtana(?)supratīpure ayanadharmata mahābhāgena mahāmaitrī upasamhete mahākṛṣṇa susamgrihite anupulana. svāhā.*

- 109 Emmerick, *Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, 27, and 56–60. See also T 665.16, 440c21–441a8 (with introductory prose) provides the spell: 爾時, 堅牢地神白佛言: 「世尊! 我有心呪, 能利人天, 安樂一切, 若有男子女人及諸四眾, 欲得親見我真身者, 應當至心持此陀羅尼, 隨其所願, 皆悉遂心, 所謂資財珍寶伏藏, 及求神通, 長年妙藥并療眾病, 降伏怨敵, 制諸異論. 當於淨室安置道場, 洗浴身已, 著鮮潔衣, 踞草座上, 於有舍利尊像之前, 或有舍利制底之所, 燒香散花, 飲食供養. 於白月八日布灑星合, 即可誦此請召之呪: 怛姪他只哩只哩 主嚕主嚕□句嚕句嚕□拘柱拘柱 觀柱觀柱 縛訶(上)□縛訶□伐捨伐捨 莎訶.

T. 1253.21).<sup>110</sup> Karashima is “95.4” per cent certain that these Sanskrit folios can be dated to 679–770 and because of their script (“Gilgit-Bamiyan type I”), they probably hail from either the Gilgit region or Haḍḍa.<sup>111</sup> This rather short scripture in Sanskrit closely matched *Dvādaśaḍaṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśatavimalīkaraṇāsūtra*, and presents the Buddha in an assembly with Avalokiteśvara, Mahāsthāmprāpta, Sarvanīvarṇaviṣkaṃbhin bodhisattvas revealing how recitation of these hymns of praise (Skt. *stotra*) of the names of Śrī Mahādevī “in one’s mind, would prosper without any danger from robbers, demons, and others.”<sup>112</sup> Śrī Mahādevī then explains that, because she recited the names of the *tathāgatas*, she was able to generate sufficient merit to bring the six perfections (Skt. *pāramitā*) to fruition. After the last name, Dharmarājaśrī, there is a *dhāraṇī*, which the Buddha states the myriad benefits of performing. Not only is this another scripture from the list Hata no Chikatō had vowed and copied for Matsuno’o that explicitly celebrates Śrī Mahādevī and receiving benefits from reciting another *dhāraṇī*, but it also establishes another widespread practice associated with Hinduism that I think must have been especially appreciated by lay shrine priests: reciting the name of deities to generate merit or this-worldly benefits.<sup>113</sup> The recitation of *dhāraṇīs* to female and male *kami* and goddesses, bodhisattvas, and buddhas in Japan can be connected to the material and intellectual world of the medieval Silk Road(s). That culture is not necessarily one focused upon silk or fine textiles from Persia or India or even China. Instead, this was the transmission of Indic sounds, phonetics, rituals, and religion.

110 I am grateful to Rick McBride for sharing a copy of this journal. See Seishi Karashima, “Some Folios of the Tathāgataḡaṇājñānācintyaṇiṣayāvātāra and Dvādaśaḍaṇḍakanāmāṣṭaśatavimalīkaraṇā in the Kurita Collection,” *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture* (Korea) 27.1 (2017): 13–17, 30–33.

111 *Ibid.*, 11–12.

112 *Ibid.*, 13–17, 30–33.

113 Keyworth, “Apocryphal Chinese Books in the Buddhist Canon at Matsuo Shintō Shrine.”