Title

Faith, Devotion, and the Transmission of Religious Knowledge: Ritual Learning and Kōshiki Performance in Early Modern Japan

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6g10n9b1

Author

Hayes, Matthew Robert

Publication Date

2020

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Faith, Devotion, and the Transmission of Religious Knowledge:

Ritual Learning and *Kōshiki* Performance in Early Modern Japan

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree

of Doctor of Philosophy in Asian Languages and Cultures

by

Matthew Robert Hayes

2020

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Faith, Devotion, and the Transmission of Religious Knowledge:

Ritual Learning and *Kōshiki* Performance in Early Modern Japan

by

Matthew Robert Hayes

Doctor of Philosophy in Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2020

Professor William M. Bodiford, Chair

This dissertation shows how early modern (1603–1868) Japanese Buddhist ritual
performances created forums for the transmission of religious knowledge across
lay and clerical divides within the Shingi Shingon school. Analyses of liturgical
manuscripts, commentaries, temple records, and denominational scholarship
reveal the emergence of registers of reception, or distinct levels of social,
linguistic, and performative apprehensions of doctrinal knowledge, during the
delivery of ceremonial lectures (*kōshiki* 講式) before mixed audiences at the
Shingon temple Chishakuin in Kyoto.

    Ceremonial Lecture [on the Merits of] Relic Offerings (*Shari kuyō shiki*
舎利供養式), written by the medieval monk Kakuban 覺鑁 (1095–1143), drew in

a variety of actors who participated in related ways. Laity witnessed hymnal versions of the ritual during the same performative sequence, scholar-monks repurposed the ritual as commentaries which circulated among novices, the ritual shared calendrical space with other ceremonies for clerical advancement, and it met new curricular concerns during periods of sweeping educational reform. In each of these cases, the *Shari kuyō shiki* offered opportunities for heuristic engagement among laity and clerics alike.

  This research shows how approaches to socially inclusive rituals can destabilize dominant tendencies to treat lay and clerical liturgical experiences as disconnected. In an effort to draw greater attention to false dichotomies that shape conceptions of "authentic" religious experience, this dissertation shows how the delivery of *kōshiki* offered not only performers and observers, but also readers, note-takers, publishers, and teachers opportunities to enact a religious and denominational discourse on a spectrum of experience.

The dissertation of Matthew Robert Hayes is approved.

Helen Rees

Robert E. Buswell

William M. Bodiford, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2020

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, who have encouraged and supported me in all academic endeavors, even when they did not understand them.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Acknowledgments

The journey to the end of my PhD program has often felt like an extended ritual process. I have followed protocols at every turn, carefully navigated rites of passage at major junctions, and improvised when necessary. Like many ritual processes, my success has been due to the collective support of many people.

I am eternally grateful to have been advised by Professor William Bodiford, whose academic rigor and attention to detail is unsurpassed in the field. I will never forget his sincere concern for his students and their success. I am also indebted to my other committee members, Professors Robert Buswell, Natasha Heller, Helen Rees, and Herman Ooms, for their thoughtful and important contributions to my research. I am grateful to have received guidance from Professor Torquil Duthie, whose professional advice has been indispensable. I also thank Professor Michaela Mross for her insightful remarks on my research at several early stages. I am profoundly indebted to Professor Mark Unno, who has provided warm guidance throughout many phases of my life, academic and otherwise.

Archival research for this project was carried out from 2016–2017 thanks to generous support from the George and Sakaye Aratani Field Experience Scholarship. Though I was assisted by countless individuals while in Japan, I would like to acknowledge those with whom I had the most contact. My principal adviser, Professor Tomabechi Seiichi, provided patient instruction that has been instrumental for my understanding of Shingon Buddhism. I would like to thank Kenichi Kuranishi and Yoshizawa Hidetoshi for their administrative assistance

during my sponsorship at the Institute for the Comprehensive Study of Buddhism at Taisho University in Tokyo. I also owe immense gratitude to Professor Niels Guelberg for his genuine support in the early exploratory stages of this project, and for arranging an additional sponsorship at Waseda University. I would also like to express my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to the Senaha-Kishimoto Family for allowing my family to rent an apartment in the beautiful city of Ōji during my research tenure.

I would like to acknowledge the staff in my home department of Asian Languages and Cultures, several centers and libraries at UCLA, and my graduate cohort. Shan Shan Chi-Au, Fatin Zubi, Tiffany Chen, and Jimmy Tang have provided unbelievable support and assistance over the years. Nöel Shimizu at the Terasaki Center for Japanese Studies has also been very helpful for my acquisition of funding for conference and research travel. I would also like to thank Japanese Studies Librarian Tomoko Bialock for her bibliographic support of my graduate research, especially while in Japan. Graduate students Eric Tojimbara, Dermott Walsh, Britt Marlowe, Meng Yin, Philip Hsu, Sungha Yun, Thomas Newhall, Lindsey DeWitt, and Caleb Carter have comprised an incredibly supportive cohort.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. Members of both my own family and the Sykes family have been incredibly supportive. As for my children, it has been a profound experience to have been buoyed by their laughter over these last few years. Above all, none of this would have been possible without the unending

confidence of my spouse, Allison. Her positivity and gentle support carried me

through every moment of self-doubt and discouragement.

Vita

Matthew Robert Hayes received his BA in Religious Studies from the University of Oregon in 2006, where he returned for his MA in Asian Studies in 2009. He has published original research articles and book chapters in the *Journal of Religion in Japan*, the *Journal of Asian Humanities at Kyushu*, and with Bloomsbury Press. His primary research interests include early modern Japanese ritual practice and the role of institutional power in the lay religious experience. General research interests include religious performance, institutional histories, and the use of religious objects.

Introduction

Imagine a congregation of Buddhist clerics in early modern (1603–1868) Japan preparing for a ritual performance at the Shingi Shingon temple Chishakuin in Kyoto. It is an early spring morning during the year 1750. During this time of the year, the temple offers several religious gatherings and events surrounding *higan*, a period during which lay members of the community arrive at the temple in order to participate in ancestral veneration. The clerics make final preparations by adjusting their robes in the monastic residences (*ryōsha* 寮舎), where assemblies for the practice and preparation of several other rituals typically take place. When preparations are complete, the clerics join the rest of the monastic group and proceed, among two single-file lines, to the lecture hall (*kōdō* 講堂). The long procession winds southwest through Chishakuin's grounds, slowly threads its way through the entryway of the lecture hall, and each cleric seats themselves on the floor at the edge of the hall. They take a choral formation, in two seated rows, along the north and south interior walls. At the front of the hall there is an altar adorned with offerings of citrus, flowers, candles, and burning incense. Behind the altar hangs an image of the Buddha. The ceremonial master (*shikishi* 式師) sits facing the altar and begins to recite several preliminary chants. At predetermined intervals, the surrounding clerics raise their voices and accompany the ceremonial master in his chants. Together, the low hum of devotional chanting begins to reverberate throughout the lecture hall and echoes throughout the immediate area.

Imagine laypeople assembling to observe this event. They have just entered the west gate of Chishakuin with several intentions. First, they intend to visit a gravestone in the temple cemetery, located on a hillside behind the main hall (*hondō* 本堂). Afterward, they intend to partake in sweetened glutinous rice (*botamochi* 牡丹餅), a confection often consumed during *higan* festivities, which they purchased from a vendor just outside the temple walls. Finally, and if the crowds are not too thick, they intend to glimpse the scenic garden visible from the east side of the study hall (*daishoin* 大書院). On their way to the cemetery at the rear of the temple grounds, the laypeople approach the lecture hall and are immersed in the low hum of chanting. Though they are only able to make out a few phrases from the exterior of the building, the laypeople have just become a distant witness to a ceremonial lecture (*kōshiki* 講式) on relic worship, the *Ceremonial Lecture [on the Merits of] Relic Offerings* (*Shari kuyō shiki* 舍利供養式), written by the medieval monk Kakuban 覺鑁 (1095–1143).

The above imagined scenario would not have been uncommon during several periods throughout the year at Chishakuin. The temple was host to an array of devotional ceremonies that coincided with other, lay-oriented events and allowed for the co-mingling of laity and clerics on temple grounds. And yet, in the above scene, it is easy to see how ritual performance can create clear divisions between the religious activities of these two groups in otherwise close proximity to one another. Clerics, consumed by their own responsibilities to ritual performance, are closest to the sights and sounds of the ritual itself. Laity, free from work during the *higan* holiday and interested in viewing the temple grounds

while attending to their responsibilities to ancestral veneration, are more distant from the ritual. By this measure, it may appear as though the religious activities of laity and clerics were largely disconnected. Yet, to those who do linger and observe, what, if anything, does the ritual communicate? Is it possible for this ritual to communicate to laypeople themes of relic worship and, if so, can it communicate in the same way to clerics? This dissertation attempts to show how Kakuban's *kōshiki* may have dissolved some of these divisions assumed during the performance at Chishakuin in the early modern era.

Aims and Goals of the Study

Kōshiki 講式, or "ceremonial lectures," are Japanese Buddhist prosimetric liturgies with generally two performative features: a lecture recited in Japanese and hymnal portions sometimes chanted in Sanskrit or Chinese. *Kōshiki* vary in form, organizational structure, religious message, intended audience, social function, and many other aspects. This multimodal feature of the genre makes it difficult to categorize individual *kōshiki* as either a religious performance, expressed through its ceremonial aspects, or as an oral disquisition expressed through its didactic aspects. As a matter of convenience, I will refer to them as "ceremonial lectures."[1]

  Kōshiki communicate. They express and clarify Buddhist doctrinal themes that relate to a central object of devotion (*honzon* 本尊), usually a Buddha, bodhisattva, scripture, founder figure, or Buddhist quality. They also often include several smaller, devotional ceremonies such as presentations of offerings,

invocations, and acts of purification. The fact that *kōshiki* appeal simultaneously to an embodied devotion and the intellect is one reason that they have been studied from several disciplinary perspectives. A focus on the devotional aspects of *kōshiki* is important because, ultimately, they are religious works of praise meant to extol the qualities inherent to the central objects of devotion listed above. A focus on the intellect is also important because *kōshiki* performances also express and explain doctrinal logic surrounding the qualities and objects of devotion extolled.

An equally important approach, however, which scholars have yet to take in their investigations of *kōshiki*, is one that identifies devotion and the intellect as co-constituents of religious experience. A combinatory approach such as this recognizes that the devotee may be seeking out and observing *kōshiki* performances on more than one basis. It also confronts the reality that devotion and the intellect are not necessarily mutually exclusive modes of religious observance. In some cases, observers may foster their devotion through a better intellectual understanding of the doctrine that undergirds it.

This dissertation attempts to provide this missing perspective. By way of illustration, I generally focus on *Ceremonial Lecture on the [Merits of] Relic Offerings* (*Shari kuyō shiki* 舍利供養式), a *kōshiki* written by medieval Shingon monk and de facto founder of the Shingi branch, Kakuban 覺鑁 (1095–1143). The performance, content, use, and reception of Kakuban's *kōshiki* demonstrates the heuristic potential within this otherwise devotional liturgical genre, and my analysis focuses on two primary topics.

The first topic concerns how we define and categorize processes of religious reception when varied Buddhist audiences engage both the text and performance of a *kōshiki*. One way to explore this topic is to addresses the issue of variability among audiences who engaged Kakuban's *kōshiki* as both a text and performance. Scholars have examined how *kōshiki* have largely been written by and for performance among the Buddhist clerical community. While this may be true, emphases on this aspect ignore the suite of iterative and related performances and texts that grew, and continue to grow, out of several important *kōshiki*, including Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. By including other, lay-oriented ceremonies tied directly to the *Shari kuyō shiki*, and by examining other clerical engagements with the *kōshiki*'s commentary, written by the medieval monk Gahō 我寶 (1239–1317), the scope of heuristic possibilities begins to open, and our view of reception among audiences begins to take on greater dimension.

The second topic concerns how early modern performances of Kakuban's *kōshiki* addressed the denominational concerns of the time. One approach to exploring this topic is to consider how devotion and learning may have inadvertently served, especially in ritual contexts, practical purposes in addressing these concerns. The state of Shingi Shingon denominational unification, doctrinal cohesion, and communal organization was still under formation during the early modern period. As Chishakuin was ensconced in the country-wide network of temples under the administration of the Tokugawa government, this formation became even more important because it meant meeting newly established criteria for temple authority within the Shingon school. In order to meet new

administrative and curricular demands issued by the government, and in order to

formalize the monastic instruction that networked Chishakuin with its subsidiary

temples, several key abbots sought to reinvigorate a Shingi ritual program that

had deep and direct ties to Kakuban, the Shingi founder. This suite of rituals,

which included several performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, supported the

formation of a Shingi denominational identity by linking Chishakuin with

liturgical authority derived from Kakuban as a founder symbol, administrative

power endorsed by the Tokugawa government, and monastic learning tied to

Kakuban's doctrinal perspective.

In exploring the two above topics, I analyze several performative,

scholastic, and editorial engagements with the *Shari kuyō shiki* at Chishakuin, one

of two head temples of the Shingi 新義 (lit. "new meaning") branch of Shingon

Buddhism. The other head temple is Hasedera 長谷寺 in Sakurai, which

administers the Buzan 豊山 division of the Shingi branch. By this time,

Chishakuin had become a pivotal administrative site for the Chisan 智山 division

of the branch, and a major arbiter of governmental power during the development

of the system of main and subsidiary temples (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度) that

hierarchized temples across the country. This system identified certain major

temples as head administrators to smaller, regional temples. The network that

developed in the wake of this system consolidated denominational hierarchies and

throttled the growing power of temples across the country.

Performative and editorial interactions with the *Shari kuyō shiki* occurred

between the mid-sixteenth and early-eighteenth centuries under the oversight of

several influential Chishakuin abbots. As I argue in this study, one particularly influential individual was the temple's eleventh abbot, Kakugen 覺眼 (1643–1722). Kakugen best illustrates efforts to leverage the heuristic benefits inherent to Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* for three related reasons. First, he sponsored the publication of and wrote the preface to the principal commentary on Kakuban's *kōshiki* at Chishakuin. This commentary offered a distillation of major doctrinal themes surrounding relic devotion and appears to have been studied into the Meiji era and beyond. Second, his sponsored publication of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki* emerged during the height of curricular overhauls within the Shingi Shingon school that standardized rituals for clerical advancement. Kakugen arbitrated both the content of these rituals and the judgment of examining clerics and, in this way, he helped to construct a denominational discourse rooted in ritual learning. Finally, Kakugen's role extended to the revival of two other crucial rituals, both of which functioned on the basis of devotion and learning in order to re-instantiate a Shingi Shingon denominational identity after the destruction and dissolution of major complexes and communities on Mount Negoro, headquarters to the Shingi branch prior to its relocation to Chishakuin.

This dissertation will also clarify a key issue in the study of early modern Japanese Buddhism. Scholars of this period, especially those who focus on the power and reach of religious institutions, tend to describe ritual in terms disconnected from religious experience. Over the past fifteen years, scholars have explained at length how ritual performance functions as a means to power, an accessory to hegemonic authority, or as a tool wielded in social and institutional

7

control. For example, Nam-lin Hur (2007, 9, 13) describes Zen ritual practice as a central feature in an emergent "economy of death" during this period. In this top-down approach to ritual performance, the people closest to the ritual act tend to fall to the periphery in favor of highlighting the transactional and coercive efforts of those in places of administrative or institutional power. While power relationships and economic opportunities were indeed negotiated through ritual performance delivered across many Buddhist schools enveloped by the system of temple affiliation (*danka seido* 檀家制度), the frequency at which scholars have focused on such negotiations has downplayed the variety of other religious and social phenomena at work during ritual performance.

This dissertation attempts to bring to life these dimensions that have been discounted or overlooked by previous accounts. In order to demonstrate that Chishakuin was a multivalent site of religious and social vitality that operated within the confines of early modern hegemonic framework, I show how the temple was host to performative and textual interactions with Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, and that these interactions highlight devotion and learning as co-constitutive experiences within this framework. Interactions with this *kōshiki* suggest that laity and clergy came together within the same ritual space and apprehended doctrinal information on very different registers. Such interactions also suggest that devotion was an equally important factor in the stewardship of religious knowledge, as well as for the organization of the clerics for whom a demonstration of that knowledge became a central means of advancement within the community.

Likewise, another goal of this project is to bring into fuller relief the relationship between early modern ritual performance, the production of doctrinal knowledge, and the reach of the Tokugawa government. Scholars have examined aspects of exchange in early modern ritual insofar as ritual performance became one mode of solicitation for seeking donations from patrons, which was maintained through systems of temple registration (*terauke* 寺請) and certification. In service to the modern scholarly category of funerary Buddhism, especially, scholars have shown how the formation of exchange relationships tended to overshadow the religious aspects of ritual practice across several denominations.

Yet more work remains in clarifying the extent to which ritual produced and maintained a body of doctrinal knowledge that may have functioned similarly in the solicitation of donations. Unlike networks of funerary temples, which had accrued much political and administrative power through the delivery of funerary rituals, Chishakuin was a prayer (*metsuzai* 滅罪) temple. This means that devotees made donations for ritual services not through government mandates to affiliation, but through *volunteerism*. This aspect of ritual participation on the basis of voluntarily seeking the benefits of prayer provides a counterbalance to other approaches that focus on the role of the government in requiring donations for ritual services rendered.

Models for the Study of Buddhist Ritual Practice

In order to explore this aspect of participation, this dissertation focuses on the ritualists and their audiences. By placing the human practitioner at the center of ritual activities, I perceive of both ritualists and observers as the prime actors in rituals and as the recipients of ritual result; Buddhist practitioners were performers, observers, vectors, and targets of ritual expression. My analysis therefore considers the role and influence of ritual participants, observers, and recipients as meaningful shapers of ritual processes. Buddhists across the world depict ritual activity in their writings and art; they maintain architectural spaces dedicated to ritual; they set aside special days or times for ritual; they construct ritual languages; and, as described above, ritual has also become a means of economic stability. The fact that so many aspects of Buddhist ritual begins and ends as a human endeavor means that an analysis that focuses on people may reveal much about the purpose of these endeavors.

This human-driven feature, however, is not particular to Buddhist ritual. Scholars have long depicted ritual as a form of *social action* across a variety of religious and non-religious social groups. We can observe several implications that emerge through this depiction. Ritual is *social* insofar as it involves, whether physically or conceptually, more than one individual. This can directly involve individuals who are a part of the ritual performance itself or it may involve individuals indirectly related to the performance, such as a distant sponsor, a recipient of transferred merit, or a long-deceased ancestor. Ritual is also *active* insofar as it involves a mode of prescribed or choreographed action in order to

bring about a result; rituals adhere to a spectrum of protocol, formality, and innovation, but ultimately aim to produce an effect. This collective recognition of ritual as a social means to an end operates on many legitimating frameworks to which human beings attach meaning. These include, but are not limited to, the broad categories of social organization, symbolism, and power exchanges.

Sociologist Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) established an early framework for thinking about religion as a social effort through what he calls the "collective consciousness." Religious action can take many forms and allows for social solidarity in and a reification of collective moral vitality, among other social behaviors. This means that ritual is, for many religious societies, a social and ethical binding agent whereby the community collectively recognizes the form, function, and ultimate importance of a ritual practice as a morally righteous action. Critically, Durkheim reveals (1995, 9) rituals, and religious actions generally, as active and creative products of communal worldviews; he shows that "rites are ways of acting that are born only in the midst of assembled groups and whose purpose is to evoke, maintain, or recreate certain mental states of those groups." This intimacy between human desire and its ritual representation was influential in establishing a human-centered approach in religious and ritual studies during the following decades.

Criticisms of Durkheim draw our attention to the risks of absolutism in sociological analysis. For some (Webb 1972; Oliver 1976), Durkheim's claims that religious action is a "social fact" that emerges, without question, from communal groups presupposes that social forces transcend the interests of the

11

individual. This presupposition makes a direct correlation between a logical and unified interpretation of religious symbols and ignores the possibility of multiple representations and understandings shared by individuals among the group. While Durkheim's model continues help us imagine the relationships between collective interests, actions, and religiosity, one must be aware of his lack of attention to the subjective desires of individuals.

Clifford Geertz (1926–2006), who is perhaps best known for his work on the role of symbols in ritual practice, built upon Durkheim's approach by investigating the ritual mechanisms through which human beings establish religious worldviews. For Geertz (2017, 14), symbols are "interworked systems of construable signs" that can signify a range of potential meanings for the observer. Symbols are thus multifaceted in meaning and, critically, linked to one another through that meaning. Following his fieldwork in Bali and Sumatra, Geertz recognized that symbols do not exist apart from their human interpreters, and in his scholarship he located symbolic power and meaning within the larger framework of cultural and religious communal belonging. Human actors "communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" through symbols (Geertz 2017, 89).

Talal Asad (1983) has called into questions Geertz's assertions regarding symbols on the basis of his tendency to approach them ahistorically. Asad points out that Geertz presents symbols, not the human actors that communicate through them, as the active forces in processes of meaning-making; symbols "induce" in humans sets of rigid dispositions which guide religious experience and action.

Geertz's focus on these dispositions, according to Asad, universalizes them and ignores the fact that religious experience and action takes place within a broader historical, institutional, economic, and political environment. To assume of symbols a coercive and universal force that guides experience leaves out the nearly all other influences on religiosity in any given historical moment.

Catherine Bell (1953–2008), perhaps more than any other scholar working on ritual, synthesized and advanced many of the views established by Durkheim and Geertz, but also many others. While she recognizes the social and symbolic imperatives to ritual behavior established by these scholars, she points out an implicit problem in the process of ritual theorization; for Bell, too many theoretical approaches to anthropology and sociology tend to obscure, rather than illuminate, the motives and beliefs of ritual actors. Theory, she says, introduces the risk of objectifying ritual as a practice set apart from other social, ideological, and political inclinations that may be equally powerful or coercive in organizing societies. She therefore shifts the focus of ritual study to the social strategies that legitimate and reify ritual as a motivated action bound in collective belief.

She accomplishes this by focusing on the accrual and exchange of social power. "Ritualization," she describes, "is a strategy for the construction of a limited and limiting power relationship" based not on absolute control of one party over another, but rather on a dually recognized relationship of consent and resistance (Bell 1992, 8). In Bell's view, ritual practice is ultimately a negotiation of authority that, critically, legitimizes the very social contexts in which this negotiation takes place. Rituals are self-perpetuating in this way and, in religious

contexts, can be very powerful in their construction of social and doctrinal legitimacy. Bell's perspective has sharpened our understanding of ritual practice as emerging dynamically at the intersections of social, political, ideological, and economic relationships, though her work also reminds us that theorization can leave out unobservable factors that shape the form and tenor of ritual practice across religious traditions.

This dissertation takes several of these perspectives seriously insofar as it highlights ritual as a human-centered practice that can serve several religious, social, and institutional purposes. It does not, however, present ritual as religious action solely aimed at those purposes. A focus only on worldly purposes has, as described above, given rise to an imbalanced view of ritual practices in early modern Japan. Rather, this study contends that processes of social organization, denominationalism, and institutional legitimation emerged as byproducts of an otherwise religious act co-constituted by devotion and learning.

Models for the Study of *Kōshiki*

Growing numbers of European-language studies of *kōshiki* have only recently begun to emerge. A majority of these examinations have focused on key *kōshiki* texts and performances. While scholars have begun to expand on their source materials and adopt new methods, they generally take three thematic approaches.

The first approach is a denominational approach. In this approach, scholars (Ford 2005; Meeks 2010; Quinter 2011; Funata 2011) focus on how performances of principal *kōshiki* address or advance the denominational interests

of their author and highlight the doctrinal tenets central to that denomination. From a broad view, there are two general conclusions that tend to emerge from this approach. The first conclusion is that the *kōshiki* genre has been a convenient performative device for distilling and expressing orthodox doctrinal views due, in part, to the genre's devotional aspects. That is, while many *kōshiki* focus on figures and objects that are targets of devotion across several Buddhist traditions, even those beyond Japan, the expression of that devotion tends to advance an institutional agenda. The second conclusion is that the voluminous production of *kōshiki*, especially during Japan's medieval era, attests to their efficacy in expressing particular religious agendas to audiences. In the medieval era especially, an increase in faith-based and lay-targeted orientations of several of denominations offered opportunities to reach new audiences. This denominational approach has advanced our understanding of *kōshiki* composition and performance insofar as it demonstrates how a liturgy written by a single individual can simultaneously express the author's personal devotion, while at the same time represent a collective doctrinal viewpoint.

The second approach is the ethnomusicological approach. In this approach, scholars (Mross 2012, 2015; Ozaki 2014; Asada 2014) have explored the musical and vocal qualities of *kōshiki* often, though not always, as they relate to its supergenre of Japanese devotional chanting (*shōmyō* 聲明). This approach has been particularly beneficial to our understanding of how Japanese Buddhists adopted Chinese musical and tonal styles in their performance. At the same time, this approach also underscores the influence of *kōshiki* musicality and orality on

the development of medieval Japanese artistic performances. These include recitations of *Heike monogatari* with string accompaniment (*heikyoku* 平曲), Noh recitations (*yōkyoku* 謡曲), and libretto associated with puppet theater (*jōruri* 淨瑠璃). Scholars of this approach have also indirectly emphasized some of the denominational aspects inherent to *kōshiki* musicality since, in many cases, the tonal variants of vocal recitation are transmitted through denominationally particular pedagogical lineages. This approach has widened our understanding of the complex lines of transmission that constitute the ritual and musical training so central to *kōshiki* performance, while at the same time it has revealed important links between Buddhist ritual, dramatic arts, and musical performance.

The third approach is the bibliographic approach. This approach primarily deals with the textual genealogy of individual *kōshiki* manuscripts and their recensions (Asano 1997; Abe 2019). It traces the performative use of later literary or liturgical iterations. Some scholars (Tsukudo 1976; Guelberg 1993) of this approach have revealed ties between *kōshiki* and Japanese literary genres. The bibliographic approach remains the dominant, though not exclusive, approach in Japanese scholarship, and has clarified many aspects of the bibliographic and historical features of the genre. More specifically, scholars of this approach have shown how the genre has maintained its appeal to clerical audiences over the centuries through the standardization of its textual form.

A special issue of *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* (Ambros et. al, 2016) has underscored not only the utility of the above three approaches but it has also highlighted the recent explosion of scholarly interest in *kōshiki*. Each

research article in this issue focuses on either a single *kōshiki*, *kōshiki* recension, or *kōshiki* author and contextualizes them in relation to an array of social, doctrinal, and institutional issues. While each scholar generally takes one of the three approaches to their studies, they also introduce additional considerations. For example, Niels Guelberg (2016, 153–175), perhaps the foremost Western scholar of the *kōshiki* genre, demonstrates the transregional importance of *kōshiki* focused on non-Buddhist divinities that take central roles in Indian, Chinese, and Korean traditions. *Kōshiki* of this type appeared much later and are therefore a better representation of the genre in his mature phase. In this new approach, Guelberg has clarified our view of the *kōshiki* genre as it relates to otherwise unstudied derivations that defy the genre standards described above by focusing on central objects of devotions beyond the Buddhist realm.

At a broad level, the above three approaches provide a glimpse of the institutional use, authorship, and performative utility of the *kōshiki* genre across nearly all Buddhist denominations in Japan, with particular focus on individual *kōshiki* composed during the medieval era. From a linguistic perspective, they also provide an example of the complex interplay between Japanese premodern literary language and the "imported" language of Chinese writing (*kambun* 漢文), both of which were enjoined through the textual and performative aspects of *kōshiki*.

The sub-field is still growing, however, and the heuristic features of *kōshiki* constitute one largely untreated area. Very few scholars have investigated such features in medieval performances. James Ford (2005) is perhaps the only

scholar to deliberately gesture toward the pedagogical potential in *kōshiki* and has done so from the perspective of clerical learning within the Hossō 法相 school. In terms of historical period, no scholar has focused on early modern heuristic engagements with *kōshiki*. In addition, no scholar has yet comprehensively engaged *kōshiki* commentarial literature. An analysis that combines these historical and thematic approaches to the genre and its sub-genres can widen our view of how Japanese Buddhists understood *kōshiki* and their heuristic utility among varied audiences during and after the centuries of its peak production. If we consider *kōshiki* as part of a larger suite of performative and scholastic practices within Buddhist communities, as this dissertation does, it becomes even clearer that clerics engaged *kōshiki* on much broader terms than previously understood, and not without the potential for lay understanding.

Relic Devotion in Japanese Buddhism

The merits of relic devotion is the central theme expressed in Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. The imperative for this expression emerges within a much larger doctrinal framework surrounding the esoteric tradition. For Kakuban, it is necessary to capture the primacy of relic devotion through this framework because it involves recognition of the equivalence between relics as physical objects, sacred symbols, bodies of the buddhas, Śākyamuni Buddha, Mahāvairicana Buddha, and the participants of the rituals to whom Kakuban directs his injunctions for relic devotion. Kakugen, too, relies on a comprehensive esoteric framework in his own writings by expounding upon similar themes

advanced by Shingon founder Kūkai 空海 (774–835), who sought to show how esotericism more profoundly and authentically reflects a view of reality. Finally, in his commentary on Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, Gahō also contextualizes his analysis within this larger esoteric framework by highlighting the connections between key terminology in the *Shari kuyō shiki* and broader, categorical issues related to esoteric doctrine. In this way, it is important to keep in mind that Kakuban's *kōshiki* reflects dominant esoteric paradigms, and that this reflection supports, in a narrower sense, the instantiation and authentication of a Shingi Shingon denominational identity.

Koichi Shinohara (2014) has recently traced the evolution of esoteric ritual texts in order to shift scholarly attention away from the terminology (e.g. "esoteric") often used to describe esoteric traditions in monolithic ways. He urges us to consider how individual ritual practices can express esoteric ideas with great variability. We must recognize the difference between scholarly classifications of practices that comprise a tradition in an ideal sense, on the one hand, and the actual practices that represented by ritual texts, or even the historical record, on the other. These often do not align with one another and, above all, Koichi's findings have drawn our attention to the benefits of viewing esoteric teachings on a graduated spectrum; many ritual texts that scholars claim to be a part of the esoteric tradition also contain exoteric aspects that remain ignored in scholarly classifications. As Robert Sharf (2005, 269) has pointed out, however, large bodies of Buddhist teachings were indeed categorized as esoteric by Chinese Buddhist bibliographers as early as the tenth century. Thus, we cannot attribute

responsibility to the miscategorization of ritual texts as esoteric only to modern scholars. There were tendencies even in earlier centuries to take a bimodal approach to esoteric/exoteric classification, and these approaches have endured into the modern era.

Some modern scholars have challenged dichotomies of a so-called "pure" (*junmitsu* 純密) esoteric Buddhism of the Shingon and Tendai schools, which Kūkai is said to have transmitted to Japan from China, and miscellaneous (*zōmitsu* 雑密) esotericism, or the teachings with esoteric elements deemed disconnected from Kūkai's transmission of "orthodox" teachings. In his work on Kūkai, Abé Ryūichi (2000, 151–184) briefly outlines the terrain of the pure/miscellaneous debate. He presents the fallacy of the use of these terms insofar as there are no examples of Kūkai's use of vocabulary denoting the purity of the esoteric practice that he propagated. Kūkai also advocated for the importance of so-called miscellaneous *sūtras* related to *mantras* (*zōbu shingonkyō* 雑部眞言經).

This issue of categorically organizing certain esoteric Buddhist teachings as more secret, hidden, or purer than other esoteric teachings raises several major issues addressed on this dissertation. First, the fact that Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* conveyed fundamental esoteric ideas, especially those first advocated by Kūkai, to mixed audiences reminds us that Shingon ritual served purposes well beyond the scope of master-student transmissions of ritual techniques. While the secrecy of ritual transmission was, and remains, a hallmark of the Shingon school, Kakuban's *kōshiki* provides a compelling example of how ritual itself can

transmit and reveal secrets to those well outside of monastic circles. The comingling of clergy and laity within the context of a performed esoteric discourse runs counter to the same ideals Koichi confronts in his work; ritual esotericism can occupy several spaces on a spectrum of concealment and disclosure.

Second, and in accordance with much of Abé's arguments surrounding the motivations for organizing esoteric teachings, many of the later editorial engagements with Gahō's commentary on Kakuban's *kōshiki* appear to have met denominational concerns over a unified doctrine that conveyed a new meaning (*shingi* 新義) of esoteric teachings. In this way, denominationalism may have been one possible reason that early modern clerics had similarly strong inclinations to pit the teachings of Kakuban and Kūkai against those of other active sects of their time. At a more general level, this is also attested clearly in Kakugen's own writings, in which he presents Kūkai as a synthesizer of discordant doctrinal views, and as a figure whose written works have been most successful in identifying the distinct aspects of esoteric Buddhism in Japan.

Brian Ruppert (2000) has provided the most comprehensive study of the changing roles of relics from the tenth to twelfth centuries in Japan. He shows how the development of Shingon lineages greatly influenced perceptions of relic power. In particular, he demonstrates how monks of the Ono lineage (Ono ryū 小野流) began to produce wish-fulfilling jewels (*nyoi hōju* 如意寶珠) perceived to have considerable social and religious power during the age of the decline of the dharma (*mappō* 末法). These relics legitimated a bevy of devotional practices that

surrounded these relics and formed a direct line to an increasingly distant Buddha at the center of the tradition. He delineates (p. 172) the benefits afforded by relics in that they "were conceived to be as much material as spiritual, since the ongoing presence of the Buddha in the form of his relics afforded believers access to the continuing power of his person—power that could be manifested for their immediate benefit."

This theme of relic power and the practitioner's access to it is a principal theme in the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Kakuban uses several techniques that highlight this theme, and I refer to these techniques as "symbolic and narrative doubling." A majority of the liturgy expounds upon the nature of relics and their symbolic and ontological connection to the Buddha, but Kakuban also highlights the importance of proximity to and mutual identification with relics; for Kakuban, relic devotion is a primary means of closing both the physical and ontological distance between the practitioner and the Buddha and, as he relates, there is immense soteriological power in this interactivity. In this way, we find that relics are not the only references to corporeality in the *Shari kuyō shiki*. The liturgy synonymizes the bodily relics of the Buddha with the transcendent bodily form of Mahāvairocana and, ultimately, the body of the practitioner that comes into proximity with these other bodies.

Theoretical and Transregional Considerations of Devotion and Learning

What is the relationship between religious ritual and reception? In what modes do rituals communicate, and to whom? More specifically, how can performative and

scholarly engagements with Buddhist rituals help us to better understand the complementarity between devotion and the intellect in the process of reception? The answers to these questions, to which some scholars have arrived through theoretical approaches to the relationship between ritual and understanding, are varied. Some have approached this topic from anthropological (Geertz 2017; Tambiah 1985), sociological (Durkheim 1965), psychological (Whitehouse 2004), and performative (Bell 1992) perspectives, among others.

Catherine Bell (1992, 19–29) has shown how many early ritual theorists understood ritual action as distinct from ideas, beliefs, and symbols; in this view, ritual is a mere physical process that lacks any undergirding theoretical support or motivation. It was not until later that new approaches to ritual recognized the necessary union between action and thought. Durkheim, especially, viewed ritual practice as an embodiment and expression of sacred beliefs among society. In both of these approaches, theorists have treated ritual as an independent object of analysis either connected or disconnected from the inner worlds of the ritual actors and participants. The problem with the early dominance of either of these approaches, as Bell points out (p. 21), is that thoughts and action are often *both* connected and disconnected in the context of ritual practice. Ritual performance is at once composed of mundane physical movements and others that are symbolically charged. The arrangement and function of this action is determined by ritualists, but this determination also reflects the concerns of ritual observers. Bell therefore contends that the hybridity of these approaches—one in which ritual operates in isolation of thoughts and beliefs and another in which it operates

in concert with thoughts and beliefs—takes into account how thought and action are constantly negotiated by ritual actors and observers. Her integrative approach builds on earlier, structuralist approaches by revealing the multifunctional and multimodal aspects of ritual action, which emerge dynamically at the intersections between social, political, ideological, and economic relationships.

As recent scholarship in Buddhist Studies attests, Bell's assertions continue to hold true. Several scholars (McDaniel 2011; Sango 2015; Stone 2016; Lowe 2018) have supported Bell's view by demonstrating how ritual practices are integral parts of religious world-building and how they can enjoin several strata of Buddhist society. Through these and other key studies, we can better observe the variability with which both ritual actors and witnesses express Buddhist devotion within the broader framework of liturgical standardization, technique, transmission, and understanding, even among seemingly cohesive social groups.

Likewise, scholars of Christian traditions (Rosenwein 1989; Zeiman 2003; Hill 2015) have also shown how devotional ritual acts, especially when performed within contexts of religious learning, can dissolve social divisions, especially between laity and clerics. These studies show us how embodiment became one means through which medieval Christian followers enacted their devotion; physical acts of offerings, recitation, and religious reading enjoined men, women, lay, and clerics alike. The scholars above rightfully privilege the performative aspects of the rituals at the center of their studies by universalizing the devotional aspects that inhere in such performances. This dissertation takes the natural next

step by investigating how similar social groups in early modern Japan found opportunities to leverage the heuristic aspects of lecture-type rituals.

The vocal recitation of a ritual text is important in the conveyance of symbolic meaning to an audience. Before his later work on the development of the theory of speech acts, J.L. Austen (1962) first proposed his model for "performative utterances."[2] These types of speech acts are especially important for understanding the instrumentality of vocal expression in a ritual context. According to Austen, performative utterances are performative insofar as they are not issued on the basis of veracity but are instead issued through the speaker's desire to instantiate what has been spoken, or to produce a new state in the relationship shared between speaker and listener. This type of speech is operative insofar as it signals to the listener that either one or both parties has, at the precise moment of utterance, demonstrated or embodied the act depicted in the utterance itself.

Some scholars in the study of East Asian religions have made use of Austen's model with relative success. In Emily Ahern's (1981) study of the relationship between Chinese ritual and politics, she argues through two case studies that we can understand the interactions between humans and spirits during Chinese divination rituals as political interactions. She describes (p. 11) how the "bureaucratic efficacy" of ritual language imbues the ritual with a potency akin to governmental edicts and legislative mandates. In other words, in much the same way as the promulgation of laws and regulations that brings them into immediate effect, the orders issued through written seals, charms, or spoken verses also bring

into effect the desired action. Religious and political speech acts are therefore, according to Ahern, functionally similar.

In the present study, the efficacy of performative speech and symbolic narrative supports a co-constitutive relationship between devotion and learning. Generally following the fixed, prosimetric structure of the *kōshiki* genre, the *Shari kuyō shiki* contains specific sets of chants that accompany the expository lecture, including an announcement (*hyōbyaku* 表白), petitions to gods (*shinbun* 神分), and invocations (*kanjō* 勧請) of Buddhist deities. We can understand these as forms of performative speech since they are declaratory and establish a particular relationship between the audience, performers, and the central object of devotion at the moment of utterance. We find several types of performative utterances within these sections that establish modes of embodied devotion (e.g. "We reverently make obeisance…") or devotion in the context of ontological proximity ("We presently meet and revere relics…"). Above all, performative speech implicates the actors and observers as equally participant in the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki*.

Chishakuin as a Site of Study

There are several reasons why Chishakuin is the ideal site for a study of this type. Beyond the obvious fact that Chishakuin was headquarters to the Shingi Shingon school and host to yearly performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, it also provides a glimpse into the dynamics of lay affiliation and clerical training. While lay affiliation and clerical training became amplified concerns for networked temples

26

across the Buddhist tradition during the early modern period, Chishakuin's administrative role allows us to observe how these concerns were met in greater detail. Ultimately, Chishakuin provides a site of analysis for better understanding the relationships between clergy, laity, and the governmental forces that linked them together within a system of patronage and exchange.

Scholars have investigated the relationship between religious belonging, patronage, and the religious authority of physical sites in other traditions. In her work on the development of geographically and socially bound donor groups centered around Cluny, a Benedictine abbey located in modern Saône-et-Loire, France, Barbara Rosenwein (1989) shows how acts of donation brought together medieval monastics and lay members and reinforced the personal ties between lay families and Cluny as an authoritative religious institution. Donations to Cluny were not necessarily given in the alienable sense that they were first released from the giver and then fully owned by the receiver. Rather, property was given to the monastery but remained an inalienable, symbolic bond between donors and the monastery; given property linked donors to Cluny, Cluny's patron saint, Saint Peter, and to the monastery's clergy. Donations to Cluny were therefore not only important for the physical growth of the monastery but also for its presence as a religious institution in society. As Rosenwein argues, these acts not only strengthened the overall geographical and social presence of Cluny, but also reinforced devotion surrounding Saint Peter.

A similar relationship between religious donation and social linking also emerged in early modern Japan. The system of head and branch temples

(*honmatsu seido* 本末制度) networked temples, while the system of temple affiliation (*danka seido* 檀家制度) organized religious communities within that network. The latter of these systems was maintained through the exchange of donations for religious services. The early modern *danka* system took shape over the course of the seventh and eighteenth centuries as a result of the slow accretion of legislative mandates. The Tokugawa government implemented these mandates in alleged reaction to the perceived threat of Christianity in the Japanese archipelago. In the wake of these mandates, the clergy's role as purveyors of ritual services took on new administrative dimensions at Buddhist temples; clergy members were required to record patron membership in their territory, as well as other statistics such as births, marriages, deaths and changes of residency. In addition to ritual services, the clergy was also required to administrate local temple schools (*terakoya* 寺子屋); (Marcure 1985, 45–46). Lay patrons, on the other hand, were required to contribute materially to the affiliated temple in the form of labor and donations. They were also required to attend Buddhist rites, especially those on the anniversary days of ancestors otherwise certificates of affiliation, issued and authorized by the clergy itself, would become void.

Chishakuin was part of this system insofar as it was named one of two head temples within the head-branch system of hierarchization. According to head-branch temple registers dating from the late eighteenth century, there were about fifteen thousand Shingi Shingon temples, which outnumbered Shingon temples affiliated with the old interpretation of doctrine (Kogi 古義) by about five thousand (Ambros 2011, 1010–1011). Though unlike funerary temples, at which

patrons received funerary services in exchange for donations, Chishakuin was a prayer (*metsuzai* 滅罪; lit. extinguish transgression) temple, which means it offered its devotees the promise of this-worldly (*genze riyaku* 現世利益) benefits, such as prosperity and protection from disaster and malady. Unlike the mandatory affiliation of patrons to funerary temples of the time, affiliations with prayer temples were voluntary. This means that while patrons made donations in exchange for prayer services, they did so *in addition* to funerary services rendered through other temples.

In this context, we can observe a rather different dynamic of affiliation than that described above by Hur as the "economy of death" that pervaded networks of funerary temples. Additionally, considering Rosenwein's accounts of the parish formation that surrounded Cluny, which geographically bound patrons to the abbey, the situation at Chishakuin differs on these terms. We can, however, identify parallels with Rosenwein's description of the symbolic role of Cluny as a center of social congregation. Patrons came to Chishakuin during critical moments throughout the year seeking, amidst an array of socio-religious events, soteriological support and made donations in exchange for prayer services. As argued in this dissertation, performances of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* expressed a unified view of Kakuban's doctrine before these donors. These performances established social and denominational links between the temple, its affiliates, and the symbolic authority of Kakuban as de facto founder of the Shingi Shingon school.

As administrator to Shingi Shingon regional academies (*danrin* 談林) and host to its own academy, Chishakuin was also a site of intense clerical training. This feature of the temple provides further opportunity to observe the role of ritual in processes of knowledge production among training monks. Early modern *danrin* are related to medieval *dangisho* 談義所 (sometimes called *danrinsho* 談林所), or academies where clerics committed to specialized study of Buddhist doctrine (Sonehara 2006, 74). Along with the legal rules (*hatto* 法度) that linked temples across the archipelago, others systematized and streamlined the social organization and curricular offerings at *danrin* during the seventeenth century. This impacted Shingi Shingon temples in the Kantō region, as regulations fixed the educational requirements for clerical advancement, unified curricula under specific lines of transmission, and more intimately regulated subsidiary temples (Nakajima 1998, 136–138).

Among these changes at Chishakuin were the integrations of two rituals, the "Great Assembly on Dharma Transmission" (Denbōdai-e 傳法大會) and "Lecture Requiting the Benefit [of Kakuban's Teachings]" (Hōon-kō 報恩講). These rituals hierarchized training clergy at the temple, reinvigorated a Shingi Shingon denominational identity through direct historical and symbolic connections to its branch founder Kakuban, and met new curricular demands issued from both the Tokugawa government and head temples within the Shingi branch. Both rituals also shared calendrical space with performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. What emerged through this process of denominational reinvigoration is what I call a devotional circularity—or an interdependent relationship between

the requiting aspects of these ceremonies, on the one hand, and their instructive aspects, on the other—that located Kakuban at the symbolic center of a yearly ritual schedule.

"Registers of Reception"

My model of registers of reception derives from several recent investigations of the nature of knowledge production in ritual contexts. In his philosophical investigation into the epistemic merits that inhere in the Eucharist, Terrence Cuneo (2016) has shown how devotional ritual fundamentally instructs. Instruction is enabled by the expressive content that emerges through the ritual narrative and demonstrates paradigmatic devotional modes of religiosity, such as blessing, petitioning, and thanking. Critically, the performance of such content demonstrates the fitness of the same or similar acts that, sanctioned by the authority expressed through the ritual act, ought to be carried out beyond the ritual space. Cuneo's work is helpful in my analysis of both of Kakuban's liturgies, as his ritual script explicitly impels fit or suitable actions—making offerings, taking refuge, petitioning—not only during the performance of liturgies, but also throughout one's lifetime of devotion to relics.

In her study of female literacy in late medieval England, Katherine Zeiman (2003) argues that, through the body, laywomen were able to perform liturgies that were otherwise unintelligible to them due to illiteracy. She explores several fourteenth-century treatises on the expectations of liturgical mastery among female laity and argues for what she calls an embodied "liturgical

literacy." This literacy enabled understanding from beyond the discursive intellect by involving phonetic, mnemonic, and musical referents that directed attention to and reception of liturgies among laity. Zeiman's study has opened new routes to exploring the interplay between ritual knowledge, performance, textual practices, and the role of the audience insofar as she takes seriously the role of corporeality in closing the perceived epistemological gaps that divide lay and clerical categories of religious belonging. The delivery of Kakuban's *Shari wasan* immediately following the delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki* offered semantic and rhetorical variations on the same thematic content, and thereby widened the scope of understanding for those in attendance.

In the context of Japanese religions, the work of Asuka Sango (2015) has been instrumental for my conception of ritual as a heuristic force. In her work on Japanese debate rituals in Heian (794–1185) Japan, she shows how debates perpetuated, expanded, and refined bodies of doctrinal knowledge among clergy. Debates that were a part of the imperial assembly of ritual offerings [to the *Sutra of Golden Light*] (*Misai-e* 御齋會) were recorded, and these records were later studied by clerics in preparation for upcoming debates typically held between representatives of the esoteric and exoteric schools. These debates therefore created a fluid body of knowledge stewarded by clergy members themselves, which was continually learned and later refined by debaters. With regard to the heuristic force inherent to the *Shari kuyō shiki*, I understand Kakuban's liturgy as functioning similarly insofar as the text and performances, arranged and mediated by skilled clerics, imparted a body of doctrinal knowledge to those in attendance

through oration and dramatism. This body of knowledge was also elaborated and refined through exegesis of the ritual text and the editorial strategies deployed by compilers in the early modern period, which created a continually developing suite of texts and performances.

My model of registers of reception attempts to synthesize these and other models concerning ritual performance and knowledge production. While my model follows them insofar as it envisions ritual practice as a vector of knowledge apprehended on a spectrum of reception, it also widens the scope of these models by considering knowledge production as an ongoing process to which new texts and performances were introduced. Whereas these and other scholars identify a single liturgy as a source of heuristic benefit, my model takes into consideration a suite of other scholastic and performative iterations tied to a single liturgy as equally constituent of the heuristic process. My model shows how processes of reception do not stop after the performance of a single liturgy, nor does reception operate in relation to the content of a single performance alone. Rather, I consider liturgy as a starting point of an ongoing process of consumption, repurposing, and expression that likewise contributed to doctrinal understanding in various registers.

This dissertation therefore recognizes the inertia of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. It began as an isolated text and performance but grew over centuries to include a network of peripheral texts and performances, which each shared in the content and purpose of the *Shari kuyō shiki* itself. Widening our view of a single liturgy in this way allows for an equally widened view of those who engaged the

33

text and performance, even in its iterative forms, and the historical and institutional terms on which they engaged them.

Overview of Chapters

Five chapters comprise this dissertation. In recognition of the momentum with which Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* gave rise to the network of peripheral texts and performances over time mentioned above, I have organized these chapters in rough chronological order.

Chapter 1 provides a comparative study of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and its shorter, hymnal accompaniment, the *Shari wasan*. In my analysis, I posit that processes of reception emerged in at least two registers during these performances, which included the devout as active agents in the ritual process. Kakuban's *kōshiki*, which takes relics as its targets of devotion during the performance, also elaborates on the general nature of relic worship, the soteriological benefits offered through relics, and the imperative for practitioners to turn toward and rely on relics. In its widening of the scope of reception, Kakuban's *kōshiki* therefore also collapses partitions between practical understanding (i.e. how to embody and express devotion) and religious understanding (i.e. the soteriological function of devotion). In my adoption and synthesis of several of the models related to reception described above, this chapter lays out the fundamental aspects of liturgical communication, expression, and apprehension that carry through subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2 contextualizes my analysis in the first chapter by exploring the denominational, institutional, social, and calendrical circumstances that allowed for the emergence of these registers of reception. I first explore the *Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools* (*Misshū shohō-e gisoku* 密宗諸法會義則) in order to show how denominational authority governed processes of religious performance within the Shingon school. I then turn to records of devotee affiliation and explore the institutional and social circumstances under which these devotees witnessed the performances of Kakuban's liturgies at Chishakuin. Finally, I analyze accounts of the performance themselves in order to show how they were supported by several other devotional ceremonies that drew in both monastic and lay observers.

Chapter 3 expands on the scholastic potential within this liturgy by focusing on its principal commentary. I trace the role of Gahō 我寶 (1239–1317), the *Shari kuyō shiki*'s primary exegete, and his vital role in repurposing this liturgy. I identify his exegetical strategies by exploring one of his earlier works, the *Commentary on Dialogues of Makino-o* (*Makino-o mondō shō* 槙尾問答鈔, undated), which echoes several of Kakuban's central doctrinal positions, namely the centrality of faith and devotion in the greater program of Shingon practice. Gahō eventually drew these themes into his later commentary on Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. In continuity with assertions made in Chapter 1, therefore, I contend that Gahō's commentary simultaneously expressed his personal devotion and his inclination toward the heuristic potential within the liturgy, as attested not only in the main content of his commentary, but also in his preface to the commentary.

Gahō's commentary is largely instructional; he interprets every line of Kakuban's liturgy and focuses especially on its terminological and thematic content. As later chapters show, Gahō was not the only scholar-monk to recognize the heuristic potential in the work of Kakuban.

Chapter 4 traces the complementarity between the *Shari kuyō shiki* and a suite of peripheral liturgies delivered in pedagogical forums. Both "Great Assembly on Dharma Transmission" (Denbōdai-e 傳法大會) and "Lecture Requiting the Benefit [of Kakuban's Teachings]" (Hōon-kō 報恩講) served social, devotional, denominational, and administrative purposes for Chishakuin clerics throughout the seventeenth century. By the end of the century, the integration of both ceremonies hierarchized training clergy at Chishakuin, reinvigorated a Shingi Shingon denominational identity through direct historical and symbolic connections to its branch founder Kakuban, and met new curricular demands issued from both the Tokugawa government and head temples within the Shingi branch. In a devotional circularity, these ceremonies also shared calendrical space with performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* at Chishakuin, and symbolically identified Kakuban as a central anchor of the yearly liturgical schedule. Devotion drove the revival of these ceremonies as a means to a cohesive denominational doctrine centered around Kakuban, while at the same time it supported the reinvigoration and maintenance of an independent branch within the Shingon school at the height of the development of its monastic education.

Chapter 5 offers the most comprehensive view of editorial activity surrounding Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* by tracing the efforts of Chishakuin's

eleventh abbot, Kakugen 覺眼 (1643–1722), and does so from two perspectives. First, it explores Kakugen's efforts to sponsor the publication of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, for which he composed a preface, alongside efforts to write and publish his own commentaries on principal works by Kūkai. Comparing the content of each of these works under Kakugen's stewardship suggests several possibilities as to how Buddhist doctrine may have been interpreted, organized, and thematized for consumption among training clerics. By examining them within the broader network of denominational scholarship, moreover, this chapter projects how certain themes and concepts found their way into the broader discourse of the religious community at large and how those themes cohered as a unified doctrine following the efforts of previous abbots. This chapter takes another perspective by tracing the texts across a network of possible users who maintained a doctrinal discourse within clerical communities. Seals, stamps, signatures, and marginalia all indicate degrees of ownership or possession, though this chapter also considers peripheral materials such as archival holdings and book-seller catalogues as indicative of how, where, and for whom this and related texts were introduced to early modern clerics at Chishakuin.

Taken together, these chapters reveal the complex interplay between religious knowledge, ritual performance, and reception. They will demonstrate that devotion and learning were co-constituents in the process of reception. Devotion was both expressed and embodied by performers and witnesses during the delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, *Shari wasan*, and liturgies linked to Kakuban mentioned above. At the same time, these liturgies also communicated the

meritorious benefits of this expression and embodiment. In this way, the activities

surrounding rituals at Chishakuin during the early modern era reveal an intimate

relationship between religious devotion and doctrinal understanding.

<u>**The Contents of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan***</u>

Introduction

The following translation of an excerpt from the *Ceremonial Lecture on Maitreya [Bodhisattva]* (*Miroku kōshiki* 彌勒講式), written by the medieval monk Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213) around 1196, highlights the variety of stylistic features that constitute *kōshiki* across the genre. The author identifies this text as a lecture meant to generally express his thoughts of devotion to Maitreya (Miroku 彌勒), the bodhisattva who will become the future Buddha, though in many areas the language is critical and instructive. Where he expresses his devotion, he also does so on behalf of the listeners in attendance. In other areas, he embellishes and dramatizes his description. In others still, the author highlights specific features of doctrine and practice:

> Now, the triple-world does not rest. [We] have long choked on the smoke of the burning house. One hundred years is fleeting, like the bubbles on the surface of water. The confused do not know their confusion. They receive their suffering and return to it in enjoyment. The greedy only grow their craving and greed. And at death, it is as though they seek life. How difficult is it separating from the old habits of the ordinary world! We are fortunate to have met the true dharma of the Great Vehicle, and even though the important route to exiting and separating [from saṃsāra] is near, it is as though we tend toward the gate of fame and profit and slavishly follow affection. In performing just a single good, our sincere heart [remains] untamed. Comparing [this single good] to our

39

unwholesome activities, one cannot analogize. The cycle of rebirth is especially long. We are incapable, unable [to find] pity. If we briefly consider our blunted religious capacities and our self-made thoughts of hanging on the edge, [during] how many births over how many lifetimes will we be dim to realizing the Buddha path? There is no equal to quickly seizing upon the entrustment of Śākyamuni and deeply relying on the acceptance of Maitreya (Jishi 慈氏). The merit in a single offering or a single [act of] praise [for Maitreya] is not merely to wait for the morning wind of the Dragon Flower [Assembly]. [As for] His vow of great mercy and great compassion, how would we not hope for the autumn clouds of Tosotsu [Heaven]?

夫三界無安。久咽火宅之煙。百年不常。幾結水上之泡。迷者不知迷。受苦還為樂。貪者彌欲貪。臨死猶求生。凡界舊習厭離甚難。我等幸遇大乘之正法、雖近出離之要路、猶趨名利之門、徒為恩愛之奴。適修一善、誠心未調。比之罪業、不可譬言。輪廻猶遙。不可、不悲。但憖顧根機之拙、自作懸涯之想、何生何劫暗成佛道。不如。早守釋尊之付屬、深憑慈氏之引接、一施一稱之功、非只待龍華之朝風。大慈大悲之誓、何不望兜率之秋雲。(*Jōkei kōshiki shū* 2000, 77)

How might we interpret this excerpt, the variety of its features, and the purpose of the complete *kōshiki*? James Ford (2005) has suggested a pedagogical potential in

clarifying key doctrinal concepts especially among its clerical audiences. He also highlights its denominational function, whereby the text represents Jōkei's own Hōssō school as particularly worthy of merit. Ford also proposes an economic function, as this *kōshiki* was performed amidst a series of fundraising campaigns.

David Quinter (2011), in his work on *Ceremonial Lecture on Mañjuśrī [Bodhisattva]* (*Monju kōshiki* 文殊講式) also written by Jōkei, has also described Jōkei's work, and the *kōshiki* genre more generally, as expressive of a plurality of devotional practices among Nara period (710–794) clerics. These two examples of interpretation alone indicate that the variability of *kōshiki* texts and their use among clergy makes it difficult to take a single position on the meaning of individual *kōshiki* and the intents of their authors. And yet, a single interpretation is not necessary. In fact, as this dissertation attempts to show, the variability with which listeners and observers received the information conveyed through *kōshiki* performance is precisely what makes this genre so compelling.

Performances of *Ceremonial Lecture on [the Merits] of Relic Offerings* (*Shari kuyō shiki* 舍利供養式; hereafter *Shari kuyō shiki*), written by the medieval Shingon monk Kakuban 覺鑁 (1095–1143), offered modes of ritual understanding that emerged during and after its performance among a range of audiences. I refer throughout this study to these modes as "registers of reception," or distinct levels of social, linguistic, and performative apprehensions of doctrinal knowledge during the early modern period at the Kyoto temple Chishakuin.

My development of this model was primarily inspired by the recent work of Terence Cuneo (2016) on the ritualization of faith in the Christian tradition.

Cuneo confronts a range of challenges surrounding the "epistemic merits" of religious belief, especially those posed by scholars such as Alvin Plantinga (2000), who emphasize a passivity in religious belief whereby the phenomenal world continually affirms for the devout a "sense of the divine" and its design. According to Cuneo (pp. 145–150), this approach leaves out the devout as an active agent in this process of epistemic confirmation, for "knowing God is a fundamentally practical activity" that inheres in action and effort. Ritual practice, for Cuneo, is the primary act through which the devout can develop a knowledge of the divine since it involves performative expressions of an epistemic perspective and an active effort on behalf of the practitioner to affirm that perspective. Cuneo thus urges us to consider divine knowledge a "species" of practical knowledge. The ritual materials under present study build upon Cuneo's claims by taking seriously this codependent relationship between transcendent truth and human means. In the case of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, physical and vocal expressions of ritual devotion became forums for practical understanding of doctrine.

In my use of "higher" and "lower" registers of reception, readers ought not to mistake it as a value-laden judgment of the utility or effectiveness in witnessing Buddhist rituals. Rather, "higher" registers refer to the complexity and depth of ritual content, as well as to the discursive processes of the intellect in parsing such content in scholastic engagements. This nomenclature also indirectly refers to the elevated religious and social status of clerics within the early modern Buddhist community. "Lower" registers refer to the performative modes of apprehension,

as well as to the reductive characteristics of ritual content. Likewise, readers should proceed with the assumption that these registers emerged across a spectrum of apprehension that differed in each individual and, as in the case of most human experience, are highly relational. This model of knowledge apprehension highlights how religious understanding takes place through multi-layered processes, and how ritual attendees apprehend performance in varied ways. Sets of social, intellectual, emotional, physical, institutional, and doctrinal interactions pervade ritual performance and the transmission and reception of religious knowledge occurs on multiple registers that inhere in at least these sets of interactions.

Ultimately, my model aims to show, in ways similar to Catherine Bell's assertions surrounding our "sense of ritual," that ritual acts do not impress upon witnesses in unidirectional and singular ways (Bell 1992, 79–80). Rather, ritual acts operate through individually inherent and socially constructed senses that vary across the spectrum of human experience. Knowledge and understanding, religious or otherwise, takes initial form by and through the five senses, but also through our "senses" of preference, tendency, and compulsion.3 On her premise, the present study recognizes not only the power of these subjective senses that drive apprehension, but their primacy in establishing a forum for that very apprehension; ritual is a physical, oral, and aural act that can appease, repulse, intrigue, and bore.

My analysis takes ritual as a means of *communication*. Ritual transmits and is received in fundamentally subjective ways that demand acute attention to

the perspectives, motivations, and faculties of actors and their social contexts at play in the ritual experience. Such analysis also demands that we consider all other physical, oral, and aural phenomena outside of the ritual performance as possible influences on the degree of apprehension; ritual witnesses may become distracted during the performance or may elect to outright ignore the performance. While it is impossible to depict the thought processes of any individual ritual witness, let alone those for whom rituals were performed several centuries ago, these issues of subjectivity, variability, and degrees of engagement temper the arguments made here. For these reasons, while my analysis below assumes degrees of engagement and apprehension; I do not make these analyses with the assumption that all ritual witnesses were present, cognizant, or interested in all aspects of the rituals under study here.

Kakuban originally composed his *Shari kuyō shiki* for clerical audiences (Yamada 1995, 35). This meant some assumption of doctrinal knowledge among his audiences during medieval performances, though accompanying performances of related liturgies indicate a range of witnesses during this time and into the early modern period. "Secret Hymn on Relics in Japanese Script" (*Shari himitsu wasan* 舍利秘密和讚; hereafter *Shari wasan*), an abridged version of the *Shari kuyō shiki* that followed immediately in ritual sequence, offered forums for apprehending simpler, hymnal versions of the ritual content. The collection of sense faculties became a potential site of understanding for lay audiences on a lower register of reception, in which the metered restraint of the *Shari wasan* could better communicate.

Clerics delivered these liturgies, but also bore witness to them. The *Shari kuyō shiki* addressed clerical concerns and engaged a deeper well of assumed doctrinal knowledge. As Chapter 3 of this dissertation will show at an institutional level, clerics engaged intellectually with the *Shari kuyō shiki* and related materials at Chishakuin during critical periods of educational reform and during times of ritualized clerical advancement.

In addressing this lower register, this chapter presents the body as an influential force behind the otherwise unseen processes of ritual understanding in at least two ways. First, the formation of a sensual event allowed opportunities for laity to apprehend ritual content through the aural faculties that partially constitute the sensorium. The body was a site of potential apprehension on this lower register in ritual contexts. Second, as both the tangible and conceptual center of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, Buddha relics (*busshari* 佛舍利) anchored and bound the thematic content shared between these two liturgies. Relics are also, according to both liturgies, the ultimate source of the Buddha's Great Compassion (*daihi* 大悲) in the present world. For witnesses, relics were a liturgical focal point and a soteriological promise made material.

The Formal Characteristics of *kōshiki* and *wasan*

Kōshiki constitute a genre of Japanese devotional liturgy. Each text extols a central object of devotion (*honzon* 本尊), which can include Buddhas, bodhisattvas, sutras, eminent founders, particular ethical qualities, or other such targets. The genre grew out of traditions of shorter liturgical recitations popular

since at least the Heian period (794–1185), such as announcements (*hyōbyaku* 表白), which state the basic purpose and motivation of a liturgy. Scholars generally identify the *Nijūgo zanmai shiki* 二十五三昧式, written by the Tendai monk Genshin 源信 (942–1017), as the first among the genre. Genshin's *kōshiki* was delivered among small groups of clerical confraternities in order to foster faith in Amida Buddha, though in later centuries the written and performative form of *kōshiki* was elaborated upon and evolved within all Buddhist schools (Yamada 1995).

Kōshiki are performed by a group of liturgically trained clerics (*shikishū* 式衆) and led by a ceremonial master (*shikishi* 式師). These performances usually occur before an image of the object of devotion central to the *kōshiki*. The texts typically include an odd number of sections, an announcement, and often include several related chants such as petitions to gods (*jinbun* 神分), praise to the four [purified] cognitions (*shichisan* 四智讃), invocations (*kanjō* 勧請), and memorial addresses (*saimon* 祭文), among others. Many *kōshiki*, such as Myōe's popular *Shiza kōshiki*, are still performed at temples today (Guelberg 1999, 30–40).4

Wasan constitute a genre of Buddhist hymns written in Japanese script that, much like *kōshiki*, extols various Buddhas, bodhisattvas, and eminent founders and their qualities. Like *kōshiki*, scholars also group *wasan* into the broader category of Japanese chanting (*shōmyō* 聲明). *Wasan* are often composed in a 7–5 syllabic meter, similar to other poetic forms such as those of popular

songs (*ryūkōka* 流行歌), across four-line stanzas. In many cases, *wasan* are performed along with an array of other recitations (Nakamura 1975, 1467a).

Historicizing Ritual Performance: Methodological Challenges

Despite extant records of performances of both the *Shari kuyō shiki* and the *Shari wasan* at Chishakuin, a clear challenge remains in making claims about ritual experience. This is true both for this study and others that engage with ritual practice beyond premodern Japan. In a general sense, any attempt to capture the subjective experience of ritual falls short of complete accuracy, though this does not mean, as Catherine Bell (1992, 30–31) describes, that ritual is utterly inaccessible as an object of study to outside parties.5 Beyond anything else, it is a social exhibition. Ritual procedure within the Shingon school, however, which derives its authority from traditions of oral transmission (*kuden* 口傳) and secret initiations into the world of ritual technique, becomes more difficult to capture. The inclusion of the lay experience only amplifies this challenge since extant written materials by laity are rare. Those that do exist tend to articulate themselves in the greater institutional context and therefore often express sentiments that inherently align with clerical imperatives.

Nonetheless, the materials under study here do throw into general relief a picture of ritual experience of both the *Shari kuyō shiki* and the *Shari wasan*: calendrical records, well-attested events and holidays that coincided with the ritual delivery, records of patron (檀家 *danka*) membership, ritual protocols (*gisoku* 義則), clerical attestations of the ritual event, clerical insights into the lay

47

experience of doctrine, and telling differences in liturgical rhetoric create a composite picture of the experience. The true challenge, and perhaps the greatest danger, is striking a fair balance between extrapolation and the hard data at hand.

In what follows, rather than make assumptions about how clergy and laity experienced these liturgies, I engage my data through three combinatory modes of descending directness. The first and most direct mode of engagement is through the raw historical record, which chronicles not only the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, but also describes accompanying performances of related liturgies. In some cases, records also provide evidence of co-occurant social events, which provides an even sharper image of the ritual performance, its attendees, and the social contexts surrounding these events and spaces.

The second mode of approach is through an analysis of the liturgical content, as well as printed protocols for the delivery of the liturgies. Premodern liturgical content—even in the case of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, which clergy still perform today—tends to be a rather inert dataset that largely indicate ideal deliveries of the ritual performance. Comparing both the content and rhetorical differences of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* side by side, and along with the historical evidence that they were performed in sequence, can reveal much about the intended audiences, their concerns over doctrinal content, and the influence of clerical mediation.

Finally, and in an effort to background my interpretation of these materials mentioned above, I use a comprehensive theoretical framework inspired by ritual and sensory studies, namely Pascal Boyer's (1990) studies on the modulation of

ritual language and David Morgan's (2010) work on the primacy of heuristic embodiment.6 This final method of approach brings together the historical and liturgical analyses by addressing the ill-defined boundaries between what Catherine Bell (1992, 21) calls "the dichotomous categories of thought and action." Rather than blindly project ideas onto acts and, likewise, rather than haphazardly strip all acts of all conceptual meaning, theoretical approaches reveal how "the dichotomy that isolates ritual [acts] on the one hand and the dichotomy that is mediated by ritual [ideas] on the other become loosely homologized with each other." In this way, this chapter seeks to bring together the inert ritual act, on the one hand, and the social, institutional, and performative contexts that surrounded audiences on the other.

The combination of these three above approaches gives a sense of how, when, where, and for whom these rituals were performed, and what they may have offered their audiences. In order to create a foundation upon which to analyze these ritual performances, I begin with a theoretical framework surrounding performance, the body, and apprehension.

Seeing, Hearing, Knowing: The Body and Ritual Experience
This study builds on several ongoing explorations of the relationship between ritual performance, textual production, social partitions, and learning not only in Buddhist Studies (See Lowe 2018 and Sango 2015) but also in medieval Christian Studies (See Hill 2015 and Parsons 2001). These studies locate sensory impression at the core of ritual events. All manner of sights, sounds, scents, and

tactile objects can populate these events and, in their immersive presence, communicate explicit or implicit meaning to, or through, attendees. Some social anthropologists, such as David Le Breton (2017), have suggested that the senses provide the most fundamental delimitation of experience and that, even without the immaterial cognitive tendencies, systems of belief, social constructs, and ideologies imputed onto sensory experience, the body and its sensorium would continue to function, apprehend, discern, and react as it interfaces with the phenomenal world. These ever-present sensual processes are vital for knowledge acquisition since they are the frontlines between oneself and the phenomenal world.7 Since oral communication is one of the primary means through which the liturgical contents of both the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* are transmitted, I posit aural experience in ritual spaces as the primary mode of understanding during their performance.

It is impossible to determine with precision which aspects of doctrinal content were transmitted during the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*. And while some scholars (Bourdieu 1972; Wuthnow 1987; Seligman, et al. 2008) have criticized ritual language as potentially having no communicative power, one must recognize that language is, while not exclusively, one means of action that drives a ritual forward; language forms the core content of a liturgy, but it can also constitute the cues and patterns that structure the ritual sequence itself. Even in instances where ritual language is disguised or deliberately misused, language is inherently communicative and performative. In her discussion of the split developmental trajectory of Roman eucharist rites, one

development in which language activates the transubstantiation of the sacrament, and another in which language had little significance, Catherine Bell (1992, 112–113) states:

> "Even the briefest contrast of these two historical rites [the Christian mass and the eucharistic meals of the early church], regarded by the Roman church as one and the same liturgical tradition, reveals how strategic the use of language can be. Whereas the use of language does not appear to be intrinsically necessary to ritual as such, the opposite does hold—namely, that ritualization readily affects the way language is used and the significance it is accorded."

Below I will show that in the cases of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, rhetorical and semantic differences that separate these two liturgies actually became the very basis for potential reception among both lay and clerical witnesses.

In his work on tradition and meaning-making in communicative acts, Pascal Boyer (1990, 79–82) notes the effectiveness of setting ritual speech apart from ordinary speech. On the one hand, ritual speech is formed by making otherwise natural speech unintelligible to outsiders through changes to morphology, consistent use of metaphorical repertoires, the inclusion of foreign vocabularies or locutions, and other methods. On the other hand, ritual actors deploy this speech in specific social, spatial, and temporal contexts, and therefore imbue such speech with a saliency set apart from "ordinary language" and make it

a point of focus for both participants and outside observers. This simultaneous

obscuration and emphasis, Boyer argues, allows for the construction of a religious

"truth" or set of truths conveyed in meaning. In much the same way as Bell's

claims to the "strategic use" of language as undergirding the possibility of

communication, Boyer likewise recognizes that liturgists can expand, contract,

alter, disguise, and emphasize speech in ways that orients the witness toward

religious meaning.

Scholars of medieval Christianity have given shape to the physical and

material aspects of liturgical experience (Power 1964; Bell 1995; Gilchrist 1994).

In her study of female literacy in late medieval England, Katherine Zeiman (2003)

argues that lay women were able to perform liturgies that were otherwise

unintelligible to them by engaging musical, phonetic, mnemonic, and other skills

grounded in the body. In her study of several fourteenth-century treatises on

expectations of liturgical mastery among female laity, she traces the contours of

what she refers as "liturgical literacy," or a mode of liturgical understanding from

outside of the realm of discursivity and the intellect. The parameters of this

literacy were not specified by those in places of literary or religious power, such

as the male priesthood responsible for composing instructions for recitation, but

instead depended on inherent skills of the female hearer.

Whereas within linguistic parameters defined by "grammatical culture," in

which cultural elites take linguistic knowledge, especially grammar, as the central

pole of understanding through oral communication, this type of literacy

apprehends through a lower register based on visceral—as opposed to intellectual,

and even affective—experience (Irvine 1994, 1–22). As Zeiman (p. 106) recognizes, a model of liturgical literacy can help scholars explore several otherwise ambiguous and ill-defined relationships between skill and performance on the one hand, and performance and understanding on the other. Zeiman's and other studies have opened new routes to the interplay between ritual knowledge, performance, textual practices, and the role of audience by revealing the intimacy between ritual actors and their liturgical material in the process of understanding.

As is the case with women in late medieval England, the literate activities of contemporaneous lay Buddhists are rather difficult to assess. Kuroda Hideo (1985, 302) has suggested connections between the rise of late Kamakura village documents and the education of villagers at Buddhist temples. He concludes that basic training at these temple sites allowed some village leaders greater command over administrative tasks and their documentation. This medieval trend, also attested in the work of Richard Rubinger (2007, 35–37), continued in narrow form through the early-Tokugawa years, whereby temples offered instruction in basic reading and writing to small cross-sections of the populace. Even later, more standardized curricula found at mid- and late-Tokugawa temple schools (*terakoya* 寺子屋) were delivered to novice monks, elite members of the samurai class, and to children. Very few townspeople, perhaps only those who required training tied to their livelihoods, accessed Buddhist education at these temples. Even then, popular literacy and its attendant disciplines (counting, history, geography) largely comprised this type of education.

Regarding Buddhist material, therefore, it becomes challenging to make strong claims about how laity apprehended liturgical content. The *Shari kuyō shiki* is written in a Sino-Japanese hybrid style (*wakan konkōbun* 和漢混交文), though the ceremonial master (*shikishi* 式師) renders the syntax into a discernible form of Japanese. Likewise, Kakuban originally composed his *Shari wasan* in poetic Japanese for recitation. These fundamental linguistic features suggest the intention of a basic apprehension of the ritual language among attendees, though it does not necessarily suggest a comprehension of the ritual content. In line with Boyer and others above, and as I detail below, several rhetorical and semantic transformations tip the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* into separate registers of potential understanding. It is for this reason that the various sensory models above help to bring into relief the intimacy between bodily faculties tuned to meter and concision and cognitive capacities for understanding and are helpful devices for exploring the performance and content of these liturgies in historical contexts.

In the present exploration of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, which clerics performed one after the other usually in the small founder's hall (*kaisan dō* 開山堂) or reception hall (*kyakuden* 客殿), the oral delivery of these rituals in varied spaces maintained a varied forum for reception among laity and clerics at Chishakuin. At the very least, the performances demanded the aural attention of the listener. The liturgical content, moreover, though similarly themed between the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, differed in their oral presentation. On an upper register, the *Shari kuyō shiki* expresses the primacy of relics through allusion, rhetorical flourish, and bare attention to the clerical imperative to

practice. The *Shari wasan*, however, expresses this same primacy through direct language, simple structure, and a de-emphasis of this clerical imperative.

Thematic, Rhetorical, and Semantic Comparisons

Akatsuka Yūdō (2012) has traced the textual history of the *Shari kuyō shiki* through the writings of Raiyu 賴瑜 (1226–1304), who many scholars believe to be the most influential figure in the development of the Shingi Shingon denominational identity after the death of Kakuban. Raiyu seized upon the doctrinal differences between Kūkai and Kakuban by further delineating a new interpretation (*shingi* 新義) of the Buddha's bodily form, which he would later attribute to Kakuban and maintain the interpretation as the doctrinal hallmark of the Shingi Shingon school.

In Raiyu's *Compendium of Various Writings on the True and Conventional* (*Shinzoku zōkki mondō shō* 眞俗雜記問答鈔), a section on the *Shari kuyō shiki* titled *Mitsugon'in Shari kuyō shiki ji* 密嚴院舍利講式事 describes two textual lines of this liturgy that grew out of terminological and structural differences created by later compilers. The oral transmission (*kuden* 口傳) of Kyōō'in 教王院, a temple of the Buzan branch (*Buzanha* 豐山派) of Shingon Buddhism, is the initial source of mentions of these lines of production. Raiyu presents several critical points of inquiry regarding discrepancies between alternate versions of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. For example, Raiyu claims that in original manuscript the second and fourth sections of the liturgy surround praise to Tuṣita (Tosotsu 兜率) and to the *Dhāraṇī of the Seal on the Casket of the*

Secret Whole-body Relic of the Essence of All Tathāgatas (*Issai nyorai shin himitsu zenshin shari hōkyōin darani kyō* 一切如來心祕密全身舍利寶篋印陀羅尼經), respectively. This manuscript is presently held at Mitsugon'in 密嚴院 of Mount Kōya.

In the *Complete Collection [of the works of] Kakuban* (*Kōgyō daishi zenshū* 興教大師全集), however, an alternate version of section two is rendered as praise for the secretly adorned Pure Land (*Mitsugon jōdo* 密嚴淨土) and, in the same section, praise for the highest joy [of the Pure Land] (*gokuraku* 極樂). Likewise, an alternate version of section four appears as praise for the *Mahavairocana Sūtra* (*Dainichikyō* 大日經) and, in the same section, praise for stupas (*sotoba* 率塔婆). Interestingly, section four also includes praise to the *dhāraṇī*, as is the case in the Mitsugon'in manuscript described above, though it was composed on the reverse side (*uragaki* 裏書) of the original manuscript. Both versions of these sections appear alongside one another in modern prints of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. The alternate versions of certain sections within the liturgy were originally separate writings produced by Kakuban and added to this liturgy by later scholar-monks during the early process of compilation. In this way, these compilations reflect the will and whim of these later compilers.

The implications of Raiyu's distinction between the two versions of the *Shari kuyō shiki* bear on my present arguments. First, it suggests that widely-read versions of the liturgy, namely those now found in modern print versions of the *Collected works of Kakuban* (*Kōgyō daishi zenshū* 興教大師全集), were the

product of a curatorial process; the liturgy became part of a compilation based on conscious choices made by latter-day monks who may have had access to the two or more versions of the text. Critically, this eclectic version differs in content from Kakuban's original composition held by Mitsugon'in of Mount Kōya. Second, the presence of these two versions during the medieval period meant that when commentators selected their target texts, they contributed in their own conscious ways to the broader discourse surrounding relic power and worship in the medieval period. I discuss the potential implications of commentarial choice in Chapter 3 in the context of clerical study at Chishakuin during later centuries.

Suzuki Sanai (1969) has examined the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* as complementary liturgies and notes the general simplicity of the *wasan* genre. He describes *wasan* as a response to a rise in lecture-based liturgical practices and to the slow rise of mass religious propagation. Tsukudo Reikan (1976, 7–15) has made similar arguments for broad-scale propagation and has suggested that the medieval period brought several changes to the religious perceptions and concerns among audiences. An increase in reductive qualities (*kakōteki seishitsu* 下降的性質) of religious services aimed at popular audiences (*minshū* 民衆), and an influence from the *biwa*-accompanied recitation of *Heike monogatari* (*heikyoku* 平曲) and the faith-based belief systems of Pure Land Buddhism, both drove the composition of not only *kōshiki* of the time but also of *wasan*. There are clear historical indications that new modes of accessibility began to pervade liturgical practice within the Shingon school during the Kamakura period (1185–1333) and judging by the continued performance of both *kōshiki* and *wasan* across Buddhist

schools through the early modern period and into the present day, these modes of accessibility continued to hold value for ritual attendees.

There are constraints inherent to the *wasan* genre that require consideration in this analysis of rhetorical and semantic style. Primarily, the structure of *wasan* typically follows a 7–5 syllabic meter, common to Japanese poetry, across four-line stanzas (Nakamura 1975, 1467a). This means that, in some cases, *wasan* authors may deploy certain isolated terms or turns of phrase in partial fulfillment of this structural feature. While it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether or not Kakuban consciously used certain turns of phrase due, wholly or in part, to the metered constraints of the *wasan* genre in his composition of the *Shari wasan*, this possibility does not alter the fact that *wasan* are fundamentally concentrated works of praise. In other words, as a genre of praise delivered before audiences of all backgrounds, and as scholar Ito Masahiro 伊藤真宏 (1992, 800) describes, *wasan* had to take the form of linguistically and conceptually distilled songs of praise; while *wasan* may be rich in meaning, they are only effective in expressing that meaning widely if the content can be communicated to varied levels of linguistic and conceptual understanding. While we can only judge the content of Kakuban's *Shari wasan* at face value and surmise the nature of reception through the various corroborative materials presented below, the connection between the *Shari wasan* and *Shari kuyō shiki* suggests that the simplified portions of the *Shari wasan* were meant for that very purpose. Kakuban's *wasan*, despite—or perhaps due to—the constraints of the genre, provided a more easily understandable version of his *Shari kuyō shiki*.

In the sections that follow, my goal is not simply to reiterate Suzuki's

assertions about the conceptual relationship between the *Shari kuyō shiki* and

Shari wasan, but to contribute examples that reveal registers of reception that

were enabled by thematic, rhetorical, and semantic differences between each

liturgy. In doing so, I show how the *Shari wasan* transmitted doctrinal knowledge

on a register attuned to alternate modes of apprehension, namely through bodily

faculties attuned to meter and concision. While the importance of clerically

oriented modes of devotion and practice may not have been easily communicated

to laity through the expository characteristics of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, the

rhythmic, metered, and restrained form of the *Shari wasan* that immediately

followed offered alternative modes of reception mediated by the body.

Rhetorical Variance

Rhetorical variance, which I define as variations in logical complexity inherent to

shared terms across each liturgy, provides a helpful, initial measure of the

differences inherent to the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*. In his *Shari kuyō*

shiki, Kakuban follows major liturgical trends of esoteric relic worship in Japan

by addressing the function of relics as vessels of the Buddha's great compassion

and the potential reward for devotion directed toward them.[8] In his *Shari kuyō*

shiki, Kakuban describes this function of relics in ascending levels of descriptive

flourish and begins simply in the announcement (*hyōbyaku* 表白). This

announcement, which both forecasts the liturgical content to follow and frames

the liturgy in broad devotional terms, lays out several basic statements surrounding the nature of relics, the Buddha, and the devotee:

[1] In accordance with the innate desires [of each of you], [He] benefits living beings without bound.

[2] As a result, until having saved everyone,

[3] his Great Compassion does not rest and [He] leaves behind relics.

[4] Thus, in taking refuge [in His relics], one will necessarily cross over the ocean of three existences.

[5] In producing offerings [to them], one will certainly ascend the summit of four virtues [of enlightenment].

[1] 隨其性欲、利生無邊。

[2] 遂乃化縁已、盡雖示滅度、

[3] 大悲不休、尚留舍利。

[4] 適致歸依、必渡三有之海、

[5] 纔興供養、定登四德之峯。

(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, text #40, lines 17–19)

We find several thematic similarities between the lines above and the sixth verse from Kakuban's *Shari wasan*:

[1] Even though the teaching of his career-long mission has ended,

[2] And [He has] returned to the metropolis of four virtues [of enlightenment]

[3] [His] Great Compassion and skillful techniques do not stop,

60

[4] And [He] leaves behind relics.

[1] 一代化儀事終て

[2] 四徳の都に皈れども

[3] 大悲方便止ずして

[4] 舎利を留め置き給う

(*Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū*, vol. 2, p. 51)

Themes cohere across both passages, but notable rhetorical differences set them apart. First, in the short passage from the *Shari kuyō shiki*, the practitioner ascends the "peak of four virtues," or the four virtues attributed to the Buddha's experience of enlightenment, after producing offerings to relics.9 In the *Shari wasan*, however, the Buddha returns to the "city of four virtues," or attains his final enlightenment, after his teaching mission ends. Second, in the *Shari wasan*, Kakuban includes skillful techniques (*hōben* 方便) along with Great Compassion as qualities that are lodged in relics. In addition to the Great Compassion of Śākyamuni that Kakuban highlights in his *Shari kuyō shiki*, he also includes the means through which this Great Compassion operates within the present world, and the means so often associated with the bodily forms (*shikishin* 色身) of the Buddha, or that of Śākyamuni.

This verse in the *Shari wasan*, therefore, in its appeal to the efficacy of the Buddha's relics in the present world, highlights an immediate access to Great Compassion through these relics despite the Buddha's seemingly distant presence.

61

Conversely, the verse in the *Shari kuyō shiki* highlights the actions of the practitioner in effecting this access. These changes slightly differentiate these passages with regard to rhetoric, though later passages from both liturgies better demonstrate the emphasis on clerical concerns in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, on the one hand, and the lay sentiments expressed in the *Shari wasan* on the other. As Kakuban states in his *Shari kuyō shiki*:

[1] Thus, the expounder of the True Word, the Great Sun Tathāgata, emerges from the supreme city of dharma bliss,

[2] courses through the gate of empowerment, confers the jeweled carriage of spiritual penetration, and leads the confused to his Golden Site.

[3] In the end, he leaves relics among people and gods, and tours and proselytizes among the *dharma* realm.

[4] [By these means] the reverent will bound over deluded attachment in a single thought-moment. The faithful will verify [their own] Buddha cognition in their ordinary body.

[1] 是故眞言教主大日如來出法樂之都、

[2] 趣加持之門、授神通之寶輅、導迷情於金場。

[3] 遂卽留舍利於人天、施化度於法界。

[4] 仰者、一念超三劫、信者、凡身證佛智。

(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, text #40, lines 53–57)

First, Kakuban more carefully articulates the emergence of Mahāvairocana (as Śākyamuni) into the present world in his *kōshiki*. On the issue of narrative

62

flourish, Asano Shōko (1992, 109) describes that, in addition to the meritorious benefits reaped through the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, another purpose of the liturgy was to add descriptive and narrative power to the episode of the Buddha's final nirvāṇa, or the disappearance of his bodily form in the world. In this case, Kakuban's deployment of rhetorical strategies lend, in a ritual context, a descriptive and narrative power that sharpen the benefits to be petitioned for by ritual attendees. In distinction to *wasan*, therefore, and recalling the simplified features described earlier by Ito Masahiro, the *Shari kuyō shiki* served the opposite purpose. It expanded and more acutely articulated the critical narrative moments in the life of the Buddha for the sake of narrative power over the audience.

Kakuban's acute references to overcoming attachment and attaining Buddhahood in one's ordinary body accord with his views on clerical imperatives to practice found elsewhere in his work. In Chapter Nine of "Esoteric Commentary on the Mantras of the Five Elements and Nine Seed-Syllables" (*Gorin kuji myō himitsushaku* 五輪九字明祕密釋), Kakuban attests to these soteriological retributions as particularly tuned to the program of practice among clerics.[10] In this chapter, Kakuban asserts that the attainment of Buddhahood in one's very body is possible only through advanced practices. While he asserts the primacy of faith and the efficacy of faith-based techniques in effecting enlightenment in some of his works, the deliberate mention of present-body Buddhahood in his *Shari kuyō shiki* connotes practices related to that particular soteriological goal.

This appeal to clerical concerns in this passage takes on even greater contour when read alongside other verses from the *Shari wasan* that highlight the retribution of merit, here in the seventh verse:

[1] [As for] companions who make offerings to and take refuge in [relics],

[2] [They receive] the immeasurable blessings of meritorious virtue.

[3] As for those who make offerings to the birth body [i.e. Śākyamuni],

[4] Complete and perfect awakening is promised.

[1] 供養帰依の輩は

[2] 福徳果報量りなし

[3] 生身供養為る人と

[4] 正等なりとぞ説給う

(*Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū*, vol. 2, p. 51)

In the above verse, Kakuban draws a clear causal relationship, in two parallel couplets, between the act of giving offerings and the receipt of meritorious blessings. He continues in this same vein in the following verse, but also makes a similar soteriological pivot in the final couplet:

[1] If one produces offerings on but one occasion,

[2] It will result rebirth into the Heavens or liberation.

[3] If one contemplates the numerous genuine meanings,

[4] [Achieving] Buddhahood in this very body will be possible.

[1] 一度供養を興ずれば

[2] 生天解脱の因となる

[3] 数々実義を観ずれば

[4] 即身成仏難からず

(*Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū*, vol. 2, p. 51)

The first three couplets communicate the direct relationship between offerings and blessings in simple terms. Companions (*tomogara* 輩) generate meritorious virtue by making offerings and taking refuge in relics, while those who make offerings to the birth body (*shōshin* 生身; i.e. Śākyamuni's relics) receive similar benefits. In slight divergence from this pattern, Kakuban then describes a single offering as cause of rebirth in the Heavens.[11] In full pivot, his final couplet describes the ease of attaining Buddhahood in one's very body as a direct result of contemplative practice. Here, he positions Buddhahood in parallel with long-established parameters of seed-syllable (*shūji* 種子) contemplation outlined by Kūkai in his seminal works, especially *The Meaning of the Syllable 'Hūṃ* (*Unjigi* 吽字義).[12] Thus, in distinction, the prior couplets highlight not only the practice of offerings, an important lay-oriented practice, but also meritorious retribution, the operative force behind those very practices. And while the final mention of Buddhahood in one's very body redefines the verse through clerical practice, we must recall that the *Shari wasan* was meant as a complement to the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which is already directed to clergy. This soteriological pivot therefore suggests a stylistic de-emphasis of the clerically centered practice depicted within the original thematic parameters of the *Shari kuyō shiki*.

Semantic Variance

While the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* differ rhetorically in their framing of the theme of potential blessings associated with relics, as well as how to access that potential, further pairings of passages highlight some of Kakuban's semantic strategies in representing the physical appearance of relics among human beings in different ways. I define these semantic variances as variations in the depth of meaning of similar or related terms across both liturgies.

Consider the following passage from the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which expresses both the visual and nondual features of Buddha relics:

[1] The lotus body forged in Jambūnada gold is a charm of the dharma [body] Buddha in the syllable *A*,

[2] [their] snowy jade emits a lunar glow, [their] ornamental pattern is the allure of the body,

[3] the purity and indestructibility [of these two bodies] are nothing other than the meaning of the Womb [Maṇḍala],

[4] and [their] radiance and solidarity are nothing other than the meaning of the Diamond [Maṇḍala].

[5] Though transformed, all four bodies are actually one.

[1] 檀金錬蓮體、阿字法佛之姿、

[2] 珂雪放月光、鑁文性身之色、

[3] 清淨不壞、即胎藏之義、

[4] 光明堅固、即金剛之意。

66

[5] 縦局變化、既是四身隨一。

(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, text #40, lines 114–118)

And sequential verses ten and eleven from the *Shari wasan* on the same topic:

[1] Within the precious purple-gold lotus pedestal

[2] The original-ground dharma body manifests itself.

[3] The lunar glow of the white snowy jade

[4] Washes over the form of the round ocean self-nature body.

[5] Because this body pervades everywhere,

[6] The entire body and one iota of it do not differ.

[7] Because of the constancy of the dharma of the triple-world,

[8] The birth body [of Śākyamuni] and [His] relics are identical.

[1] 紫磨金の蓮台に

[2] 本地法身相現じ

[3] 白珂雪の月光に

[4] 円海性仏色澄めり

[5] 編一切処の身なれば

[6] 全体一粒ことならず

[7] 常恆三世の法なれば

[8] 生身舎利一つなり

(*Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū*, vol. 2, p. 51)

While each passage from the two liturgies above communicates the basic visual qualities and ontological implications of Buddha relics, Kakuban's inclusion of semantic differences allow them to operate in two different registers. First, in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Kakuban uses a reference to Jambūnada to describe the rarity and exquisiteness of the gold akin to the Buddha's lotus body (i.e. relics). Beyond this equality between a fine mineral and Buddha relics, Jambūnada refers to the trees that line rivers running through Jambudvīpa, the terrestrial continent within Indian cosmology, and the process of natural refinement of the gold within the river (Nakamura 1975, 121c).[13] In the *Shari wasan*, however, the quality of value equal to gold is expressed much more simply through a synonymous reference to a highly prized gold of a purple tinge (*shima gon* 紫磨金; a.k.a. *shima ōgon* 紫磨黄金). This synonymous use does not carry the same referential and metaphorical weight as its mention of a specific Indian site and its narrative connotations in the *Shari kuyō shiki*.[14]

Second, in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Kakuban presents the nondual features of relics through linked binoms in which their double meanings unfold. Relics represent both the beautiful (*shishiki* 姿色) alluring charms and the meaning (*igi* 意義) of the absolute reality of the dharma body, itself a cosmic manifestation of the seed syllable *A* so often mentioned in the context of contemplative practice throughout the rest of the liturgy. This technique of symbolic and narrative doubling allows Kakuban to amplify certain features of doctrinal content within the *Shari kuyō shiki*. While it is possible that these techniques communicated these double meanings to keen clerics during performance, it is more likely that

such communication occurred during moments of practice with the ritual script itself.

While Kakuban makes a similar culminating statement at the end of the passage in the *Shari wasan* by positing the singularity of Buddha relics and Buddha bodies, he does so without the use of symbolic and narrative doubling. Instead, by way of conditional particles, he indicates the nondual relationship between realities of corporeality, the constancy of the dharma, and the singularity of body and relics. In this latter case, the relics in the world appear much more substantive and pervasive. The appearance relics in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, while conceptually identical to reality itself, was semantically obscured to many listeners through the use of symbolic and narrative doubling.

Conclusion

The rhetorical and semantic differences outlined above suggest two related purposes that link these liturgies. First, the concision of the *Shari wasan*, in its appeal to the long-popularized (as of the medieval period) distillation and concentration of religious performance, forces an abandonment of much of the intensely referential and metaphorical perspective taken on by Kakuban in the *Shari kuyō shiki*. There also appears, by way of these same characteristics, an emphasis on the clerical routes to effective practice in the *Shari kuyō shiki*. The potential for apprehension on a lower register for lay attendees therefore inheres in the *Shari wasan* through rhetorically and semantically simplified language.

While the *Shari kuyō shiki* highlights the active clerical imperative to practice and soteriology, the *Shari wasan* emphasizes the activities of Mahāvairocana, Śākaymuni's relics as sources of compassion, and the access to that compassion and merit through relic offerings. In resonance with Zeiman's model of "liturgical literacy" outlined above, the *Shari wasan* offers doctrinal meaning primarily through the aural faculties of the lay practitioner and emphasizes the lay religious experience, not through an appeal to grammatical, metaphorical, or overtly referential modes of communication, but through an appeal to a type of literacy tied specifically to the rhetorical and semantic characteristics of the liturgical content apprehended through the body.

Ritual Performance in Socio-historical Context

Introduction

Both late-medieval and early modern historical records indicate that clergy

performed the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* in direct sequence of one another

usually in the small founder's hall (*kaisandō* 開山堂) or reception hall (*kyaku den*

客殿) at several Shingon temples, including Chishakuin. The construction of

Chishakuin's original founder's hall began during the tenure of the temple's

fourth abbot, Genju 元壽 (1575–1648), through modest donations made by

followers. Land was granted in the southern Chishakuin precinct in 1665, on

which expansions to the founder's hall began in 1667. This new expansion forms

the basis of what stands at Chishakuin today, now referred to as the *Mitsugon dō*

密嚴堂 and measures forty-five *tsubo* 坪 (roughly 14 square meters) (*Chishakuin*

shi, p. 158). Most of the reception hall was lost to fire in 1681, though the north

gate was saved and used in the reconstruction of the building in 1685. For

centuries, this hall has also been used for ritualized doctrinal debates (*rongi* 論

議), and for this reason is also referred to as the lecture hall (*kō dō* 講堂). Today's

reception hall measures approximately 645 square meters (*Chizan yōkō*, plate 4).

When one considers the contextual details of these performances to

follow, which situate ritual attendees within these spaces during an array of other

festival and ceremonial events, the rhetorical and semantic differences outlined

above take on even greater significance. As mentioned at the start of this chapter,

ritual is ultimately a social exhibition and the records below reveal the exhibitive

nature of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*. In addition, ritual protocols from

within the Shingon school, as well as records of *danka* membership at

Chishakuin, suggest that these liturgies were part of large-scale, communal

events. Finally, Shingon ritual protocols published during the early modern

period, and which engage the issue of doctrinal comprehension among laypeople,

also suggest that clerics and laity apprehended doctrinal content differently. What

follows is composite evidence that these rituals were not only well-attended but

attended by a wide variety of Buddhists that spanned the social spectrum between

laity and clergy.

Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools (*Misshū shohō-e gisoku* 密宗諸法會義則**, 1774)**

Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools (*Misshū

shohō-e gisoku* 密宗諸法會義則, 1774) is a compendium of rules, regulations,

and ritual sequences for a variety of liturgies from within the Shingon tradition.[15]

A lengthy section on *kōshiki* confirms the exhibitive and pedagogical elements of

the both *kōshiki* and *wasan* within this tradition. Broadly, this section provides a

basic rubric for understanding how clergy envisioned and, ultimately, were meant

to wield the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* performances as representative of

the Shingon school.

  The first observable protocol in this compendium is a lineage-specific

protocol for the delivery of *wasan*. The text lists several notable *wasan* meant to

accompany offerings made during rites of transmission (*denku* 傳供), or ritual

offerings made before an image of a Shingon patriarch that precedes the

performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. The first of these *wasan* is the "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms" (*Shichi Bongo san* 四智梵語讃), a hymn praising the four wisdoms associated, in the esoteric schools, with the buddhas of the four directions who accompany the central Buddha, Mahāvairocana, in each of the four cardinal directions: Akṣobhya (Ashukuba 阿閦婆) in the East, Ratnasaṃbhava (Hōshō 寶生) in the South, Amitābha (Amida 阿彌陀) in the West, and Amoghasiddhi (Fūkū Jōshū 不空成就) in the North. This hymn is notable for two reasons. First, as the compendium describes, clergy should only follow its guidelines in cases where *wasan* sequences are absent of lineage-specific protocols:

> Reizui says that in cases of abbreviated [procedure], do not use *wasan*. Again, in that textual explanation, there are differences in procedure and characteristics. If any other [aspects of the performance] lack meaning from within the lineage's procedures, then use [this] protocol.

> 瑞云畧ニ就テハ和讃ヲ用ヒ不。又其ノ文句ニ進ト相異有ル也。苟クモ余ハ進流ノ義ニ非レハ則用ヒ焉。(*Misshū shohō-e gisoku*, leaf 11)

In other words, lineage ought to take precedent in the governance over *wasan* performance, though the compendium may be used in cases where such protocols are unclear or unestablished. This emphasis on lineage suggests that the transmission of ritual techniques for both the *Shari wasan* and this supportive hymn were, as in the case of much of the Shingon ritual repertoire, largely

maintained through either lineage-based oral transmission (*kuden* 口傳) or through open teachings confined to the lineage. In the case of ritual activities at Chishakuin, transmission occurred within Kakuban's Daidenbō'in 大傳法院 lineage.16 The "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms," therefore, as a hymn centered on the wisdom of the four cardinal Buddhas, simultaneously expresses praise for such spiritual attainment and represents a ritual orthodoxy particular to the Shingi Shingon school and, more narrowly, Kakuban's own lineage.

The second and related notable characteristic of this hymn is its atypical musical and tonal adherence to Shingi Shingon notation standards. According to Arai Kōjun 新井弘順 (1983), the basic notation of the "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms" derives from the standard *shōmyō* manuals of the Shingi Shingon school. These are based on the *Gyosan taigaishū* 魚山蠆芥集, compiled by Jōe 定惠 in 1496. As Arai points out, however, the *Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms* is an exception to standard rules when it comes to musical scale.

Shingon *shōmyō* is based on a basic five-note scale. When arranged by order of ascendance, the first five pitches correspond to the pentatonic *solfège* in the following way: *kyū* (宮) corresponds to *do*, *shō* (商) corresponds to *re*, *kaku* (角) corresponds to *mi*, *chi* (徵) corresponds to *sol*, and *u* (羽) corresponds to *la*. Various scales adopted from Chinese musical systems were eventually arranged into two groups of different pattern called the *ryō* 呂 group and the *ritsu* 律 group (Rechberger 2018, 197). While hymns in the *ryō* ascendance mode, to which the "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms" belongs, typically begin and end on either

the *kyū* or *chi* scale notes, the "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms" begins and ends in a *shō* scale note.

As a hymn that precedes the full delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, the proper performance of the "Sanskrit Hymn on the Four Wisdoms" depends on its proper ritual transmission within Kakuban's lineage. That is, the *Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools* insists on a lineage-based adherence to the standards of execution. Yet, those standards, according to Arai, run against common musical and tonal representations of Shingon *shōmyō*. This seems to suggest that subsequent performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, two liturgies originally composed by Kakuban, were delivered from a particularly Shingi denominational perspective.

The denominational and lineage-bound characteristics of this sequence of liturgies adopt even greater dimension when assessed within the social and institutional contexts outlined in the following two sections, which propose that laity witnessed these rituals alongside clergy in great numbers.

Chishakuin Devotees

The accounts of the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, which I explore in the following section, contain ample details on the location, timing, and ritual accompaniment at Chishakuin. The compilers do not, however, explain the status of affiliation and support among its ritual attendees, nor do the accounts provide links between ritual performance and any donations made by affiliated householders (*danka* 檀家). The dearth of attendance information surrounding

Chishakuin makes it difficult to gain a clear view of who and how many attended performances of Kakuban's liturgies, but Chishakuin is not the only temple for which such information is scant. In fact, as Nam-lin Hur (2000, 133) laments in his research on the social and institutional organization of temple networks in the early modern period, comprehensive Tokugawa-era records that compare nation-wide temple affiliations holdings do not exist. He does offer alternatives, however, and principal among them is the *Classified Investigations of Shrines and Temples* (*Shaji torishirabe ruisan* 社寺取調類纂, 1990), a compilation of Buddhist temple affiliation collected by the Meiji government between 1868 and 1871. This broad-scale investigation contains the *Detailed Registrars of Temples and Shrines* (*Jiin meisaichō* 寺院明細帳), the first of two datasets collected by the Meiji government in 1868. While neither of these sources provide ideal views of the volume of affiliation at Chishakuin, we can infer some degree of affiliation within the Shingon school generally using the data provided within them.

Hur draws his data from the *Classified Investigations of Shrines and Temples*. He selects, at random from north to south, five sample areas and surveys their volume of affiliation for the 1, 336 temples that populate these areas, which are: Kakuda in northern Honshū, Izu in eastern Honshū, Kurashiki in western Honshū, Ōzu in Shikoku, and Hita in Kyūshu (2000, 131–137). In his summary table (p. 137), which presents data on these five areas side-by-side, Hur then lists the number of affiliated householders (*danka* 檀家) linked to Shingon temples within these five areas. For example, he shows that thirty-five Shingon temples held affiliates numbering between one and twenty-five; thirty-six Shingon

temples held affiliates numbering between fifty-one and seventy-five; twenty-seven temples held affiliates numbering between 201 and 300; and one temple held affiliates numbering between more than 600.

Hur's selected data, while representative of only five random areas of Japan containing Shingon temples at the end of the early modern period, becomes more helpful when compared to other data compiled by historian Tamamuro Fumio. Tamamuro compiled the *Meiji shonen jiin meisaichō* 明治初年寺院明細帳 (2013), which provides images of early-Meiji temple recordings of affiliate householders. Tamamuro includes (vol. 7, p. 24) images of recordings from Chishakuin, and while this data represents affiliate numbers during the early Meiji period, it does give a narrower sense of where Chishakuin stood in terms of affiliations during earlier periods. In fact, Hur (2000, 133) himself openly recognizes the utility of this record because of its temporal proximity to the Tokugawa period.

> Images of records drawn from Chishakuin list eighty-nine affiliations:
>
> > Prayer worshipers, eighty-nine households
> >
> > 滅罪旦家八拾九軒 (*Metsuzai danka hachi jū kyū ken*)
> >
> > (*Meiji shonen jiin meisaichō*, plates 51–52)

Here we have a clear account of households tied to Chishakuin by the start of the Meiji era. Of additional importance is Chishakuin's status as a prayer (*metsuzai* 滅罪) temple. The compound *metsuzai* literally means "extinguish transgression," and this refers to temples that offer ceremonies that promote this-worldly benefits

(*genze riyaku* 現世利益) such as prosperity and protection from disaster and malady. *Metsuzai* is also synonymous with *kitō* 祈禱 ("to pray"), which denotes the prayer status of temples (Ambros 2009, 86).

If we compare the number of prayer households affiliated with Chishakuin by the start of the Meiji era with Hur's selected data, we can see that Chishakuin held roughly the same number of affiliates as 13% of the funerary temples he sampled from North to South. This percentage is significant because it communicates that, even by the start of the Meiji era, during a time when Buddhist temples suffered losses of followers under government efforts to excise Buddhism from Japan, Chishakuin still maintained a fairly robust pool of affiliations. We can therefore surmise that during the late-seventeenth centuries, during periods of peak affiliations across the networks of Japanese temples, the number of prayer households with connections to Chishakuin would have been much higher.

Chishakuin's status as a prayer temple is important in the following consideration of rituals conducted at the temple during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries because it communicates both the types of rituals most offered to households, as well as the status of their affiliation. Whereas funerary households (*sōshiki danna* 葬式檀那 or *sōshiki danka* 葬式檀家), for whom funerary rites were delivered by clerics from the affiliated temple, prayer households (*metsuzai danna* 滅罪檀那 or *metsuzai danka* 滅罪檀家, written above as *metsuzai danna* 滅罪旦那) were offered rituals focused on the receipt of this-worldly benefits, which included protection from disaster and malady,

prosperity, and longevity. The types of rituals associated with this-worldly benefits include, among many others, fire ceremonies (*goma* 護摩) for karmic expiation, the chanting of *dhāraṇī,* and acts of offerings, each of which are represented below in the accounts of ritual services rendered at Chishakuin.

Additionally, these households sought such ritual services from prayer temples on a voluntary basis (Ambros 2009, 86–87). While the country-wide system of temple affiliations (*danka seido* 檀家制度), which mandated ties to funerary temples through a registration system (*terauke seido* 寺請制度), authenticated the links between households and temples during the early modern period, households could also make additional, voluntary donations to prayer temples in order to receive prayer services. In the case of Chishakuin, therefore, we can surmise that many householders witness to the performance of prayer rituals were present of their own volition. Householders actively sought out the benefits offered through rituals, many of which, as described below, coincided with a variety of other socio-religious events hosted by Chishakuin. In this way, the suite of prayer rituals that accompanied performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* directly addressed the active concerns of householders who made voluntary donations to the Chishakuin.

Accounts of the Performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*
With the information above, we can understand the *Shari kuyō shiki*, *Shari wasan*, and supportive liturgies as representative—musically, socially, and in terms of content—of a particularly Shingi Shingon perspective among clergy. Clerics

delivered these liturgies not only in the stylistic and technical vein of the Daidenbō'in transmission lineage, originally established by Kakuban on Mount Kōya and later relocated by Raiyu to Mount Negoro, but also through their conceptual connection to the Shingi branch after Negoroji's official split from Kogi Shingon. In addition to the above information, materials such as personal diaries and temple histories that account for performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* suggest an ample presence by lay attendees. More broadly, they suggest that while clerics delivered these liturgies within the narrow confines of lineage protocol, the presence of a broad audience meant that an array of liturgical performances could reach many of these attendees. As this chapter argues, the presence of laity allowed for a different forum of understanding on a lower register, one that operated on the premise that the *Shari wasan* differed rhetorically and semantically in content from the *Shari kuyō shiki*. The historical accounts below, therefore, offer a glimpse into how, and for whom, these liturgies addressed religious concerns that cut across the social spectrum.

The *Diary of Gien, Attendant to the Royal Consorts* (*Gien Jugō nikki* 義演 准后日記), was written by Gien 義演, who served as abbot of Daigoji 醍醐寺 from 1596–1626. His diary was part of his efforts to reorganize and consolidate the teachings and rituals central to head temples in the Shingon tradition. In addition to accounting for regular performances of these rituals, Gien also details social and religious contexts surrounding them at Daigoji, one of the head temples of the Shingon school located in Kyoto. His accounts span from 1595 to 1602, across which there are at least twenty mentions of the *Shari kuyō shiki*

80

performance. In at least five of these mentions, Gien mentions the liturgy's

coincidence with *higan* 彼岸 (lit. "other shore"), a festival period during which

Buddhists perform various rituals surrounding veneration and offerings made to

deceased ancestors, for whom the spring and autumnal equinoxes provide periods

to return to the world of the living.

Scholarly interpretations of the social and ritualistic aspects of *higan* vary

widely. Uranishi Tsutomu (1986, 66–67) suggests that *higan* is a Buddhist custom

during which ancestral veneration and fertility rituals coincided in ceremony

during the spring and autumnal equinoxes. Of early modern *higan* ceremonies,

Hur (2007, 189) points out that lay Buddhist patrons of practically all traditions

gathered to chant the Buddha's name, and that temples also offered special

sessions for preaching and sermonizing. Finally, Nakamura (1975, 1121a–b)

suggests that while the predominant purpose of *higan* assemblies was ancestral

veneration, these seasonal celebrations also allowed for respite from the toil of

daily work.

While each interpretation emphasizes different aspects of *higan*, it is clear

that temples welcomed an influx of laypeople who came to observe, engage in, of

offer donations for Buddhist ceremonies. Earlier accounts, such as the *Diary of

Mansai, Attendant to the Royal Consorts* (*Mansai Jugō nikki* 滿濟准后日記, vol.

19, 341, 395), written by Mansai 滿濟 (1378–1435) while at Daigoji, situate the

Shari kuyō shiki performance amidst additional ritual contexts such as New

Year's celebrations, Buddhist lectures, celebrations for the Buddha's birthday,

and chanting events. In this way, performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* (and the

accompanying *Shari wasan*) appear to have been delivered among a wide array of social, religious, and institutional events. Considering the volume of prayer householders seeking such services outlined in the above section, these events seem to have drawn in Buddhists from all walks of life to Daigoji to witness these liturgies.[17]

While many of Gien's entries account for single performances on a single day, three entries stand out for their content across several months. From the eighth month of 1596 through the first month of 1597, Daigoji clergy performed Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* on a variety of successive occasions:[18]

1596

8th month, 4th day

Early morning, began *higan* [service], *Shari kuyō shiki*, performance of verses (*gata* 伽佗）(Jōshin-in); the [court appointed] Gyōgon Dharma Seal (Gyōgon hō-in 堯嚴法印) follows with the usual [performance of] fire offerings (*goma* 護摩) [for the] Wisdom King of Love (Aizen myōō 愛染明王), aside from the above, there was an out-of-the-ordinary earthquake this evening.

8th month, 7th day

Early morning, midday *higan* [service], Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* as usual, hall-entering ceremonies, [the performance of] fire offerings as customary, aside from the above, there was a momentary earthquake.

1597

1st month, 1st day

Next [concerns] that which is of tangible form, beginning with performance of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, merely as a New Year's Day Assembly (*shūshō'e* 修正會). Then begins devotional chanting (*shōmyō* 聲明), starting with beginning with *Praise to Relics* (*Dato san* 駄都讚). The great preceptor chants the entirety of it. Then the [recitation of the] *Heart Sutra*, followed by giving of the dharma [truth][19] regarding the five aggregates (*go da* 五駄).

文禄 5

八月四日

喬、彼岸入、舍利講式顕、伽佗演賀(成身院)アサリ・堯嚴・法印・演俊以下、愛染護广如常、他震今夜又事外動ス

八月七日

喬、彼岸中日、舍利講式 ऄ 如常、入堂、護广如例、他震一度動ス;

(*Gien Jugō nikki,* vol. 1, 68)

慶長 2

正月一日

次入持所、先舍利講ʤ修之、修正耳、次聲明初、先馱都讚、次大

阿闍梨聲明悉誦之、次心經以下五馱法施 (*Gien Jugō nikki,* vol. 2, 4)

There are several notable features in the above accounts that suggest the presence of varied audiences. First, Gien records the vernal *higan* celebration as a temporal demarcation of the start of the ritual sequences. With this, we can safely assume that followers populated the temple site during this time in an effort to venerate ancestors, witness a variety of Buddhist services, and make donations to the temple. Along with mentions of the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Gien also records performances of the *Shari wasan*, here styled *Praise to Relics* (*Dato san* 馱都讚), directly following the performance of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. In conjunction with the above analysis, we can surmise that the ritual attendees bore witness to the rhetorical and semantic differences that emerged as the performance of both liturgies carried on in sequence. Finally, these liturgies are also accompanied by the delivery of the *goma* 護摩 (here, abbreviated as 護广) rite, or the fire ritual performed widely across the Shingon school and meant to expiate karmic afflictions among participants and witnesses. As this rite also meant protection from malady, disaster, and misfortune, the consignment of wooden sticks to fire also found particular promise among lay audiences, especially those with the *metsuzai* status of affiliation.

If one takes a wide view of this ritual calendar, Gien's accounts paint a vivid picture of a variety of devotional and commemorative performances among

84

broad audiences at Daigoji during the late sixteenth century: clergy and laity comingled during the events of *higan* and others for ancestral veneration, bore witness to the performance of both the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* in ritual sequence of one another, and participated in accompanying rites for protection and karmic expiation. In this way, while the liturgical content of the *Shari kuyō shiki* appears, on the surface, to meet clerical imperatives to understand doctrinally dense and complex themes on nonduality, the Great Compassion of Mahāvairocana, and relics as sources of this compassion in the present world, laity satisfied their own imperatives among the social and ritual peripheries of Daigoji during these same events.

History of Chishakuin (*Chishakuin shi* 智積院史, 1934, 386–392), compiled by Maruyama Shōei 村山正榮, gives rather similar accounts of the performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*, the deliveries of which partially represented drastic changes to the liturgical program at this temple beginning from the end of the seventeenth century. According to four service records (*gyōjiroku* 行事録) covering the years 1751–1854, these changes gave rise to a ritual program at Chishakuin that centered around ritual types of a devotional and petitionary nature.[20] This new liturgical focus suggests some degree of movement toward a ritual program with a much larger and varied audience from the end of the seventeenth century.

A year-round calendar (*Chishakuin shi* 1934, 386–392), built from a composite of the four service records mentioned above, accounts for ritual activities at Chishakuin that highlight the devotional and petitionary nature of the

events. For example, during the second day of the first month, clerics performed

reverential services for Fudō Myōō (*Fudō Myōō hōbuju* 不動法奉修), a

protective deity who guards the dharma and is classified as one of the five

wisdom kings (*myōō* 明王) in Buddhism. These services set off a longer sequence

of rituals beginning with the recitation of the *Transcendent Principle Sūtra* (*Rishu

kyō* 理趣經), a *sūtra* that highlights the wisdom of Mahāvairocana as preached for

the benefit of Samantabhadra (Fugen 普賢), a central bodhisattva in the Shingon

school. Following this recitation is the recitation of the *Uṣṇīṣa vijaya dhāraṇī*

(*Butchō sonshō darani* 佛頂尊勝陀羅尼; alternatively written as 尊勝陀羅尼), a

dhāraṇī delivered with the express purpose of protection against disaster and for

the benefits of a long life (Nakamura 1975, 893a). The *Mantra of Light* (*Kōmyō

shingon* 光明眞言), the next liturgy in this sequence, offered witnesses the

potential removal of karmic hindrances and illnesses and potential for longevity.

The final two portions of this ritual sequence include the recitation of jeweled

names (*hōgō* 寶號) of Buddhas and bodhisattvas and the dedication of merit (*ekō*

廻向).

     Finally, beginning on the seventh day of the first month and extending for

six days thereafter, *Chishakuin shi* (1934, 386) reports the daily performance of

the dharma bliss (*hōraku* 法樂) service on behalf of Yakushin 益信 (817–906),

referred to by his honorary title "Great Master Original Awakening" (*Hongaku

Daishi* 本覺大師). This service was a devotional and commemorative rite for

Kōngōkaku 金剛覺 (retired Emperor Uda) upon his entrance to Ninnaji 仁和寺 in

86

899. Yakushin is considered the founder of the Shingon Hirosawa lineage (*Hirosawaryū* 廣澤流), under which Kakuban's Daidenbō'in lineage falls along with five other lineages (Saitō and Naruse 1986, 421).

The rituals that initiate the yearly program at Chishakuin were, according to these chronicles, therefore largely focused on devotion, prayers for protection, and the liturgical representation of founders associated with specific lineages tied, by the early modern period, to the Shingi Shingon school. These services appealed, in part, to the this-worldly benefits so often sought after by lay devotees as voluntarily affiliated with Chishakuin, and for whom protection from illness and disaster and longevity became central religious concerns, especially by the end of the seventeenth century.

This theme of lay-oriented devotion comes into greater relief later in the calendrical cycle. On the fifteenth day of the second month, *Chishakuin shi* (1934, 387) accounts for the performance of the Permanence and Bliss Assembly (*Jōraku'e* 常樂會), a service commemorating the everlasting bliss of final nirvāṇa following the moment of his passing.[21] The performance of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, *Shari wasan*, and *Shari raimon* 舍利禮文 (*Relic Rite*) constitute the central portion of this service and is perhaps the clearest representation of the sequential delivery of Kakuban's liturgies.[22] As argued above, the delivery of these liturgies in tandem created opportunities to listen to the liturgies and their rhetorical and semantic features. Laity, especially, in witness to a larger ritual for commemorating the Buddha's teachings, apprehended the ritual content through the aural faculties, a process made possible by the rhetorical and semantic

adjustments Kakuban includes in his *Shari wasan*. Other accounts (*Chishakuin shi* 1934, 388) reveal that the opening statements (*kaibyaku* 開白) of the *Shari kuyō shiki* were delivered, as in the case of Mansai's accounts at Daigoji nearly four centuries earlier, during celebrations for the Buddha's birthday on the eighth day of the fourth month. Likewise, we also find a delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki* in isolation during the eighth day of the seventh month, along with merit-dedication for the recently deceased, recitation of the *Transcendent Principle Sūtra*, and the chanting of the *True Word of Radiance [of Mahāvairocana]* (*Kōmyō Shingon* 光明真言).[23]

While Chishakuin's early liturgical calendar is a composite picture constructed from four service records, together they give a comprehensive view of the variety of ritual performances and coincident events that included a wide range of audience members. Overall, it accounts for an active and vibrant ritual calendar that included not one, but many performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan*.

Conclusion

In Chapter 1, I demonstrated how the ritual performance at Chishakuin offered opportunities for reception at the somatic level among lay audiences. These opportunities emerged through the rhetorical and semantic features of the *Shari wasan* delivered immediately following the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Considering the historical details above, which locate lay devotees at Chishakuin during key moments of religious gathering and performance throughout the year, we can

observe how those features of the *Shari wasan* and *Shari kuyō shiki* offered alternative modes of reception among the varied ritual witnesses. As a prayer temple, Chishakuin offered its voluntary householders the potential for this-worldly benefits along with opportunities to understand Kakuban's doctrinal positions as they were expressed through his devotional rituals. *Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools*, the compendium discussed in the previous section, corroborates the inherently pedagogical nature of *kōshiki* generally:

> According to explanations [of the many types of *kōshiki* recorded], from long ago to the present, giving praise through [these] ceremonies has been to give the dharma [truth] (*hosse* 法施). *Ceremonial Lecture on Daikoku* and *Ceremonial Lecture on Bishamon* are these [ceremonial] lectures. The *Eight Lectures on the Lotus Sutra* and the *Lecture on the Sutra of Golden Light* are also like this. That is, these lectures are indeed the responses that are clarifications of the sutras. Presently, they are that which are referred to as [ceremonial] lectures. Praising the virtue [of the devotional objects] of those [lectures] is as though [one] praises the [same virtue] in the Bishamon Assembly. For example, the *Permanence and Bliss Assembly* and *Relic Assembly* are [also] like this. Naturally this designation is an ancient transmission and for this reason one cannot alter [its designation]. Furthermore, regarding the meaning of the word ["ceremonial lecture"], if one considers it through a dependence on ancient texts, they essentially [give] mimetic understanding [as the definition]. If one considers it

through a dependence on current texts, they essentially give the meaning

of procedural understanding [as the definition]. Since this is the case, one

ought not to harbor only one perspective [on this matter]. Simply try to

decide through examination, and that is all.

因便ニ辯シテ云ク古往今来式ヲ讃テ、法施ヲ為ス。大黒講毘沙門講

等ト云フ夫レ講ハ也者。法華八講最勝講等ノ如ク。乃チ經ヲ講解ス

ル者之レ講ナルニ應レ矣。今ニ講ハ謂フ所ノ如ク。唯其功徳ヲ讃ス

毘沙門會等ト稱ス宜ク也。例エハ常楽會舍利會等ト白フガ如シ。然

ト古ク傳ノ所名目ナルガ故ニ輒チ改ルコト能ハ不。又字義ニ就テ之

ヲ論セハ古文ニ依ルコトハ則チ講ハ者習也。今文ニ依ルコトハ則チ

講ハ者解也。若爾ラハ一隅ヲ守ル可ラ不也。唯タ試ニ之断スルコト

巳。(*Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma Assemblies in the Esoteric*

Schools, leaves 12–13)

In comparison to older texts (*kobun* 古文), which refer to *kōshiki* as liturgies tied

to learning through mimetic processes (*narau* 習う), whereby repetition and

pattern tend to govern apprehension, newer texts (*konbun* 今文), or those written

around the time of the compendium's composition in the early modern period,

refer to *kōshiki* as liturgies tied to a procedural understanding (*hodoku* 解; lit.

"untie" or "unwind"). If we read this latter character as such, apprehension occurs

as a gradual unfolding and disclosure of religious knowledge. For this reason, the

90

Protocol explains, ritual performers ought not to abide by only one of these perspectives when it comes to the pedagogical style of *kōshiki*, but rather to approach each individual ritual as having potential to appeal to understanding in different ways.

Considering the manners and degrees of reception among witnesses to ritual, this injunction to maintain an open pedagogical style in the delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and, by association, the *Shari wasan*, indicates not only that the performance of these liturgies had potential to appeal to many modes of apprehension, but also that, over the centuries, these performances became more inclusive in terms of audience. In other words, the early modern compilers of the *Ritual Protocols* urge users to recognize the primacy of ancient perspectives on *kōshiki*, which include both titling and pedagogical conventions, and yet also maintain an openness to current perspectives that may govern the delivery of the ritual in different ways. If this compendium held any weight for ritualists within the Shingon school, and especially for those within Kakuban's Daidenbō'in lineage of ritual transmission, then the delivery of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* at Chishakuin may have encapsulated one, or perhaps both, of these types of pedagogical styles.

As multi-layered and multi-vectoral performative events during which the transmission of religious knowledge took shape in different registers, the deliveries of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* were meant to be consumed in some way. Whether through repeated observances or a gradual "unraveling," or whether through an appeal to allusion and metaphor or through simplified

91

language, these complementary rituals offered the spectrum of Chishakuin clerics and patrons an opportunity to engage socially, intellectually, emotionally, and physically with the ritual content. The rituals cut across social and religious boundaries that distinguish clergy from patrons and brought them together physically, during an array of coincident social events, and conceptually, under the rubric of devotion expressed through liturgies written by the Shingi Shingon founder. Ultimately, the performances reveal the body as a valuable site for understanding processes of apprehension that transcended the intellect. For laity at Chishakuin, the body became both a means of expressing devotion and contextualizing that devotion through a narrative surrounding the Buddha's own body that remains in the present world.

Scholastic Engagements with the *Shari kuyō shiki*

Introduction

Doctrinal interpretation is a subjective practice. One purpose of this dissertation is to demonstrate how the medieval Shingon exegete Gahō 我寶 (1239–1317) analyzed Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and which aspects of his analysis found their way among a scholastic Shingi Shingon discourse issued from Chishakuin in the early modern period. This chapter investigates how he distills and amplifies themes of faith and devotion in his *Commentary on Ceremonial Lecture on [the Merits] of Relic Offerings* (*Shari kuyō shiki shō* 舎利供養式鈔). These themes influenced his subsequent works after this initial composition. His commentary and its target text thereby functioned as a headspring of doctrinal knowledge given shape by these very emphases on faith and devotion.

It is helpful to consider the practice of exegesis in terms of subjective choices made by the exegete and how those choices influence the form, use, and interpretation of their commentaries. In his comparative work on Western and Confucian exegeses, John Henderson (1991, 122–127) describes this feature of comprehensiveness as a technique that exegetes actively deploy in order to express the totality of a canon linked to target text. In this way, many exegetes move beyond their target text in their interpretation of textual meaning. Henderson assumes a comparative perspective and therefore limits his analysis to Confucian and Western biblical interpretive models, though this comprehensive feature is also well attested throughout Buddhist East Asia. In comparison to small-scale scholasticism that engages a text or a portion of a text narrowly,

exegetical comprehensiveness seeks to instantiate the target text among a network of authoritative sources.

Of East Asian exegetical forms, which derive largely from Confucian models, Robert Buswell (2017, 137–139) describes hermeneutical superstructures laid atop commentaries as unwieldy for uninitiated readers, though vital for understanding the broad movements of the target text and its relationship to the commentator's interpretive schema. This superstructure also indicates broader doctrinal elements at play beyond the text. In this way, scriptural exegesis is a micro-expression of the breadth and depth of not only the target text, but also its surrounding meta- and paratextual materials.

Beyond East Asia, Mizuno Kōgen (1982, 135–149) describes how techniques for classification and interpretation became vital for both the initial acceptance and eventual readership of Buddhist literature, and that these techniques gave shape to later modes of textual transmission. As for the consumption of texts in an out of Buddhist communities, José Cabezón (1994, 76–83) characterizes the scholastic engagements with scriptural commentary as one of the most suggestive in Buddhist intellectual history. This facet of study, he says, reveals the "self-awareness" of commentarial acts insofar as they became more than acts of mere textual production; religious understanding itself became a new object of scrutiny and, in this process, demanded the exegete define the parameters of audience, modes of exposition, and the contours of subject matter that would become objects of later study.

The *Shari kuyō shiki shō* is not a scriptural commentary since its target text is not a part of the Buddhist canon, though in its adherence to East Asian exegetical standards of scriptural comprehensiveness I suggest that Gahō adopts a nascent denominational perspective that later clerics such as Kakugen 覺眼 (1643–1722) amplified at Chishakuin during the publication of Gahō's commentary. Buswell (2017, 136) also describes several commentarial designations that define a commentary's relationship to its target text: "commentary" (*sho* 疏), as a general term, indicates a detailed scriptural gloss with semi-canonical status, "doctrinal essentials" (*shūyō* 宗要) indicates a thematic summary, and "exposition" (*ron* 論) indicates a scriptural treatise.

While Gahō designates his work a *shō* 鈔, akin to an "summary" or "digest" (sometimes "sub-commentary" when attached to another commentarial work), its content transcends this simple designation.24 I translate Gahō's *shō* as a commentary precisely because of the partial adherence, both in the text's original composition and later publication, to scriptural commentarial standards, as well as his imposition of degrees of hermeneutical rigor common to East Asian exegesis.25 Additionally, and by comparison, the content of a commentary on another of Kakuban's ceremonial lecture, the *Jizō Bosatsu kōshiki kenpishō* 地蔵菩薩講式顯祕鈔, written by Gōkan 豪寬 (d. 1707; styled Ichiu 一雨) in 1697 while residing, incidentally, at Chishakuin, adheres much more closely to the usual sense of *shō* as "summary."26

We can derive two implications concerning the features above: first, that Buddhist exegetes saw scholarly potential within their target texts and, second,

that scholarly engagement with their commentaries contributed to a broader discourse surrounding the target texts and their themes. Even without the added challenge of translation, medieval and early modern Japanese exegetes discussed in this dissertation employed similar techniques in engaging with texts. That is, among domestic Buddhist writings—those both written and interpreted by Japanese Buddhists—audience, expository techniques, topical breadth, accuracy, and all manner of exegetical concerns influenced the processing of doctrinal information.

In line with the examples presented by Buswell, Cabezón, Mizunō, and Henderson above regarding the choices of exegetes as to the comprehensiveness of their analysis of a target text, I broadly frame exegesis as a curatorial process; a target text is consumed, interpreted, and repurposed for new modes of engagement among new audiences and to varying degrees of connection to a network of other texts. In parallel to the discussion of the registers of religious knowledge that emerged from the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* among varied audiences outlined in the previous chapter, Gahō's exegetical repurposing of the *Shari kuyō shiki* operated to similar effect. On the one hand, he composed a fundamental source-text for doctrinal study among novice clerics. On the other hand, his analysis also highlights features common to lay orientations of practice, namely the centrality of faith and devotion. While Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō* likely never found readership among lay groups, this thematic complementarity between doctrinal rigor and accessibility is one of the major ways through which clergy engaged the text in educational contexts during the early modern period.

Methods and Motifs

In order to better understand how Gahō read Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, as well

as how his commentary influenced later discourse on Shingi Shingon doctrine, I

begin by exploring another of Gahō's commentaries written a few years after his

Shari kuyō shiki shō, Gahō's *Commentary on Dialogues of Makino-o* (*Makino-o*

mondō shō 槇尾問答鈔, undated). His interpretation of Kakuban's work

continued to guide his own understanding of devotion within the Shingon

tradition, the features of which readily appear in this second text. The primacy of

faith and devotion is important to draw out of this second work because it

contextualizes his earlier analysis of the *Shari kuyō shiki* in terms of the

devotional relationship shared between practitioners and relics. It also reveals a

continuity and, more ultimately, a maturity, in Gahō's doctrinal perspective.

I deploy the English terms "faith" and "devotion" provisionally here

insofar as they are not direct translations of the terms that appear in *Shari kuyō*

shiki, though they do appear as such in the *Makino-o mondō shō*. In the *Shari*

kuyō shiki, refuge (*kie* 歸依; also referred to as *kimyō* 歸命, which loosely

translates *namu* 南無, a transliteration of the Sanskrit *namaḥ*, "to offer

obeisance") is the compound from which I derive these English terms. *Kie* means

"to take refuge" and in Chinese and Japanese Buddhist texts, it is usually used in

reference to the Buddha, *dharma*, and *saṃgha* that constitute the "three refuges"

(*sanki* 三歸, Skt. *triśaraṇa*). Declarative vows for turning toward these "refuges"

are chanted daily by most Buddhists.[27] In extrapolated meaning, taking refuge

may also refer to the act of taking refuge in any figure, object, concept, or

scripture. Faith, or the giving over of oneself in confidence, inheres in this process of reliance insofar as it is undertaken from a point of commitment and fidelity. Offerings made in a ritual context, as Kevin Trainor (1997, 152–155) notes of offerings made to stupas in the Sri Lankan Theravada tradition, constitute an "orientation to the Buddha's presence" insofar as it establishes a dependent relationship shared between the practitioner and the Buddha, but also, and more broadly, expresses Buddhist ideals of nonattachment. An offering, therefore, is a practitioner's mark of confidence in the object of devotion (e.g. the Buddha) as a refuge, and an expression of their fidelity toward it.

Kie appears numerous times throughout Kakuban's Shari kuyō shiki in reference to taking refuge in the dharma body of the Buddha (butsu hosshin 佛法身). In this context, we can surmise a fairly traditional use of the term; Kakuban impels his audience to "turn toward and rely on" the power and compassion of relics as Buddha. As I show below, Gahō follows Kakuban's treatment of this term in his exposition. He advances the imperative of reliance in each of the sections under detail.

As for the Makino-o mondō shō, however, these motifs of faith and devotion appear both implicitly and explicitly. In this work, we find terms of clear synonymy, namely shin 信 (Skt. śraddhā), often rendered as "faith" or "confidence." The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism (2014, 847–848) describes the range of cognitive, conative, and affective dimensions of this glyph, two of which are helpful for tracing a relationship between shin and kie. First, one conative dimension that appears frequently in Buddhist literature is through

98

offerings made during encounters with objects of devotion. In this sense, we can understand acts of offering as physical expressions of one's faith in the object to which offerings are made. Second is that the three jewels (*sanbō* 三寶) constitute one of the main objects of faith in Buddhist literature. In light of Gahō's treatment of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, which emphasizes acts of making offerings to relics as expressions of *kie*, his use of *shin* in similar contexts in his *Makino-o mondō shō* warrants a similar approach to the terms in both works. That is, taking refuge carries, for Gahō, the same soteriological implications as having faith in and a reliance on relics; relics are at once targets of one's devotion but also havens toward which one can turn and take refuge and from which one can receive merit.

More broadly, understanding Gahō's perspective on relics, faith, and devotion gives a sense of how it accorded with the broader discourse on relics within the Shingon school. As outlined in the previous chapter, the Shingon school garnered much of its power through its oversight of relics during the medieval period. Tomabechi Seiichi 苫米地誠一 (2017), a Shingon specialist, has made acute remarks on the varied utility of relics in Japanese esotericism (*mikkyō* 密教) during especially during the tenth and eleventh centuries. He cites compelling evidence in support of his conclusions that Shingon clerics of the ninth century primarily used relics in rainmaking rituals. By the end of the tenth century, however, they had begun to use relics more often in rituals to protect the lives of the ruling families (*kokka* 國家, i.e. aristocracy). In fact, in his *Goyuigō* 御遺告 (835) Kūkai describes relics as a coalescence of the self-so principle

(*jinen dōri* 自然道理) of the dharma body of the Buddha, which can be harnessed under the right conditions. He describes how one can concoct relics by hand (*jōshō suru no tama* 成生するの玉, lit. "[actively] mature jewels"). In short, the perception that relics promise immense and meaningful benefits to human beings drove all manner of preservation, production, replication, and even acts of theft among Shingon relic stewards during the Heian period.[28] The utility and power of relics in the Shingon tradition, as expressed by Gahō in his commentary, reflect this longstanding perception of relics as sources of immense benefits in the present world.

While Chapter 1 of this dissertation outlines the soteriological utility of relics in greater detail with regard to the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Tomabechi's description of the many rituals involving benefits to both the clergy and aristocracy draws our attention to the potential benefits offered by relics in this lifetime. As Tomabechi describes (2017, 111), the imperative for and effectiveness of faith and devotion toward relics grew, in part, out of perceptions of relics as sources of wish-fulfillment in the present world. It also grew out of the proximity to and homological indistinction between relics and the Shingon school's principle Buddha, Mahāvairocana. While faith and devotion toward relics as both sources of worldly blessings and as sources of salvation existed alongside one another in practically all centuries of the development of Japanese Buddhism, there occurred during Kakuban's era a heightened recognition of their utility. This utility was enacted and demonstrated through ritual. As I show below, Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō* makes direct appeal to this very utility.

Gahō's Interpretation of the *Shari kuyō shiki*

There are at least six extant early modern printed texts of the *Shari kuyō shiki shō*.
I have analyzed three and am in possession of two of them, one of which is a
Meiji-era reprint.29 The following analysis mainly concerns the content of the
Shari kuyō shiki shō and the *Shari kuyō shiki*, and leaves material and historical
detail for later discussions of editorial treatments of the texts in Chapter 4.

     In his *Shari kuyō shiki shō*, Gahō expounds upon every line of Kakuban's
original text and does so with no apparent emphasis paid to any one section. He
provides not only his commentary on the target text, but also sub-commentary to
clarify his own references made to a multitude of related sutras, treatises, and key
terms that he clarifies. This format is effective in conveying his own analysis and,
perhaps more importantly, the authority of his analysis by way of textual
pedigree. As I show below, Gahō's efforts to trace Kakuban's thought backward
through a pre-existing body of Shingon literature locates both Kakuban and the
Shari kuyō shiki among some of the most revered figures and texts in the Shingon
school.

Selection One: On *Shari kuyō shiki*, lines 126–133

What follows are two selections from Gahō's commentary. I have selected these
passages for their emphasis on themes of faith, devotion, Great Compassion, and
nonduality, all of which are foundational features of Shingi Shingon doctrine that
speak to the wide applicability of the *Shari kuyō shiki* as a vector of doctrinal
discourse:

"For this reason, our great teacher [Kūkai] said: '[The one hundred poisons] seen by the physician's eye…the multitude of living beings become Buddhas' is the prooftext.

Question: Regarding the line 'The one hundred poisons seen by the physician's eye transform into medicine,' [does it mean that] even something that is not medicine, by means of the physician seeing it and by means of the physician illuminating it, is it used as medicine?

Answer: The poison was transformed from the start and it did not become medicine. The Buddha can respond in accordance to the pain of all the myriad grasses and trees, and these [responses] are all medicine. Not knowing this way [of things] is none other than becoming poison[ed]. If [sentient beings] rise to this way [of things], then all things are medicine. In this way, when entering scrutiny of the universe of the six great [elements] and the four [types of] mandalas, all sentient beings are Buddhas. Others say things like the multifaceted meaning just mentioned. [Shinzei's] *Collection of Nature and Spirit* states: 'The dragon king holds rare *maṇi* and rains down jewels. Since the wondrous medicine of the wheel-turning king is meant for ordinary people, accordingly one ought to think that it is this that transforms poison.'

[As for] 'The multitude of deluded beings yet are identically the one awakened body [of the Buddha],' the quotation says it is not the interpenetrating principle-nature [of the Yogacara tradition]. It is also not the inseparable essence and aspect [of the Kegon tradition]. Although

102

raindrops are numerous, all enter the water of [the syllable] "*A*." If one

enters meditative insight on the originally unarisen and looks at this then

all dharma worlds are the form of the *A* syllable. Section Nine of

Dhāraṇīs for Safeguarding the Nation, the Realm and the Chief of State

(*Shugo kokkaishu darani kyō* 守護國界主陀羅尼經) states: "One hundred

twenty five meanings emerge from the syllable "*A*." Every one of the

various *dharmas* are all this syllable "*A*." The commentary states:

"*Anuttara-samyak-saṃbodhi* is equality in *dharmas*, there are no things

[i.e. *dharmas*] high and low. For this reason, the *tathāgata* is likewise

what we call all Adamantine Bodhisattvas. [He is] likewise what we call

the sage of the four realizations [of the *śrāvaka* path]. [He is] likewise

what we call foolish beings outside of the Path. [He is] likewise what we

call sentient beings on the varied evil paths. [He is] likewise what we call

people of mistaken views and [who commit the] five grave crimes. The

Great Compassion Maṇḍala (i.e. the Womb Maṇḍala) truly makes

manifest this meaning." For this reason, all delusions are none other than a

single type of the *dharma* world gate.

故ニ大師言ク：醫眼所覩乃至衆生即佛ト者引證也。問フ：醫眼ノ覩

ル所百毒藥ニ變スト者藥ニ非ル物シテモ醫師ノ眼ヲ以テ、之ヲ照シ

テ、藥ニ用ル乎。答フ：本ト自リ毒ヲ變シテ、藥ト成スニハ非ス。

一切ノ千草萬木病ニ随ヒ、物ニ應レテ、皆是レ藥也。其ノ方ヲ智ラ

不ハ即チ毒ト成リ。其ノ方ニ達スレバ、一切皆藥也。此ノ如ク六大

四曼等ノ周遍法界ノ觀見ニ入ル時キ、一切衆生皆是佛也。重重ノ義

以前ノ如シ云云。性靈集ニ云ク：「摩尼ノ奇特ハ大龍ヲ待テ、而雨

寶ヲ輪王ノ妙藥ハ鄙人ニ對スレバ、以テ毒ト為ルト之ヲ思フ可

シ。」　▲羣30迷尚是同一覺體ト者謂ク理性之融通ニモ非ズ。性相之

不離ニモ非ズ。雨足ハ多ト雖モ並ニ一種ノ व水ニ入ル。本不生ノ

觀ニ入テ、之ヲ見レバ法界皆是 अ 字ノ體也。守護經ノ第九ニ अ 字

ニ百二十ノ義ヲ出ス。一切諸法皆是 अ 字也。」疏ニ云ク：「阿耨

多羅三藐三菩提ハ法ニ於テ平等ニシテ、高下有ルコト無シ。是ノ故

ニ如來ヲ亦ハ一切金剛菩薩ト名ケ。亦ハ四果ノ聖人ト名ケ。亦ハ凡

夫外道ト名ケ。亦ハ種種悪趣ノ衆生ト名ケ。亦ハ五逆邪見人ト名

ケ。大悲曼荼羅ハ正ク此義ヲ表ス文」。故ニ羣迷即チ一種ノ法界門

ナリ。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaves 128–129)

In the above selection, Gahō addresses lines 126–133 of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which are as follows:31

> Thus, the great teacher [Kūkai] said: "The one hundred poisons seen by the physician's eye transform into medicine. The multitude of living beings illuminated by the Buddha's wisdom identify as Buddhas." The multitude of deluded beings yet are identically the one awakened body [of the Buddha]. How could the various Buddhas not be not two dharma bodies? The parts and the whole are not two [groups]. How [could one]

104

bring about the distinction of and attachment to one iota of substantive

totality? The dharma [body] and response [body] are just the same. Do not

give rise to misinterpretations of quiescent and universal illumination. The

living body is at once the dharma body. It is the name of true awakening.

To separate from the delusion that you lack Buddha[hood] is called

profound insight. As such, the nine-fold maṇḍala depicts humans as

universal emanations of the dharma body, [who] does not alter the

arrangement of the distinct aspects of the [first] four maṇḍalas, and [who]

unites and enters the sixth maṇḍala.

故大師言、「醫眼所覩百毒變藥、佛慧所照眾生即佛。」群迷尚是同

一覺體。諸佛寧非無二法身。分滿不二。何起全體一粒之別執。法應

惟同。勿生能寂遍照之異解。即生是法。名之眞覺。離凡無佛、謂之

深觀。因茲、不動九界迷情、悉目等流法身、弗改四曼別相、合入一

印大日。(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, lines 126–133)

These lines appear in the third section of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, which

broadly covers acts of singing praises to relics and vowing to become a Buddha.

Kakuban spends the beginning of this section detailing the vast system of

symbolic homology that pervades Shingon doctrine. He describes how "the

present bodily relics are none other than the teachings of the entire Buddha body"

(今此生身舍利、卽彼法佛全體也), and "none other than the five syllables of

the secret *dhāraṇī*" (卽秘密總持之五字). He describes how their true aspect is

105

"none other than the five wheels of the equal and original vows [of the Buddha]" (即平等本誓之五輪) represented by the five-wheeled stupa, which themselves are an expression of the activity of the "five great elements" (*godai* 五大), or void, air, fire, water, and earth, of dharma nature (*hosshō* 法性). He continues to discuss the interpenetrative nature of the four types of maṇḍalas (*shishu mandara* 四種曼荼羅, abbreviated *shimandara* 四曼荼羅), comprised of the great maṇḍala (*dai mandara* 大曼荼羅), the maṇḍala depicting icons (*zanmaiya mandara* 三昧耶曼荼羅), the maṇḍala depicting seed syllables (*hō mandara* 法曼荼羅), and the maṇḍala depicting the activities of Buddhas and bodhisattvas (*katsuma mandara* 羯磨曼荼羅). He also describes how relics also subsume the three mysteries (*sanmitsu* 三密) of mental, verbal, and physical activities and the three Buddha bodies (*sanshin* 三身), or the dharma body (*hosshin* 法身), reward body (*hōshin* 報身), and response body (*ōjin* 應身). Finally, he describes that relics are the accretion of the voiced syllable *A*.

Through this vast correspondence, Kakuban places relics at the center of a nondual relationship between the appearance (*yōsō* 様相) and function (*sayō* 作用) of various components of Shingon logic and ritual practice; in their simultaneous embodiment and expression of both the dharma body and its outflow of Great Compassion, relics occupy both of these modalities.

In his analysis of these lines, Gahō draws out Kakuban's reference to Kūkai's allegory of a doctor and clarifies the process by which this nonduality appears as an essential truth to the practitioner. Gahō asks a basic question: How

106

does the doctor transform poison into medicine or, beyond the analogy, how does the Buddha transform delusion into enlightenment? His answer is simple:

> "The poison was transformed from the start and it did not become medicine. The Buddha can respond in accordance to the pain of all the myriad grasses and trees, and these [responses] are all medicine. Not knowing this way [of things] is none other than becoming poison[ed]."
> (See page 102 above)

This interpretation falls in line with Kūkai's own deployment of the allegory in his *Script for the Consecration of the August High Heavenly Sovereign in the City of Peace [Heian]* (*Heianjō taijō tennō kanjōmon* 平安城太上天皇灌頂文, T. 2461, 78.1a, 13–14):

> "The one hundred poisons seen by the physician's eye transform into medicine. The multitude of living beings illuminated by the Buddha's wisdom identify as Buddhas. The multitude of living beings, the bodies and natures of the various Buddhas, and the dharma body are all fundamentally of the same kind and are completely without distinction."

> 醫眼所覩百毒變藥。佛慧所照眾生即佛。眾生體性諸佛法界本來一味都無差別。

Kūkai explains how just as the physician transforms poison into medicine, sentient beings assume Buddhahood through the Buddha's wisdom. In this way,

there is no distinction between the bodies of sentient and those of Buddhas. Likewise, according to Gahō, poison is one and the same as medicine and delusion is one and the same with enlightenment. While true poison is seeing the world dually, the Buddha responds to sentient beings with the salve of profound insight (*shinkan* 深觀) into the true reality of nonduality. This reference, among others in the *Shari kuyō shiki* taken up by Gahō, constitutes what Suzuki Sanai (1969, 122), in his work on Kakuban's liturgies, refers to as textual allusion (*tenko no kankei* 典拠の関係) with regard to motifs of faith and nonduality.

Suzuki points out that Kakuban drew from Kūkai in his *Shari kuyō shiki* but that his *Shari wasan*, the shorter, verse-form of the liturgy detailed in Chapter 1, takes on a more Shingi Shingon flavor through changes made to phrases drawn from Kūkai that highlight faith and devotion. For example, Suzuki (p. 122) explores the insertion of the term for empowerment (*kaji* 加持) into the *Shari Wasan* as an indication of the ceremony's Shingi Shingon characteristics.

As I discuss in greater detail in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, Shingi Shingon doctrine emphasizes the importance of Mahāvairocana's response to sentient beings through the body of empowerment (*kajishin* 加持身), a doctrinal feature codified by Raiyu that includes a different aspect of the Buddha's dharma body.[32] This doctrinal distinction is precisely the "new interpretation" (*shingi* 新義) that identifies Shingi Shingon Buddhism. In the case at hand, Gahō focuses on the allegory of the doctor, which originally appears in an otherwise doctrinally dense section of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, as a simple metaphor for nonduality before

proceeding to more complex explanations of the same issue and, at the same time, authenticates his explanation by way of his initial reference to Kūkai.

Gahō goes on to cite *Supplementary Notes on the Collection of the Universally Illuminating Nature and Spirit of the Teachings [of Kūkai]* (*Zoku henjō hakki shōryōshū hoketsu shō* 續遍照發揮性靈集補闕鈔), a collection of various writings compiled by Kūkai's leading disciple Shinzei 眞濟 (800–860), in which he describes the ordinary people for whom the transformative medicine of the Buddha ameliorates, and asserts that one ought to recognize, through faith, that the Buddha's transformative compassion is in full operation in combating delusion:

> "The dragon king holds rare *maṇi* and rains down jewels. Since the wondrous medicine of the wheel-turning king is meant for ordinary people, accordingly one ought to think that it is this that transforms poison." (See page 102 above)
>
> 摩尼奇珠，待大龍而雨寶。輪王妙藥，對鄙人以為毒。

Gahō takes this citation up and elaborates, once again, on the inseparability between delusion and enlightenment, citing state-protecting sutra literature such as *Dhāraṇīs for Safeguarding the Chief of the Realm* (*Shugo kokkaishu darani kyō* 守護國界主陀羅尼經). Since his analysis engages with citations from a section on relic praise, we can surmise that faith in the transformative power of the Buddha's Great Compassion is, for Gahō, part and parcel of one's understanding of the nonduality between the Buddha and his relics. Relics are, as Kakuban

corroborates elsewhere and as Gahō picks up for analysis, "replete with various virtues," "indivisible," and "whole."

Gahō's perspective accords with that of Kakuban in a general sense here, but his emphasis on the transformative power of the Buddha's Great Compassion and the imperative to perceive a nondual reality—all by way of the doctor allegory—offers insight into Gahō's method and intention. This is especially true of the section on relic praise drawn from the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Marcus Bingenheimer (2017) describes the literary impact of medical allegories in two sutras from the Chinese canon and points out that later recensions of Vaṅgīsa's verse in the *Alternate Translation of the Grouped Āgama Sūtras* (*Betsuyaku zō agon kyō* 別譯雜阿含經, T no. 100) included physicians that did not appear in original versions. He describes how the motif of skilled physicians remained, and perhaps increased, from the inception of Buddhism through the first millennium. In addition to Jīvaka (Jpn: *Kiba* 耆婆), a famous Indian physician encountered in the following section on Gahō's *Makino-o mondō shō*, other physicians appear in the Āgama texts and, as Bingenheimer (p. 164) explains, it is possible that these were the names of notable physicians in the audience with whom the lecturer compared to Jīvaka. The allegorical effectiveness of this motif among varied audiences also appears to have remained among the work of Kūkai, Kakuban, and Gahō, all of whom appeal to this effectiveness by citing the allegory in their works. Thus, while Gahō's perspective doctrinally accords with that of Kakuban, it is also clear that he indulged in similar literary strategies with rather long histories of deployment in Buddhist writings.

Selection Two: On *Shari kuyō shiki*, lines 24–27

In his analysis of lines 24–27 of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, Gahō makes an even more direct appeal to the centrality of faith in his treatment of the announcement (*hyōbyaku* 表白):

> A jewel is a round bead. A round bead signifies a perfectly full and complete attainment. For example, even though we regard the square, sphere, half-moon, and triangle [shapes of the *gorin*], when [stacked] crookedly [at an angle] they appear crooked. When [stacked] straight, they appear straight. [Yet] their [original] appearances and forms are unmodifiable. Their myriad virtues are complete and full. Therefore, according to this comparison, we call it a jewel [rather than a round bead]. Moreover, within the most secret meaning in India it is called 'rice' [*śāli*], which can be read as 'relic' [*shari*]. Of the "five grains" in [Kūkai's] *Hizōki*, there is no surpassing rice [*śāli*] as the most nourishing [among them]. This rice grain is replete with various virtues in five flavors. The relics of the *tathāgata*, in distinctly located singular grains, are whole and indivisible. Therefore, [Buddhas] use shallow worldly names to express the profundity of dharma nature.

> One's current task is the true miracle, think about this! Investigate this! To wit, the form of polished rice is none other than white in color. Therefore, at the moment when your current work is genuine [awakening] the white jewel [relics] are themselves rice grains! This is not the ordinary understanding. [They] are things associated with the most secret training

in procedures for fire invocations (護摩 *goma*), and so forth. It namely indicates the present rice [*śāli*; i.e. relic]. This is the most secret [understanding]. When bestowing benefits to sentient beings, it is a rice grain. When attaining awakening, it is relics. It is also said: "Use wild grain rice," and so forth. The reason for this is that the law of the land dictates tilling the fields. Sometimes one enters the field according to impurity. During this interval [of time] there is intention to dispel the impure. For this reason, at the beginning [of the arousal of faith] there is the perception of oneself and [other] living beings. For this [same] reason, after [the arousal of faith] there is a lack of perception of oneself and [other] living beings. This is the use of faith. ▲The superior practices of deliverance to the Land of Bliss and the external appearances of becoming a Buddha convert others.

▲As for "marvelous practice of the sudden realization of enlightenment," its true meaning is self-verification.

Question: If that is the case, ritual procedure ought to be the ultimate arousal of the mind [of enlightenment]. What is the sequence for the ultimate arousal of the mind?

Answer: There are two levels of faculty with regard to faithful practice and arousing the mind [toward enlightenment] in our school. They are the faculty of entry by practice and the faculty of entry by faith. This ritual expresses the meaning of this.

玉ト者圓珠也。圓珠ト者圓滿成就ノ義也。縱ヒ方圓半月三角為ト雖モ曲ルハ曲ガ如ク。直ハ直カ如ク。其ノ形體ヲ改不也。彼ノ所ニ萬德ヲ圓備ス。故ニ譬ヲ以テ玉ト云。又最秘ノ義ニハ印度ニハ米ヲ呼テ、舍利ト云フ見ル可シ。秘蔵記ヲ五穀ノ中ニ利益最トナルハ米ニ過タルハ無シ。此ノ米粒ニ於テ諸德ヲ備ヘ五味ヲ含ス。如來ノ舍利一粒ノ所ニ分滿不二也。故ニ世間ノ浅名ヲ以テ法性ノ深號ヲ表ス。卽事而眞ノ奇特、之ヲ思フ可シ。之ヲ察ス可シ。謂所米精ノ形ハ即チ白色也。故ニ今ノ白玉卽事而眞ノ時ハ直ニ米粒ヲ指ス也。常情ノ義ニ非ズ。最秘最秘自行ノ次第ニ護摩ノ相應物ト云云。即チ今ノ米ヲ指ス。是レ最秘也。利益衆生ノ時ハ米精也。自證ノ時ハ遺身也。又云ク稘米ヲ用ト云云。其ノ故ハ大國ク法ハ田ヲ耕ス。時ハ諸ノ不浄ヲ以テ、田ニ入ル。之間不浄ヲ去ル意ナリ。又ハ初メハ人ト我物ノ想有ルガ故ニ。後ニハ我物ノ想無ガ故ニ。之ヲ用也。▲往生極樂之勝行者成佛ノ外迹ハ化他也。▲頓證菩提之玅因ト者菩提ノ實義ハ自證也。問：若爾ハ發心究竟ノ次第ナル可シ。何究竟發心ト列スル乎。答：自家ニ於テ信修ト發心ト之二機有リ。次ノ如ク行入信入ノ機也。式ハ此ノ義ヲ演ヘタリ。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaves 32–33)

 As discussed in Chapter 1, the *hyōbyaku* is perhaps one of the most important features of *kōshiki* since it lays out the broad purpose of the liturgy and establishes the parameters of performance. As I show below, Gahō seizes this opportunity to

113

establish his own parameters of analysis as he draws out the vital role of faith in practice. Lines 24–27 of the *Shari kuyō shiki* comprise a series of declaratory statements regarding the stewardship of relics among human beings or, more specifically, Shingon Buddhists:

> For this reason [we] expound the profound implication of the esoteric canon, praise the merit of inner realization, accumulate offerings of *maṇi* [jewels], and perform offerings of relics of white gems. [As for] the excellent activity of deliverance to the [Land of] Ultimate Bliss, how can the marvelous practice of the sudden realization of enlightenment in any way compare to these?

> 所以開密藏之奧旨、讚內證之功德、儲摩尼之供養、獻白玉之舍利。往生極樂之勝行、頓證菩提之妙因、何事如之。(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, lines 24–27)

Gahō seizes upon these lines by clarifying connections between relics and faith in the practitioner. We see themes similar to the allegory of the physician, namely that faith is one major component of practice, but here Gahō presents a different allegory. On the topic of arousing the already-enlightened mind (*hosshin* 發心), he begins by presenting an allegory on how people enter fields to till at different intervals according to various customs of impurity. In a treatment similar to lines 126–133 above, Gahō's allegory follows a citation from Kūkai's *Gilded Key to the Secret Vault* (*Hizōhōyaku* 祕藏寶鑰, T no. 2426). In this work, described by

114

Ryūichi Abé (1999, 124–125) as a disjointed record of oral instructions Kūkai

received from his master, Huiguo 惠果 (746–805), Kūkai mentions five staple

grains that are the most beneficial to human beings: barley (*ōmugi* 大麥), wheat

(*komugi* 小麥), rice (*tōkoku* 稻穀), lentil (*shōzu* 小豆), and sesame (*koma* 胡麻).

Among them, Gahō claims that rice (*kome*) is foremost in that its five

flavors possess various virtues. Here, Gahō uses metaphor as an expository tool.

The Japanese transliteration of the Sanskrit term for relic (*śāli*) is *shari* and thus

Gahō appeals to the keen eye and ear of the reader. Just as rice is the unsurpassed

agricultural grain among human beings, so too are relics (*shari*) the unsurpassed

bodily grains of the Buddha in the present world. Likewise, just as rice is replete

with virtue in five flavors, so too are relics replete with the various virtues of

Buddhahood; rice nourishes the body of the practitioner in the same way as relics

nourish the practitioner's innate Buddhahood. Finally, he even appeals to the

visual similarities between polished white rice and the luminous white color of

Buddha relics:

> "The form of that which is called polished rice is none other than white in
>
> color. Therefore, in the situation that this white jewel is a phenomenon no
>
> different from reality, it directly indicates a rice grain."
>
> 謂所米精ノ形ハ即チ白色也。故ニ今ノ白玉卽事而眞ノ時ハ直ニ米粒
>
> ヲ指ス也。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaf 33)

Gahō continues in his use of this agricultural metaphor in his discussion of the two-step sequence in arousing one's mind to enlightenment: one begins by fostering faith and then engages practices that continue to foster this faith. This portion of the passage is important not only in its explication of the centrality of faith as a starting point, but also for its positioning of the *Shari kuyō shiki* as a liturgy that captures that centrality. Continuing from his metaphor of rice grains, Gahō describes some of the social and legal parameters of sowing a field; one must enter the field as a worker on the land of another at the right time according to customary intervals of impurity. This imperative to follow certain intervals of purity and impurity derive from early customs of agricultural rites surrounding planting and harvesting; prayers were offered at spring and fall intervals in order to petition for successful planting and harvesting.[33] In demonstrating one's intention to follow these customs, one first establishes in one's mind notions of ownership, spatial sovereignty or, as Gahō states, perceptions of property of others and one's own property (人ト我物ノ想). Property owned during this period was sown through one of two agreements. Smaller plots were given over to tenant cultivation (*kosaku* 小作) overseen by peasant farmers, while larger holdings were treated as farming units and were worked by the holder (*tedzukuri* 手作り) and its dependents (Smith 1959, 5–6).

Through metaphor, Gahō appears to equate the field to one's mental field and seeds to one's mental thoughts. Just as one enters the field with intentions to dispel impurity, so too do practitioners enter their minds with the perceptions of

116

duality that separate the practitioner from divinities. Faith, however, works to dispel those perceptions:

> Sometimes one enters the field according to impurity. During this interval [of time] there is intention to dispel the impure. For this reason, at the beginning [of the arousal of faith] there is the perception of oneself and [other] living beings. For this [same] reason, after [the arousal of faith] there is a lack of perception of oneself and [other] living beings. This is the use of faith. (See page 112 above)

If we extend Gahō's metaphor, we can infer that tending the field (i.e. cultivating faith) yields a fruitful harvest (i.e. awakening). Gahō ends this section by making a reflexive assertion about the purpose of the *Shari kuyō shiki* in explaining at least two faculties recognized in the Shingon tradition.

> There are two levels of faculty with regard to faithful practice and arousing the mind [toward enlightenment] in our school. They are the faculty of entry by practice and the faculty of entry by faith. This ritual expresses the meaning of this. (See page 112 above)

This assertion clarifies our understanding of the *Shari kuyō shiki* as a text and performance of practical function. His treatment of this portion of the announcement illuminates and amplifies Kakuban's views on faith in practice, but also identifies the utility of these views in the greater ritual program within the Shingon school. That is, the *Shari kuyō shiki* is meant to express and

117

communicate to audience member the centrality of faith in identifying with a divinity and, ultimately, in bearing the fruits of awakening.

As we saw in Chapter 1, Kakuban has much to say about the sharp and dull (*ridon* 利鈍) capacities of the practitioner and, in his system, describes several ways that awakening is made possible through practices that are refined through clerical training. Yet in the fourth section of his *"Esoteric Commentary on the Mantras of the Five Elements and Nine Seed-Syllables"* (*Gorin kuji myō himitsushaku* 五輪九字明祕密釋*), Kakuban also describes how even if one lacks profound wisdom, engaging in contemplative practice with faith in its efficacy will naturally bring about results. While contemplation on the syllable *A* is, for Kakuban, a singular practice in terms of its ease and efficacy, one should perform all manner of Shingon practices from a point of faith and trust. In the fifth section of the same text, Kakuban expresses precisely the point of Gahō's metaphor of sowing the field during proper intervals of purity:

> If one does not choose [the] moment of *siddhi* [*shijji* 悉地; i.e. the attainment of enlightenment], faithful practice is the time.
>
> 悉地時ヲ簡バズ、信修是レ時ナリ。(*Kōgyō daishi zenshū*, vol. 5, 199)

From a few lines on the nature of relics culled from the announcement, Gahō is able to draw out some of the fundamental convictions of Kakuban regarding faith and trust in Shingon practice. The central focus here is not only on the imperative to approach all manner of practice, including relic worship, with faith and trust, but also that Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* operates as an expression of—or perhaps

a call to—this imperative. While the liturgy itself offers up a view of the contours of faith-based practice in a ritual format, Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō* is, ultimately, a set of meta-instructions meant to study alongside. While I take up the influence and use of Gahō's exegesis in Chapter 4, this text communicates that Gahō saw the *Shari kuyō shiki* as a liturgy that captures one of Kakuban's fundamental perspectives on access to doctrine and practice.

Gahō's *Makino-o mondō shō*

The transcription of the *Makino-o Commentary* in my possession gives no date for the original composition of Gahō's text. There are, however, indications that that Gahō composed this text at Mount Makino-o, a temple complex located on the northwest outskirts of Kyoto, after he composed his *Shari kuyō shiki*. After receiving training from Kakuzei 覺濟 (1227–1303) and Shōken 證賢 (n.d.) at Kongōō'in 金剛王院 in Kyoto, he traveled to Mount Kōya to concentrate his practice in the Three Mysteries (*sanmitsugyō* 三密行). Thereafter, he traveled to Saimyōji 西明寺 of Mount Makino-o where he resided from at least 1309, though likely earlier. Kōngōkaku 金剛覺 (retired Emperor Uda, 1267–1324; r. 1274–1287) ordered the erection of various dormitory halls at Makino-o in 1290 and renamed the complex Byōdōshinnō'in 平等心王院. (Saitō and Naruse 1986, 97). We can only speculate as to the date of composition of his *Makino-o mondō shō*, though since the order to build the dormitories came down in 1290, we can, leaving a few years for construction, approximate Gahō's residence in those dormitories beginning from around 1293–1295. The written record gives his first

sets of lectures, which largely focused on the works of Kūkai, at Makino-o in 1309. I deduce, therefore, that Gahō composed his *Makino-o mondō shō* sometime between the years 1294 and 1309.

Beyond the motifs of faith and devotion, there are two broader reasons why this text is particularly suitable for contextualizing Gahō's own perspective on Shingon doctrine after his exposition of Kakuban. First, the structure of the *Makino-o mondō shō* indicates that it was meant for self-study and reference. Across one hundred sections of varying length, Gahō explores one major theme per section with relative concision; conversely, these sections do not appear to be thematically connected as a doctrinal treatise would, nor does Gahō attempt to convey an overarching perspective on the sections as a whole. Records show he had a sizable student following at Makino-o due specifically to his scholastic mastery of exo- and esoteric studies (*ken-mitsu no gaku* 顕密の學) and his level of virtuous conduct (*tokugyō* 德行; Saitō and Naruse 1986, 97). It is therefore possible that he used this text as a primer among this following. The text, moreover, assumes a base knowledge of Shingon doctrine since there are a variety of key terms that remain undefined or unexplained. As perhaps a private textbook, the *Makino-o mondō shō* differs in this way from other texts that focus on simplifying ideas for the sake of conversion such as notes on *dharma* debates (*hōdan* 法談) or instances of lay preaching (*sekkyō* 説教). In short, the structure of the *Makino-o mondō shō* offers access to Gahō's teachings in an isolated and organized way, one in which we can assess his own perspective on a categorical basis.

Second, discussions of doctrine constitute a majority of the text. I discern three major categories and various sub-categories across its entirety: 1) Practice (1a. Ritual and 1b. Cultivative); 2) Doctrine (2a. Terminological and 2b. Expository); 3) Material/Regulatory.[34] The content of these sections suggests that Gahō taught a wide range of Shingon tenets and concepts. Although doctrine comprises over half of the work, Gahō does not appear to favor any one major thematic issue, but instead gives a survey of some of the major issues that comprise Shingon doctrine and practice. Where one might get a sense of an author's perspective on a narrow issue by reading a treatise on that issue, the content of the *Makino-o mondō shō* suggests that Gahō was interested in surveying a variety of features in order to give an overall picture of Shingon doctrine as he observed it. In other words, although Gahō highlights various sub-topics within sections on practice, image production, and regulatory procedures, doctrine still figures into his analysis by way of scriptural or commentarial pedigree as authoritative textual support. In this sense, although the topics and sub-topics that comprise the *Makino-o mondō shō* are under Gahō's full control, he offers a composite picture of Shingon doctrine and practice by way of this support. This practice of extensive citation is not uncommon for scholarly analyses in the Buddhist tradition, but here it is telling of the ways in which Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō* not only captured Kakuban's distinct doctrinal views but that those views influenced this later composition.

Selection One: *Section Four, [On the] Matter of Central Objects of Devotion*

In Section Four of his *Makino-o mondō shō*, Gahō outlines the role of central objects of devotion (*honzon* 本尊), or the various divinities at the center of ritual and practice. Here he makes claims on two major doctrinal points: First, that Mahāvairocana, the cosmic Buddha and principal focus of the Shingon school, is indistinguishable from other Buddhas and bodhisattvas and, second, that faith, devotion and sincerity in practice are the true expression of awakening. He uses several key phrases to make this clear and draws from an important Zhēnyán (Jp: Shingon) sutra commentary authored by Yixing 一行 (683–727) in 725.[35] While he does not discount the importance of distinguishing acts of refuge (*kie* 歸依) from one another in a provisional sense, the deepest understanding of the *dharma*, he says, arises when one knows all these objects as Mahāvairocana. Developing this insight is not simply a technique for focusing one's devotional efforts on the principal Buddha, but it also has soteriological value in the program of practice. As Janet Gyatso (1998, 199) describes, insight into nonduality underlies the very possibility of an enlightened state; if the illusion of binaries and pluralities were real in any substantive way, there could be no possibility of their elimination. One implication of Gahō's insistence, therefore, is an intimate relationship between acts of refuge and the possibility of enlightenment. Devotional acts are not merely devotional but also expressive of one's epistemological position:

> Question: In the main purpose of this doctrine, the Buddhas, bodhisattvas, and luminous kings (*myōō* 明王) all serve as the principal divinities [who

preside over ceremonies]. As for practitioners, to which divinity should they devote to attain *siddhi* [Jp: *shijji* 悉他; perfection]?

Answer: Section Seven[36] of the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana-abhisaṃbodhi-tantra* 大毘盧遮那成佛經疏 states: "Furthermore, [as for the] the five ranks of enlightenment within the three mandalas, these are all the esoteric empowerment of Vairocana. All His companions become Buddhas in one lifetime with distinction between those of shallow or profound understanding." Section Six[37] of the same commentary states: "The Buddha and the Buddha Way are not different routes." [The question of] which object to which devotion is aimed is like this [sentence]. By practicing the *dharma* [one] ought to achieve *siddhi* [perfection]. However, the practices and conducts focus on various divinities. There is no single application. There are some practitioners who faithfully entrust themselves to a Buddha. Some practitioners, who from the very first consecration to forge a karmic connection [with a Buddha], should fix upon that Buddha. This is the oral transmission of our ancestral teacher [Kūkai]. One ought to not mistake any of the patriarchs in these three explanations [above]. It is for this reason that we rely on our teacher's transmission. These methods of using objects of devotion are not useless. Faithfully entrusting in the Buddha and a consecration to forge a karmic connection to [a Buddha or bodhisattva] both result from karma of one's previous lives. Nonetheless, within the three explanations [above]

there is a faithful entrusting in the Buddha. This is how one picks one's own divinity.

For example, even though the sense organs of the human tongue detect five flavors, there are [also] desirable tastes for the ear. It is like excess taste.38 The practitioner's material body is the mandalas of two realms. In whatever Buddha you place your trust is the Buddha-nature endowed in your own body entrusting that Buddha. If your *ācārya* (Jp: *ajari* 阿闍梨, "master of esoteric ceremonies") tells you to trust a different Buddha you will lack faith and this will be as if you have not entered the manifest function of esoteric scriptures. Thus, attaching to any divinity accords with the teachings of the Buddha. If [one] commits to this practice they will surely become a Buddha. How could one give rise to selection and rejection? But in accordance with the four types and five types of dharma [rituals] they each have a distinct divinity.

問：此ノ宗ノ意佛菩薩明王等ハ皆本尊ノ躰也。行者ハ何ノ尊ニ付テ、悉地ヲ成ル可シ耶。答：大疏第七云ク：「若更ニ深秘密尺ヲ作如シ、三曼荼羅ノ中ニ五位ノ三昧ハ是レ皆ナ毘盧遮那ノ秘密加持ナリ。其レ與ニ相應者皆ナ一生ニ成佛可シ。何浅深之殊有リ文」同疏第六云ク：「仏與ニ道門ヲ更ニ無異路文」是文ノ如ク何ノ尊ニ付ルモ如シ。法ニ修行ニハ悉地ヲ成ル可シ。但シ諸行諸修ハ本尊ヲ用ル。一准セ不、或ハ行者任運ニ信ズル佛アリ。或ハ行者最初結縁灌

頂時ノ得佛ヲ本尊ト成ル可シ。之祖師口傳ナリ。此三義何モ祖違有ル可カラ不。其ノ故ニ師傳ニ依リ。其ノ流ノ本尊ヲ用モ徒然ニアラ不。又任運ノ信佛並ビニ灌頂得佛モ皆過去フ宿習也。然而ルニ三義ノ中ニ任運ノ信佛アリ。之ヲ以テ本尊ト為可シ。歆假令、人舌根五味ヲ備ト雖モ耳味好者アリ。餘味又爾也。行者色身兩部万荼羅也。何ノ尊モ自身所具ノ佛性德モ信ズル佛ナリ。何阿闍梨只ダ別佛之ニ信ズル可シ。旨之ヲ示せバ還テ、不信ヲ生キル可キガ顯機密藏ニ入ラ不ルガ如シ。爾ラ者何ノ尊ニ付テモ如法ヒ。修行セハ成佛ス可シ。何ゾ取捨ヲ生キ可キヤ哉。倶シ四種、五種法ニ就テ、本尊各別也。(*Makino-o mondō shō*, leaves 13–15)

There are four reasons why this section of his commentary, along with others that explicitly engage with the issue of devotion and faith, is important for linking the *Makino-o mondō shō* with the *Shari kuyō shiki shō*. First, and in line with Gahō's major claims here, Kakuban himself understood the indistinguishability between Mahāvairocana, other Buddhas and bodhisattvas, and relics as part and parcel of Shingon Buddhist devotion. As he describes in his *Shari kuyō shiki*, to give rise to doubt, lack faith, or to question this indistinguishability is to lack "true awakening" (*shingaku* 眞覺):[39]

How could the various Buddhas not be the dharma body that is free from duality? Partial attainment and complete attainment are nondual. How [could one] cling to the whole body and its individual iotas separately?

The dharma [body] and response [body] are identical. Do not understand the awakening [of the response body] and the universal illumination [of the dharma body] as different. They are nothing other than a production of this dharma. We call it true awakening. Apart from ordinary people, there are no Buddhas [and] we call this profound insight.

諸佛寧非無二法身。分滿不二。何起全體一粒之別執。法應惟同。勿生能寂遍照之異解。卽生是法。名之眞覺。離凡無佛、謂之深觀。(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, text #40, lines 128–131).

Second, and as we saw in the two above expositions of parts of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Kakuban, like nearly all Buddhists, considered faith a deeply necessary requisite for successful practice. In line with similar assertions made in the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* on trusting in one's development in practice, Kakuban writes that one must have faith in the combinatory efficacy of mantras and mutual empowerment (*kaji* 加持). According to the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*:

Next, Master of the Secret and Hidden, in the stage of practice of faithful understanding on observes three minds, the vision of wisdom [derived from] immeasurable perfections, and the four means of converting [others]. The stage of faithful understanding is unobstructed, immeasurable, and inconceivable. [Through it] one attains the ten minds and boundless knowledge arises. All things that I have expounded are acquired on this foundation. For this reason, as for the wise, they should

126

ponder this stage of faithful understanding in their pervasive wisdom. Moving through another *kalpa*, [the wise] will abide in this stage. One quarter of this will at once take [the wise] beyond faithful understanding.

復次祕密主。信解行地。觀察三心無量波羅蜜多慧觀四攝法。信解地。無對。無量。不思議。逮十心無邊智生。我一切諸有所説。皆依此而得。是故智者。當思惟此一切智信解地。復越一劫昇住此地。此四分之一度於信解。(T no. 848 3b24–3c01)

In section three of his "Esoteric Commentary on the Mantras of the Five Elements and Nine Seed-Syllables", he describes how imperative it is to engage in practice from a point of faith and trust and, moreover, that the result of this mode of engagement supersedes all others. As he says:

Even without practice or cognitive wisdom alone, if [one has] faith, the merit that is acquired will surpass the merit that is acquired across countless eons of exoteric teachings.

偏修偏念智無クトモ、信アレバ所得ノ功徳、顕教ノ無量劫ヲ経テ得ル所ノ功徳ニ迢過セリ。(*Kōgyō daishi zenshū*, vol. 5, 197)

For Kakuban, faith in the efficacy of practice was a paramount feature of developing one's degree of insight, and in this section of Gahō's *Makino-o mondō shō* we find this imperative in equal measure.

Third, Gahō's explanation of the nonduality shared between various manifestations of Mahāvairocana is a primary theme that Kakuban expresses in relation to the Buddha's Great Compassion (*daihi* 大悲) in his *Shari kuyō shiki*; one ought to understand a Buddha relic, the central object of devotion in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, as nothing other than an embodiment of Mahāvairocana's Great Compassion. Taking refuge in relics as concentrations of compassion and as sources of benefits, Kakuban says, will necessarily allow one to escape suffering. In making offerings to them, one will know the four virtues of enlightenment. As he states:

> Now the Buddha Path is not distant, [but] is fundamentally intrinsic our own mind. The Pure Land is not external, [but] its nature imbues our own body. Nonetheless, sentient beings are foolish and dim and do not know that they abide within this store. They are all deluded, deranged and drunk [with ignorance], unaware of the precious jewel hidden in [their] cloak. Thus, the Tathāgata, from his great sea of compassion, emanates his transformation body, not born yet born, invisible yet visible. In response to the karmic desires of living beings, the benefits for sentient beings are without limit. Accordingly, the conditions for his transformation have already come to an end. Although he shows himself as completely extinct, [the Buddha's] Great Compassion does not cease but still abides in his

128

relics. Thus, upon taking refuge [in those relics], you will necessarily cross over the ocean of three existences. Even the slightest of offerings [to them] and you will certainly ascend the summit of the four virtues.

夫以佛道不遠、本備自心。淨土無外、性具己身。然衆生癡暗不智宅中之伏藏。群迷狂醉、無覺衣裏之寶珠。是故如來從大悲海、流演化身、不生而生、無相現相。隨其性欲、利生無邊。遂乃化緣已盡雖示滅度、大悲不休、尚留舍利。適致歸依、必渡三有之海。纔興供養、定登四德之峯。(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, lines 13–19)

In fact, in his *Dialogues on the Syllable A* (*Aji mondō* अ 字問答), he describes Great Compassion as the very "root of enlightenment" (*daihi ikon* 大悲為根). Kakuban begins his explanation of this sequence by parsing a three-glyph compound for originally unarisen (*honpushō* 本不生) syllable *A*, synonymous with all myriad phenomena, including Mahāvairocana:

"Originally" is a phrase [that denotes] the cultivation of an aroused mind. The cause of the seeds of an aroused mind is therefore the original source and beginning of the fruits of practice. "Un-" is a phrase [that denotes] the basis of compassion. To wit, "un-" is void, empty. "Arisen" is a phrase that refers to skillful techniques as the culmination of enlightenment.

129

本ト者、菩提心為因ノ句。菩提心ノ種子ノ因ハ、行果ノ本源初ナル
ガ故ニ。不ト者、大悲為根ノ句。謂ク不ト者空也、無也。。。生と
者、方便為究竟ト云フ句ニ攝ス。(*Kōgyō daishi zenshū*, vol. 5, 1022).

A similar formulation appears in the Mahāvairocana Sūtra, here again referring to
the state of enlightenment:

Compassion is the basis, the arousal of the mind is the practice, and

skillful techniques are the culmination [of enlightenment].

悲爲根本。菩提心爲因。方便爲究竟 (T no. 848 1b29–1c01).

Gahō echoes this idea in this section on objects of devotion in a variety of ways,

but his mention of having a natural faith (*nin'un ni shinzuru* 任運ニ信ズル) as

one initial entry to practice stands out.

Fourth, Gahō's efforts to highlight the openness of devotional acts. In

addition to the mode of entry through natural faith, one may also enter awakening

through practicing rites of consecration with a Buddha or bodhisattva. There is

not, as he states, a single aptitude for awakening; some practitioners may have a

natural affinity for acts of refuge, while others may connect through a formal and

initial consecration ritual. No matter the mode of entry, though, faith is essential

for the practitioner to ensure effective practice. This emphasis on the utility of

faith and devotion, as well as the emphasis on multiple entries to awakening,

reflect Kakuban's particular views on faith as a potent stand-in for instances of misapplied practice. Faith, it seems, opens the path to soteriological efficacy.

The above concepts are not of exclusive Shingon design, but constitute a broader, Mahāyāna framework that binds together compassion—both human and transcendent—and the soteriological goal of awakening. It is the connection to Mahāvairocana, as the font of this necessary compassion, that imparts a Shingon fundamentality; only through the Great Compassion of the principal Buddha may one plant the root of enlightenment. By way of the correct perception of nonduality shared between Great Compassion and objects of devotion that Gahō describes, one can carry out proper devotional acts. Finally, through faith, one can progress on the path of practice despite an initial lack of this correct epistemological perception.

In this way Gahō demonstrates the vital role played by devotion in the greater soteriological program for Shingon Buddhists of his time. He echoes and elaborates on Kakuban's perspective in Section Four of his *Makino-o mondō shō*, whereby he equates faith in the Buddha's compassion, which is made manifest in and through acts of devotion, with enlightened understanding of the indistinguishability between distinct Buddhas and, ultimately, Buddhas and practitioner.

Selection Two: *Section Fourteen, [On the] Matter of the Eight-Thousand Stick [Goma Ritual]*

Another selection from the *Makino-o mondō shō* makes clear reference to Great Compassion, faith and nonduality through reference to two of Kakuban's works, his *Secret Explanation of the Eight-Thousand Stick [Goma Ritual]* (*Hassen mai hisshaku* 八千牧秘釋) and *Efficacy of the Five Elemental Luminous Kings* (*Go dai myōō kunō* 五大明王功能). These are two of many of Kakuban's works that Gahō cites throughout his commentary, but these stand out for their allegorical advancement of the themes outlined above.

Gahō begins by describing and explaining some of the verbally and visually symbolic systems surrounding the image of Fudō myōō 不動明王, one of the primary deities of protection who resides over the *dharma* and is commonly part of the Mahāvairocana image triad. Practitioners are meant to perform the Eight-Thousand Stick Goma Ritual before an image of Fudō myōō, a deity that is depicted as standing on the stone platform in a body water, as Gahō describes.

In tracing the meaning behind the count of eight thousand milkwood (*nyūmoku* 乳木) sticks necessary for a proper ritual, Gahō cites Kakuban's *Secret Explanation of the Eight-Thousand Stick [Goma Ritual]*.[40] Therein, we find the fundamental problem of delusion laid bare; sentient beings are stricken with a deluded mind, which is discernable in eight parts.[41] One thousand afflictions populate each of those eight divisions and therefore, as Gahō purports, we have a single milkwood stick for the eradication of each affliction. Of a ritual meant to

expiate such afflictions through the offering of each stick to the power of Fudō Myōō, Gahō takes Kakuban as an authority on the history of ritual protocol.

In the *Efficacy of the Five Elemental Luminous Kings*, Kakuban explores the ways in which practitioners can petition the virtues of the five dharma-protecting kings, Fudō 不動 (Skt. Acalāgra), Gōsanze 降三世 (Skt. Trailokyavijaya), Gundari 軍荼利 (Skt. Kuṇḍalī), Daiitoku 大威德 (Skt. Yamāntaka), and Kongōyasa 金剛夜叉 (Skt. Vajrayakṣa; Ono 1933–1936, 270d). In continuative reference to the imperative to penetrate delusion, Kakuban compares the skill of Yōyū, an unmatched archer who appears in Mencius, and the roar of a lion, to the disarming qualities of virtue and wisdom; these qualities can effect the immediate erasure of delusion if channeled appropriately. Kakuban once again invokes Kūkai in his use of the physician allegory deployed in the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Here, Kakuban describes the skill of famous Indian Buddhist lay physician Jīvaka and Chinese physician Biànjuān (Jpn: *Henken* 遍鵲), both of whom, he says, are able to transform bad poison (i.e. delusion) into "healthy sprouts" (*ryōga* 良芽).42 In much the same way as in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Kakuban's assertions about the nature of delusion and the transformative power of the various Buddhas, bodhisattvas, and deities is a matter of perspective; correctly perceiving the nondual nature of delusion and awakening is the initial step in eradicating the delusion and affliction that comprise the sentient mind. The Eight-Thousand Stick Goma Ritual, as Gahō appears to suggest with his deliberate citation of Kakuban and Kūkai here, is a physical expression of the power of that transformation—just as one consigns to fire the eight-thousand

milk-wood sticks, one ought to rely on the powerful virtues of the five dharma-protecting kings as a combustive force in eliminating one's delusion:

At the time of the eight-thousand-stick *goma*, [when] tossing in milk-wood [sticks], those with quick speech complete the spell of salvific compassion. Those with slow speech complete the single-syllable *mantra*. There is oral transmission [regarding this].

What is its source and, as for answers in that oral transmission, which ought to guide others?

Now, take the five-syllable mantra for Fudo Myōō. The five elemental dharma characteristics appear accordingly within the divinities. [The five elements are] nothing other than this divinity [Fudō Myōō]. [In images of this divinity] the great stone platform [represents the earth element *a*], the great ocean [represents the water element *vi*], the flames [represent the fire element *ra*], the deity [i.e. Fudō Myōō] [is represented by a blue-black color and the seed syllable *huṃ*]. Also represented are [the wind element *am* and vast space [space element *mam*]. For this reason, we recite the five-syllable mantra, and toss in the [milk-wood] sticks.

Question: What is the history of the 8,000-sticks?

Answer: A *sūtra* states: "The 8,000-sticks came to this world in former days. This is a matter of Śākyamuni as one of the *tathāgata*'s eight-thousand manifestations [in the world]. Attached to this is the burning of eight-thousand milk-wood [sticks]. Kakuban's *Hassen mai hisshaku* states: "In eliminating the obstructions of the eight

134

consciousnesses, does authentication make manifest the principle and wisdom of the various Buddhas? As for the deluded minds of sentient beings, their quantity is immeasurable. From the breadth [of their minds] does not exceed eight consciousnesses. Within the eight consciousnesses are each a thousand distinct types of afflictions. It therefore culminates in eight thousand. As for striving for the complete quantity of that which is "thousand," [Kūkai's] *Hizōki* states: 'Strive for the complete quantity of that which is 'thousand.'" Kakuban's *Godai myōō kunō* states: "If Yōyū draws his bow, birds in the sky fall to the ground. When the lion roars, the birds in the mountains and forests lose their courage. Is hearing the power of demon king Pāpīyas [i.e. Māra] not delusion? Bad poisons are transformed before the eyes of Jīvaka and Biànjuān, and they become good sprouts. At the seat of the world of stone demons, tiles and pebbles are transformed and become gold and jewels. [Before] the greatly honored luminous kings of today, fundamental afflictions are none other than the eye of the bodhisattva. Accordingly, they perceive suffering as nothing other than the adornment of enlightenment. Rather than the poisons of greed and anger, they become the good sprouts of *dharma* body wisdom."

八千牧時乳木ヲ擲ルニ早ロノ人ハ慈救ノ咒ヲ満ズ。遅ロノ人ハ一字ノ咒ヲ満ス。口決アリ。何ヲ以テ本ト為ス乎。如彼口決ノ答エハ人ニ依リ可シカ。又五字明安鎮ノ軌ニ不動明ト為ス。諸尊ノ中ニハ正ク法性ノ五大ヲ顕ス。則此尊也。大盤石 [大地 अ] 大海 [大水 वि] 大

火[大火 र] 尊 [靑黑色種子 हु]。 則 [大風 अं] 虛空 [大空 मं]。₄₃是故ニ五字ノ明ヲ誦シテ、乳木ヲ擲ル歟。問：八千牧何由緒有耶。答：或經ニ云ク：「古今此世界ニ来ル。八千返文」。徃来娑婆八千度者尺迦佛御事也。之ノ付八千ノ乳木ヲ燒ク。八千牧秘尺 व ニ云：「八識障ヲ断テ、證ハ諸佛理智ヲ表ス歟。意ノ云衆生ノ妄心其數無量ナリ。廣撮略從八識ニ過不。八識ニ各千殊ノ惑品有リ。故ニ八千ト成。千ト者満數ヲ舉テ、表ス無數ヲ。秘蔵記ニ云ク：「千者満數ヲ舉文」。」五大明王功能 व ニ云：「養由ハ弓ヲ取レバ、虛空ノ鳥ハ地ニ落ル。獅子ハ吼ル時ハ山林ノ禽ハ肝ヲ失フ。魔王波旬明王ノ威勢ヲ聞テ、寧ロ迷惑不乎。耆婆遍鵲(＝扁鵲)ガ眼ノ前ニ惡毒ヲ轉ジテ、良芽ト為ル。石魔男ノ掌ノ内ニハ瓦礫ヲ變シテ、金玉ト為ル。大聖明王今日煩悩即菩薩ノ眼ヲ以テ生死即涅槃ノ掌ヲ観ス。度給ニ寧ロ貪慾嗔恚ノ惡毒即法身般若ノ良芽ト為ス文」。(*Makino-o mondō shō,* leaves 44–46)

Thus, while the physician allegory finds a place among the earliest Buddhist literature in India and, likewise, across East Asia, its reference in the *Makino-o mondō shō* provides an allegorical culmination, framed in broad Mahāyāna terms, from Gahō's earlier, more pointed elaboration on Kakuban's citation in the *Shari kuyō shiki shō*.₄₄ These are, of course, only two of the one hundred sections that constitute the *Makino-o mondō shō* and there are others that address these core

doctrinal issues either from similar or variant perspectives. Nonetheless, they shed light on how Gahō carried his initial impressions of Kakuban's appraisal of practice and doctrine, especially in light of the primacy of relics in the present world, through his later compositions that were less narrow in focus.

The above analysis is not exhaustive of the *Makino-o mondō shō* as a whole, but it gives a sense of some later context for the ways that Gaho interpreted Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and, more importantly, why he chose to engage with the text to begin with. Kakuban was a prodigious writer and, like Kūkai, composed treatises and commentaries on all manner of Shingon doctrine. As this dissertation argues, the *Shari kuyō shiki* is a text of doctrinal paradigm; it is singular in its composition but wholly encompassing in its content. Gahō clearly saw heuristic possibility within the text to attend to nearly every line in such detail and, as his *Makino-o mondō shō* attests, that heuristic aspect is applicable in other of his doctrinal writings.

Conclusion

When put in contact with one another, Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō* and *Makino-o mondō shō* bring to light some of the major doctrinal themes of the Shingi Shingon school in inverse ways. The former is singular in its purpose in that it emphasizes the primacy of Kakuban's thought with regard to relics, though its overall message is one of universal Mahāyāna import. The latter is broad in its purpose in that it raises all manner of Shingon doctrinal issues, though Gahō nonetheless manages to focus on Kakuban as an authority in many sections.[45]

While it is difficult to attach agency or purpose to Gahō's expository and allegorical techniques across only these texts, they do suggest a bare attention to thematic cohesion between them and, perhaps more broadly, Gahō's general view of Kakuban's principle doctrinal concerns.

There are a number of implications related to the centrality of Kakuban's liturgy during the early modern period, but chief among them is perhaps that it addressed an epistemological gap among the Shingi Shingon community. In a doctrinal sense, the emphases on faith and devotion can stand in for the epistemological barrier that nonduality presents for deluded beings; as Kakuban, Kūkai, and Gahō all echo of one another, faith and devotion are inroads to the direct apprehension of Mahāvairocana—as relic, as image, as Great Compassion and, ultimately, as practitioner.

The implication that the imperative to devotion expressed within the *Shari kuyō shiki* is an accompaniment to religious understanding is further reinforced when one considers the pedagogical and intellectual potential inherent not only to the *Shari kuyō shiki*, as described at the end of the previous chapter of this study, but also to Gahō's commentary. That is, Gahō's treatment of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, along with its inherently expansive rhetorical and semantic characteristics, allows the *Shari kuyō shiki* to support an upper register of apprehension. I detail this higher register, in which clerics carried out intellectual endeavors of ritual study at Chishakuin, in the following chapter.

As Mark Teeuwen (Scheid and Teeuwen 2006, 18–21) has noted, beginning in the early modern period, religious secrecy weakened as a cultural

episteme in Japan because of the influence of Buddhist and Confucian discourses that pervaded society at all levels. While it is impossible to discern whether the widespread use of the *Shari kuyō shiki* within the Shingi Shingon school was either a vector or symptom of this influence, some association seems clear. That is, while complex doctrine and an assumed knowledge pervades a majority of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*, it is ultimately a devotional liturgy that appeals to the fundamental sameness between relics, Mahāvairocana, images, lay practitioners, and clerics. Rather than obfuscate faith and devotion in favor of doctrinal complexities and widen the gap between the doctrinal and social barriers outlined above, Gahō seems to recognize that to interact—in any way—with the liturgy itself can enliven faith and devotion as requisites for practice. In this way, his interpretive strategies, fostered during his earlier commentarial work, had an influence that transcended the page and enjoined followers to make use of their proximity to relics in the present world.

Devotion, Ritual, and Monastic Education at Chishakuin

Introduction

The themes of faith and devotion that Gahō drew out of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* did not remain dormant in his commentary. Nor Gahō's interpretation of the *Shari kuyō shiki* the only scholastic engagement with themes of faith and devotion centered around Kakuban during the course of the formation of the Shingi Shingon branch. Kakuban recognized faith as central to effective practice and, likewise, Gahō recognized its centrality by focusing on it in several of his works, many of which appear to have had instructive purpose. Beyond this, though, faith and devotion also figured prominently in several other liturgies related to Kakuban during crucial decades of denominational formation during the early modern period.

While Chapter 5 will show how readers engaged Gahō's commentary in interactive ways to leverage the heuristic potential of both it and the *Shari kuyō shiki*, the present chapter explores how clerics at Chishakuin integrated devotional rituals into programs for monastic learning and clerical advancement. These activities further reveal the attention paid by high-ranking clerics to the complementarity of acts of devotion and learning, especially in light of greater efforts to reinvigorate the denominational identity of the Shingi Shingon branch at Chishakuin.

This chapter demonstrates the complementarity between devotion and learning by analyzing two principal ceremonies focused on doctrinal mastery among training clerics: the Great Assembly on Dharma Transmission (Denbōdai-

e 傳法大會) and Lecture Requiting the Benefits [of Kakuban's Teachings] (Hōon-kō 報恩講). These rituals served social, devotional, denominational, and administrative purposes for Chishakuin clerics throughout the seventeenth century. By the end of the century, the integration of both ceremonies organized and hierarchized clergy in training at Chishakuin. It reinvigorated a Shingi Shingon denominational identity through direct historical and symbolic connections to its branch founder Kakuban. Finally, it met new curricular demands issued from both the Tokugawa government and head temples within the Shingi branch. These ceremonies also shared calendrical space with performances of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* at Chishakuin. In this way, what I call a devotional circularity—or an interdependent relationship between the requiting aspects of these ceremonies, on the one hand, and their instructive aspects, on the other— located Kakuban at the center of a yearly ritual schedule that addressed each of the purposes above. Devotion drove the revival of these ceremonies as a means to a cohesive denominational doctrine centered around Kakuban, while at the same time it anchored the reinvigoration and maintenance of an independent branch within the Shingon school at the height of its development of monastic education.

Monastic Learning at Chishakuin

Danrin 談林 denotes a place of Buddhist clerical education. While this compound evokes the English "seminary" insofar as it signifies a place to foster a command over religious doctrine, one commonly used English rendering is "regional academy," which more precisely captures the geographical connections between

provincial sites of religious learning and their head temples (see Ambros 2009, 87, n. 16; Vesey 2003, 207). The regional academy system (*danrin seido* 談林制度), which consolidated and standardized monastic education within several Buddhist schools during the early modern period, began as early as the thirteenth century when residential monks living or staying at temples began to spontaneously congregate to discuss the meaning (*dangi* 談義) of scriptures and texts. Congregations and the subjects under discussion among them developed individual characteristics at each temple, which led to a lack of cohesion with regard to basic study and learning objectives across the Shingon school. Yet each temple was also focused on the social organization of training monks, and this effort to loosely organize under the parameters of scholastic learning marked these early temples as sites of formalized discussions of [doctrinal] meaning (*dangisho* 談義所 or *danrinsho* 談林所), which continued to meet concerns over clear and effective hierarchizations of the community of clerics.

The early institutionalization of Shingi Shingon *dangisho* began at the end of the sixteenth century. Four temples affiliated with Negoroji 根来寺, then the center of Kakuban's following, served as the first sites at which *dangi* were regularly offered: Kuronikudera 黒貫寺, Mantokuji 満徳寺, Shōkaiji 性海寺, and Yakuōji 薬王寺. By 1560, these temples had begun to weaken in power. At the same time, there occurred a sudden rise in power among Shingi-affiliated temples in the Kantō region. In 1565, in an effort to rebalance and throttle the growing power of these temples in the Kantō region, the government issued

regulations (*hatto* 法度) that made Negoroji and Chishakuin the principle *danrin* in the Kansai region.

In 1585, however, Negoroji was sacked by provincial warlord Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉 (1537–1598), who had inherited many of the rivalries between his predecessor, Oda Nobunaga 織田信長 (1534–1582), and several powerful Buddhist factions. Toyotomi had especially feared the monks at Negoroji who had, by this time, amassed large volumes of firearms to defend the temple (Turnbull 2003, 26–27). After the Toyotomi's successful siege in 1585, the Chisan and Buzan branches split, which opened the prospect of several subsidiary *danrin* at various regional temples. Interest in monastic learning among Shingon *danrin* accelerated significantly thereafter (Nakajima 1998, 136–137).

During the Tokugawa era, the first regulations that applied to Chishakuin focused on three general areas: fixing the social standing of abbots, stimulating study and learning, and regulating control over regional temples. In 1603, the Tokugawa government issued regulations stipulating that all monastic education be delivered at *danrin*, and that future teaching responsibilities in an official capacity be contingent upon at least twenty years of study at *danrin*. For training clerics, this new scholastic trajectory mandated this twenty-year term of study before allowing a return to one's regional temple to engage in lectures on the Buddha's teachings (*hōdan* 法談) and general instruction among novice clerics (Nakajima 1998, 138–139). These new parameters placed on the duration and location of Buddhist learning within the Shingon school meant that instruction

was issued from specific sites and issued consistently among clergy staying at these sites for extended periods of time.

By the end of the seventeenth century, Chishakuin issued more detailed regulations on the education and organization of clergy among its subsidiary temples. Kakugen, by this time eleventh abbot of Chishakuin, refined a system of visual differentiation among training monks derived from a prior system developed by Ryūkō 隆光 (1649–1724), imperially appointed abbot (*monzeki* 門跡) of the Buzan temple Murōji 室生寺. In 1695, Ryūkō's system of colored robes (*shikie jōmoku* 色衣条目) distinguished between monks residing at a *danrin* temple from those residing at a non-*danrin* temple. While this system of visual distinction set apart those clerics within ther twenty-year training period from those outside of it, it also formed a new, visually distinctive social sub-group of clerical training. Ryūko's system of color distinction was later codified by Kakugen in 1709 as official guidelines on robe color (*shikie shikimoku* 色衣式目). He introduced a new requirement that training monks spend at least three years of their twenty-year training period at either Chishakuin or Hasedera. He also stipulated that robe color be determined by how many years beyond this three-year minimum the training monk spent at the head temple during the training period, as well as whether or not the *danrin* at which they studied was recognized as a temple for imperial prayer (*dokurei* 獨禮) or a temple with direct land grants from the shogunate (referred to as "red seal" temples, or *shuin* 赤印); (Nakajima 1998, 140–142). Kakugen's expansion of Ryūko's system directly integrated the imperial recognition of the Tokugawa government, which more

144

fully linked Chishakuin to programs of monastic education under the rule of law. Tokugawa regulations also stipulated that the name of each cleric be placed in a school register (*gakuseki* 學籍) and that the yearly advancements through the stages of monastic education be logged (Nakajima 1998, 136).

Thus, while *danrin* served a practical purpose for the Tokugawa government in that they helped to control temples as sites of religious learning that had the potential of gaining much social and institutional power, they also served a practical purpose for Shingon school. *Danrin* introduced a consistency and regularity to monastic instruction and emphasized for Shingon clergy the imperative of training and advancing to the role of chief priest (*jūshoku* 住職), for whom similar responsibilities of instruction at regional *danrin* would become available after such training and advancement.

"Lecture Requiting the Benefits [of Kakuban's Teachings]"

In addition to regulations issued by the Tokugawa government that sought to streamline and control monastic education among temples, the head temples of the Shingon school (Mount Kōya, Tōji, Daigoji, Ninnaji representing Kogi Shingon and Chishakuin and Hasedera representing Shingi Shingon), with newly sanctioned administrative power under the system of head and subsidiary temples (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度), created their own regulations among the subsidiary network beginning in the 1630s. Among these was the direct integration of the "Lecture Requiting the Benefits [of Kakuban's Teachings]" (Hōon-kō 報恩講) into Shingi Shingon *danrin* curricula, a measure co-signed by representatives of

145

head temples of both Chisan and Buzan branches of the Shingi Shingon school. (Nakajima 1998, 139).

At a practical level, the Hōon-kō is a bi-annual period of monastic instruction for the purpose of advancement. During the summer and winter seasons, clerics commit to intense study and memorization that culminates in a monastery-wide ceremonial examination. While clerics typically performed the Hōon-kō during the summer and winter seasons at Chishakuin during the early modern era, from the start of the Meiji period, they only performed the winter Hōon-kō annually (Nakajima 1998, 152). Sakaki (2000, 150) has shown how historical records do not clearly indicate the cause of phasing out the summer Hōon-kō.

At a devotional level, the Hōon-kō is also a ritualized requital. Through the performance, participants and witnesses recognize, praise, and express gratitude for the teachings of Kakuban. The Hōon-kō was originally referred to as the Kakuban-kō 覺鑁講 and likely began in performance for Kakuban in 1344 (Sakaki 2000, 136). Nakajima (1998, 151) describes the Hōon-kō as a dharma assembly (*hō'e* 法會) and doctrinal discussion (*rongi* 論議) for the requital of Kakuban (*Kaisan Kōgyō Daishi he no hōon* 開山興教大師への報恩). In essence, the Hōon-kō is performed in a dedicatory mode whereby Shingi participants ceremonially recognize their founder figure and the primacy of his teachings.

With regard to content, the summer and winter Hōon-kō performances each focus on mastery of different source material. The winter Hōon-kō focuses on the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra*, while the summer Hōon-kō

146

focuses on the *Explanation of Mahāyana Discourse* (*Shaku Makaen ron* 釋摩訶
衍論, T. no. 1668)

The basic schedules of both the summer and winter Hōon-kō rituals are
the same in length.46 The winter Hōon-kō schedule (Ogasawara 2005, 68–72), for
example, spans the ninth through twelfth months and includes several stages of
preparation, instruction, and assessment. During the ninth month, first- and
second-year novices spend each day receiving instruction in the proper reading of
bound volumes (*sōshi* 草紙) of one of the two texts under study. On the twenty-
fifth day, clerics engage in reading and comparison (*yomiawase* 讀合) of one of
the texts in their residence quarters. During the following day, clerics then
undergo an examination of their answers (*narashi* 習試) on a particular theme
drawn from the text under study.

Concentrated, ritualized periods of study comprise the tenth and eleventh
months in the schedule. During this time, clerics undertake four sequential modes
of study, the entire cycle of which repeats in alternating locations throughout the
Chishakuin precincts, including the lecture hall (*kōdō* 講堂), study hall
(*kangaku'in* 勸學院), and clerics' residences (*ryōsha* 寮舍). The four modes of
study are: 1) the discussion of the meaning (*dangi* 談義) of a theme drawn from
the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra*, delivered by the instructor (*keshu*
化主), 2) the instructor's judgment (*handan* 判斷) of the correct course of action
for difficult answers to questions posed on that theme, 3) the recitation of
memorized expositions of doctrinal meaning while confined to a darkened study

147

hall (called *yaminarashi* 闇習試), and 4) expositions of meanings (*rongi* 論義) of doctrine drawn from the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* carried out in the study hall (called *naiza* 内座, lit. "sit inside").47 Clerics repeat cycles of these four modes of study through the eleventh month.

From the fifth through the eleventh days of the twelfth month, the Hōon-kō culminates in a final, monastery-wide attendance of doctrinal exposition (*shusshi rongi* 出仕論義) before an image of Kakuban, which covers the same themes drawn from the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* center to practice during the previous two months. This final event involves questions and answers (*mondō* 問答) between the presiding instructor and monks, to be performed before an image of Kakuban.

The scholastic focus of the Hōon-kō is quite clear from the intense periods of study and assessment that seek to prepare the training cleric in paradigmatic interpretations of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*. We can, however, also observe devotional elements at play during the final *rongi*. During this phase, the image of Kakuban is placed before the participants as a symbolic target of the ritual requital expressed through their demonstration of mastery over key esoteric Mahāyāna doctrine. In this way, the Hōon-kō performance became a junction at which ritual devotion and learning converged and supported one another.

The Integration of the Hōon-kō into Shingi Shingon *danrin* Curricula

Ogasawara Kodo 小笠原弘道 (2005, 74–78) has traced how later scholastic endeavors at Chishakuin became the impetus for a Chisan-focused *rongi* within

the Hōon-kō. He also shows how this version of the Hōon-kō diverged in content from the Chisan/Buzan collaborative integration of the Hōon-kō *rongi* mentioned above. Ogasawara describes how Unshō 運敞 (1614–1693), Chishakuin's seventh abbot, composed essential works that focused on the two core treatises under study during the Hōon-kō. Unshō's works include *Discussion of the Meaning of the Great Commentary [on the Mahāvairocana Sutra]* (*Daisho dangi* 大疏談義, T. no. 2540), *Instruction on the Great Commentary [on the Mahāvairocana Sutra]* (*Daisho keimō* 大疏啓蒙), *Discussion of the Meaning of Explanation of [Mahāyāna] Discourse* (*Shakuron dangi* 釋論談義) and *Instruction on Explanation of [Mahāyāna] Discourse* (*Shakuron keimō* 釋論啓蒙). Unshō based the first two of these works on a sub-commentary written by Shōken 聖憲 (1307-1392), titled *One Hundred Themes and the Third Level [of Religious Faculties] in the Great Commentary [on the Mahāvairocana Sutra]* (*Daisho hyakujō dai sanjū* 大疏百條第三重, T. no. 2538). With the addition of his own independent commentary, Unshō composed a treatise that what would become the basis of a Chisan-centered *rongi* for the Hōon-kō at Chishakuin.

Chishakuin shi (1934, 481–482) gives clear indication that the publication and circulation of Unshō's writings initiated a period of intensified interest in the study of Chisan doctrine. We can observe a steady increase in the number of studying clerics listed in the registers for those based at Chishakuin. During the abbotship of Yūtei 宥貞 (1592–1664), the tenure that preceded Unshō's, the names of approximately 400 clerics appeared on the register during peak

enrollment. During the two sequential abbotships following Unshō's tenure, those of Yūban 宥鑁 (1624–1702) and Senkai 専戒 (1640–1710), enrollment more than doubled, reaching nearly 1,000. During Kakugen's tenure as abbot, *danrin* enrollment at Chishakuin reached a historic high, surpassing 1,300 clerics listed on the register. The fact that more than 300 names were added to the Chishakuin *danrin* registry during Kakugen's abbotship alone suggests that beginning after the publication of Unshō's foundational scholarship on Chisan interpretations of key esoteric treatises, participation in and widespread recognition of the Chisan Hōon-kō rapidly flourished. By the time Kakugen had assumed the role of abbot, in addition to issuing important intra-denominational regulations that organized and hierarchized clerics within the newly overhauled system of monastic study, he had also seized upon and fueled interest in the study of Chisan scholasticism in ritual contexts at Chishakuin.

"Great Assembly on Dharma Transmission"

Similar to Unshō's efforts in revitalizing the Hōon-kō at Chishakuin after the collapse of Negoroji in 1585, Yūban committed to a similar revitalization of monastic learning only a few decades later during his own tenure as abbot. In 1693, he sent Kakugen, Unju 運壽 (?–1711), Gizan 義山 (1646–1722), and Kan'ō 觀應 (1656–1710) to Mount Kōya in order to learn the procedures and regulations of the *jugi* 竪義, or a system of examinations (*shiken seido* 試験制度) meant to foster scholastic training among the clergy within the Shingon school. The *jugi* constituted the core focus of the Great Assembly on Dharma

Transmission (Denbōdai-e 傳法大會), an assembly that derives from the Denbō'e 傳法會, originally conceived of by Kūkai on Mount Kōya to train Shingon clerics. This assembly later died out but was reintroduced by Kakuban on Mount Kōya. After the death of Kakuban, Raiyu transplanted the assembly to Negoroji (van der Veere 2000, 21). The assembly shares its name with the temple erected by Kakuban on Mount Negoro, Daidenbō'in 大傳法院, which stood as headquarters of the Shingi branch prior to its destruction at the hands of Toyotomi in 1585. Yūban's plan was to reinstate this assembly as part of the Chisan ritual repertoire already under formation at Chishakuin.

Unju, Kakugen, Gizan, and Kan'ō returned from Mount Kōya and compared these procedures and themes with those that had been archived from Negoroji. Their interpretation of these two sets of procedures resulted in an updated version of the Denbō'e, the content of which focused on both paradigmatic Mahāyāna doctrine and key esoteric interpretations derived from Kakuban. This version, called the Denbōdai-e, began to be performed yearly at Chishakuin from 1696 and retained the basic structure of a doctrinal examination (Ogasawada 2005, 78–80). Thus, while the structural design of the assembly reflects a synthesis of both Kogi and Shingi perspectives, portions of the doctrinal content under examination assumes a definitely Shingi Chisan position.

Three phases comprise the Denbōdai-e at Chishakuin: pre-lecture dharma essentials (*zenkō* 前講法要), proposition and judgment (*jusei* 豎精), and an examination of discourse mastery (*ronshō* 論匠; also called *tsugai rongi* 番論 義).[48] All of these phases take place in the lecture hall (*kōdō* 講堂), and below I

explain each in turn. The first phase, pre-lecture dharma essentials, is led by the judge, and involves the recitation of the *Sūtra on Consummate Achievement* (*Soshitsujikyara kyō* 蘇悉地羯羅經, T. no. 0893) before an image of the central object of devotion, as well as several other buddhas and bodhisattvas. In terms of function, this recitation ensures the successful delivery of any esoteric rituals to follow during the course of the Denbōdai-e. It also frames the rest of the assembly within a broader framework of devotion. Fuse (2005, 91–92), for example, describes these recitations of the initial phase as offerings (*kuyō* 供養) for the dharma enjoyment (*hōraku* 法樂) of the various enlightened beings captured in image.

The second phase is comprised of the a central examination in which clerics expound upon doctrinal concepts and then judged against the meaning (*jugi* 豎義) established by the presiding instructor. The *Denbōdai-e jugi kōyō* 傳法大會豎義綱要 (1937, 16–34) describes ten themes that comprise the *jugi*: the parable of the jewel [in one's cloak in the *Lotus Sūtra*] (*hōju hiyu* 寶珠譬喩), establishing the meaning of dharma categories (*ryūgi hōsū* 立義法數), the ten stages [of bodhisattva practice] and the sixteen births (*jū ji jūroku shō* 十地十六生), the rise and establishment of the two gates [of Mahāyāna and mainstream practice] (*nimon jiryū* 二門峙立), mental dharmas and physical forms (*shinbō shikigyō* 心法色形), the gate of self [practice] and mental recollection (*jimon shinnen* 自門心念), repeatedly passing over an entire *kalpa* [of rebirth] (*fukuetsu ichiko* 復越一劫), gradual cultivation of the true gate [of practice] (*shinmon*

senshū 眞門漸修), easily grasping *siddhi* (*shijji kangō* 悉地寛狹), and the true meaning [according to the] pervasive and limited (*nyogi tsūkoku* 如義通局).

In surveying these themes, it is clear that the *jugi* of the Denbōdai-e focused on training in fundamental Mahāyāna doctrine, though it also represents the doctrinal views of Kakuban. Notes made on Kakuban's lectures delivered during his medieval Denbō-e sessions, attributed to Chōganbō Shōō 長厳房聖応 (n.d.) and titled *Uchigikishū* 打聞集抄, reveals several themes that also appear in the Denbōdai-e *jugi* given at Chishakuin during the early modern period. These themes include parsing differences between esoteric and exoteric teachings, the periods of the Buddha's teaching and their contents, the bodies of the Buddha, and the efficacy of the three mysteries of body, speech, and mind (*Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū*, vol. 2, 218–222).

As Hendrik van der Veere (2007, 26–28) suggests, Chōganbō's notes also indicate that Kakuban included didactic stories (*setsuwa* 説話) and anecdotes in many of these lectures as teaching strategies for his varied audiences. He describes how these stories highlight Kakuban's concern for distinctions between mental capacities of spiritual attainment, especially those parsed by Kūkai in his *Treatise on the Ten Abiding Minds of the Secret Maṇḍala* (*Himitsu mandara jūjūshin ron* 祕密曼荼羅十住心論). van der Veere contends that Kakuban deployed *setsuwa* during these lectures in order to better transmit information about Shingon practice as it compares to other practices, but also to communicate the primacy of Kūkai's teachings over teachings of other branches within the Shingon system. This instructive purpose becomes even more evident considering

153

that several of these same *setsuwa* appear in *dangi* composed and delivered by Kakuban during the early years of his instruction at Mount Kōya. Considering the instructive aspects of *setsuwa* generally, which seek to clarify for the listener a particular maxim tied to a Buddhist theme under discussion and, considering Kakuban's own intentions of reaching varied audiences through his liturgies, van der Veere's hypothesis about Kakuban's Denbō'e lectures and their reliance on instructive *setsuwa* remains compelling.

To return to the middle phase of proposition and judgment in the Denbōdai-e, we can get a sense of how this phase compared to similar phases in the Hōon-kō. This phase is begun by the proponent who leads in collective bows to the north for tutelary protection, to the present judge, to the southeast, in the direction of the Chishakuin founder's hall (*kaisan dō* 開山堂), and to the south, in the direction of wish-fulfilling jewels (*nyo-i hōju* 如意寶珠) stored at the Buzan temple Murōji 室生寺. The proponent then selects five questions each from two categories: expositions on the compilation of the esoteric sutras (called *gōgi* 業義) and a supplemental discussion of this exposition (called *tengi* 添義); (Fuse 2005, 94–98).

The *Denbōdai-e jugi kōyō* describes these two categories and their relationship to two central texts in the Hōon-kō described above:

"[Questions requiring] exposition on compiling the esoteric sutras are displayed, and [questions requiring] supportive discussion of this exposition are concealed. In observing most *Jugi* [*Denbōdai-e*] themes, [questions concerning] the *Great Commentary* [*on the Mahāvairocana*

154

Sūtra] are displayed, and in combination, there is the precedent of concealing the [questions concerning] the *Explanation of Mahāyana Discourse*.

業義とは表にして、添義とは裏を意味する。多くの竪義論題を觀る
に『大疏』を表にして、『釈論』を裏に組み合わすは古例のようで
ある。(*Denbōdai-e jugi kōyō* 1937, 17)

Thus, while the phase of proposition and judgment involves the same doctrinal treatises under examination during the Hōon-kō, it also includes a degree of visual aid to the participating clerics. Much like in the case of the Hōon-kō, the ten questions posed to clerics during the exam cover fundamental Mahāyana doctrine, which frames a narrower subset of esoteric interpretations derived from Yixing's *Commentary* and similarly expressed by Kakuban himself during early Denbō'e performances.

The final phase, the examination of discourse mastery, involves a question-and-answer format that culminates in a ranking of performances among participating clerics. During this phase, judges intercede when necessary to adjust and assess the responses of the candidates (Fuse 2005, 92–93, 102).

In 1696, the same year the Denbōdai-e was reinstated at Chishakuin, Unju and Kakugen filled the two most crucial roles in the ceremony. At these roles, both individuals arbitrated the religious knowledge that coursed through the network of curricular learning stemming from Chishakuin. Unju took the title of

proponent (*jusha* 竪者), or the role primarily responsible for composing and issuing the questions posed to clerics during the middle phase of proposition and judgment. Ogasawara (2005, 85) describes this position as largely an instructive position (*shidōteki tachiba* 指導的立場) meant to foster clerical training, though from the descriptions of the complex phases of the Denbōdai-e, the role of the proponent is much more than instructive: as designer of the examinations that comprise the ceremony, the proponent has full control over the key points of doctrinal emphasis deemed worthy of examination at Chishakuin. By 1696, at the role of proponent, Unju helped to reinvigorate the Denbōdai-e at Chishakuin not only in its performance but in its very design and effectiveness in organizing clergy according to doctrinal mastery.

Yet Unju did not act alone. His designs of the questions and themes integrated into the Denbōdai-e were assisted by the judge (*seigisha* 精義者, lit. "detailed meaning individual"), the role filled by Kakugen by the time he was abbot of Chishakuin. In this role, Kakugen was responsible for assessing and judging the responses of clerics during the examinations. In addition to fulfilling this role in the Denbōdai-e, the judge also filled the same role during the examinations administered in the Hōon-kō described above. In this way, Kakugen played an equally integral role in shaping the parameters of doctrinal mastery demonstrated by training clergy across the two main ceremonies revived within the Shingi Shingon school. This control over the thematic content and questions administered to clerics, as well as their clearance of the exams, meant that both Unju and Kakugen shared an active responsibility in shaping the form and content

of ritualized monastic learning while the denominational identity of the Shingi Shingon school was still under formation.

The Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e remain hallmark ceremonies of Shingi Shingon Buddhism because of their ties to Kakuban. As Yūban recognized early on, the school was in need of a symbolic and ritual reconstitution in the wake of the destruction of Negoroji. He brought to institutional prominence two ceremonies with dual purposes: to identify the Shingi branch through a several links between these ceremonies, the doctrinal tenets represented therein, and the branch founder, and to build a robust Shingi following by hierarchizing and ritualizing the organization of the clerical community under the banner of denominational learning.

Calendrical Links between the Hōon-kō, Denbōdai-e, and *Shari kuyō shiki*

The above historical developments illustrate just how powerful Chishakuin and its late-seventeenth century representatives were in the formation of a cohesive curricular program. Unju and Kakugen, especially, enjoyed widespread administrative control by extending the regulatory reach of the government. They accomplished this through their strict hierarchization of clerical learning and through the organization of periods of study across the entire Shingi Shingon network. As I also showed above, the revival and integration of the Hōon-kō at Chishakuin and its relationship to the Daidenbō'e reflect the success of these representatives in reinvigoration of a denominational identity within this framework of monastic learning.

Kakugen was able to shape the denominational discourse stemming from Chishakuin in other ways beyond the integration of the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e. I contend that his publication of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki* in 1696, the very year he assumed the role of judge in both the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e, and during the very year those ceremonies were reinstated at Chishakuin, further underscores just how formative liturgy became in scholastically articulating a Shingi identity at Chishakuin. Equally important to this effort were the performances of both the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* amidst these ceremonial examination schedules; like the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e, these performances communicated fundamental doctrine focused on relic devotion. Kakugen's efforts therefore further illustrate the intimate relationship between devotional and intellectual practices among Chishakuin clergy. Just as the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e served educational purposes within a broader framework of requital and devotion, so too did the *Shari kuyō shiki* and its commentary offer heuristic advantages to witnesses and readers within a similar framework. Each of these performances linked devotion to doctrinal learning through Kakuban's paradigmatic teachings and helped to identify the Shingi school as the school of new meanings (*shingi* 新義) in Shingon doctrine. Kakuban's role as founder, teacher, and symbolic figure represented by and through each ritual event makes it difficult to distinguish these rituals as falling into either category of the devotional or intellectual; clerics were expected to consume and demonstrate their prowess over doctrinal knowledge so central to

the teachings of Kakuban, and yet this practice occurred within a much larger devotional framework of ritual expression aimed at Kakuban as a symbolic figure.

The devotional circularity expressed through ritual performance becomes even clearer when we examine performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which suggest that leading clerics at Chishakuin also established links between Kakuban and relic devotion as a touchstone of Shingon practice. *Chishakuin shi* (1934, 136, 386–392) gives a composite picture of the yearly ritual schedule of performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki,* Denbōdai-e, Hōon-kō, and other devotional ceremonies. As the table (Figure 1) shows below, there was considerable overlap between these performances throughout the year. Devotional performances delivered during the first month include the recitation of sutras for the dharma enjoyment (*hōraku* 法樂) of deceased Kakuban. The second through the fifth months constitute a concentrated period of ritual activity, which includes the performance of the Permanence and Bliss Assembly (Jōraku'e 常樂會) (discussed in Chapter 1), the Denbōdai-e, the start and finish of the summer Hōon-kō, and the start of a four-month sequence of daily deliveries of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. We also find the performance of another of Kakuban's *kōshiki*, the *Jizō kōshiki* 地藏講式, which praises the virtue of bodhisattva Jizō (Sk: Kṣitigarbha), during the seventh month:

Composite Schedule of Ritual Activity (Selections) at Chishakuin (Fig. 1)			
Month	Ritual and Day of Performance		
1	Hōraku 法樂 for Kakuban (12th day)			
2	"	Jōraku'e 常樂會		

		(15th day)		
3	"	Denbōdai-e 傳法大會 (20th day)		
4	"	Summer Hōon-kō 夏報恩講 begins (1st day)	*Shari kuyō shiki* 舍利講式 (8th day)	
5	"	Summer Hōon-kō 夏報恩講 ends (last day)	"	
6	"		"	
7	"		"	*Jizō kōshiki* 地藏講式 (15th day)
8	"			
9	"			
10	"			Winter Hōon-kō 冬報恩講 begins (1st day)
11	"			
12	"			Winter Hōon-kō 冬報恩講 ends (11th day)

Organizing the yearly ritual schedule at Chishakuin in this way helps to visualize the complementary relationship between devotional and intellectual acts among early modern training clerics. The calendrical space in Figure 1 captures several layers of this complementarity. The Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e, two performances

that simultaneously expressed a requital and devotion to Kakuban and governed

the advancement of clerics, occurred across six of twelve months during the year.

Performances of the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e were supplemented by other

ceremonies with a similar focus on Kakuban, who was the symbolic and historical

source of teachings that gave rise to early Shingi versions of these very two

ceremonies. Performances of Kakuban's *kōshiki*, especially sequential

performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, reveal yet another layer of relic devotion at

play throughout a majority of the year. Just as Kakuban's religious and

denominational significance brought him to the symbolic center of the Hōon-kō

and Denbōdai-e, performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* establish links to him

through relic worship as a primary mode of devotional expression at Chishakuin.

Kakugen's Sponsorship of Gahō's Commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki*

As argued in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, much like the Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-

e, the sequential performances of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* offered

heuristic benefits to its lay and clerical witnesses. Beyond opportunities for

understanding offered during its performance, the circulation of scholastic

treatises on the *Shari kuyō shiki* text continued to offer heuristic potential.

Kakugen's sponsorship of the 1696 publication of Gahō's commentary on the

Shari kuyō shiki suggests that he recognized this potential and seized upon it by

more closely integrating principal interpretations of a ritual ceremony already

well-integrated into the yearly calendar at Chishakuin.

By the end of the seventeenth century, moreover, he had effectively published an exegetical work in direct complementarity with the new uniform requirements at *danrin* that had shaped critical features of monastic learning under Chishakuin's control. These features included a stimulation of clerical learning under a newly reconstituted liturgical program focused on Kakuban as a representative of new esoteric interpretations of Mahāyāna doctrine. While the table above clearly shows how critical Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* had become for the broader ritual repertoire at Chishakuin on a yearly basis, Kakugen's publication of the principal commentary on this liturgy suggests that its themes of relic worship were suitable complements to its co-constituent repertoire of doctrinal instruction.

This focus on doctrinal instruction comes into greater focus if we examine the preface written by Kakugen to the 1696 publication of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Here, Kakugen begins by emulating Gahō's own introduction to his commentary, though on a smaller scale, by first explaining the basic meaning of the term *shari* (relic) and its connections to both the historical Buddha Śākyamuni and Mahāvairocana:

Preface to *Ceremonial Lecture [on the Merits] of Relic Offerings*

The abbreviation for the Sanskrit word *śārira* (*sharira* 設利羅), is *shari*.

They [*shari*] are none other than the bones of the fragmented body of the *Tathāgata. Shari* are also called rice grains. They are also called rice plant grains. *Dhātu* (*Dato* 駄都) [i.e. "relic"] signifies the meaning "body." This is the bodily part of the *Tathāgata* and, among a majority of the rice grains

162

of the Buddha's body, they are quantified like rice plant grains. Therefore,

it is so termed. As for the Buddha's lifelong teachings, even though the

causes and conditions [of his existence] have already exhausted, [His]

great compassion does not stop, [but] lodges in relics and [we] turn toward

and rely [on them] completely. If [we] give rise to faith in them even for

an instant, [the karmic obstacles from] afflicted activities will melt like

ice, and if we recall them even for a moment, merit and wisdom will

gather like clouds. Knowing this, the gradual destruction of delusion in

one's present body is none other than the subtle technique of attaining

buddhahood in one's very body. Moreover, the true body relics of the

Tathāgata Śākyamuni are none other that the dharma realm *stūpa* of the

dharma body Dainichi. How could one foster alternative understandings?

This present ceremony was written by our Mitsugon Kōgyō Daishi

[Kakuban], and [this commentary is] an expression of Jishō Gahō Shōnin

of Makinō-o. At this time, [this commentary] has been proofread, mistakes

have been excised, and by these means it has been transmitted to the

world.

On the 15th day of the 8th month, Genroku 9 [1696]

Written in reverence by Kakugen while residing at Chishakuin

舍利供養式序

梵語設利羅訛略シテ、或ハ舍利ト云ウ。即是如來碎身ノ靈骨也。舍
利ト者、或ハ米粒ト云ウ。亦ハ稻穀ト云ウ。駄都ト者體ノ義分ノ義

ナリ。是レ如來ノ身分ニ而、佛體ノ大小米粒ノ大ニ似て、稲穀ノ量ノ如シ。故以名ト為也。夫レ佛之一化、因縁已盡ト雖ドモ、大悲亦止無、舍利ヲ雷テ、全ク歸憑ト作。利那モ之ヲ信ズレハ惑業冰ノ如クニ銷ス、須臾モ之ヲ念スレバ福智雲ノ如クニ集ル。諒是、現生斷惑之勝計即即身成佛之玅術也。矧復釋迦如來ノ眞身舍利ハ即是大日法身ノ法界塔婆ナリ。豈異解懷乎。今斯ノ式者我ガ之密嚴興教大師ノ所作ニ而、其鈔者乃レ槇尾自性我寶上人ノ所述也。今番讎校ニ而、誤ヲ削刊行シテ、以世ニ傳ヲ云ウ。

元祿九季歳次丙子仲秋日

智積院寓遊客覺眼拜書

(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaves 3–6)

This initial attention to how readers should conceive of relics prior to engaging with Gahō's text suggest that Kakugen perceived the text as instructive; the very object at the center of the *Shari kuyō shiki* is framed in plain language, using the very synonymous references to rice grains that Gahō begins with in his commentary.

The latter half of the preface engages several devotional aspects of practice, in which he further borrows language from Gahō's commentary. Kakugen refers to the great compassion that is lodged in relics long after the annihilation of the Buddha's physical body, a theme referred to in both the announcement (*hyōbyaku* 白衣) of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, and in verse six of the

Shari wasan.49 This reference culminates in a similar injunction to relic worship, as Kakugen impels his reader to turn toward (*kaeru* 帰る) and rely on (*tanomu* 憑む) relics, and to cultivate faith (*shinzuru* 信ずる) so that spiritual attainment is possible. This echoes much of Gahō's own interpretation of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, and more generally his emphatic focus on faith in Shingon practice found elsewhere in his works. Kakugen then brings these two points together by outlining for the reader that even though relics, as targets of devotion, derive from the body of Śākyamuni, the true recipient of such devotion is Mahāvairocana, principal Buddha of the Shingon school.

In light of the state of monastic education, denominational identification, and the yearly ritual schedule at Chishakuin, Kakugen's sponsorship of the publication of Gahō's commentary and his authorship of its preface reveal at least three implications. First, the preface itself frames the commentary as instructive in scope and purpose. Kakugen appears to have deliberately drawn from much of the language used by Gahō himself in his exposition and interpretation of key terms and concepts related to the nature of relics and their soteriological potential. Conversely, there is very little in Kakugen's preface that communicates a different purpose for the publication; he introduces the basic linguistic and conceptual elements at play in defining the term *shari* (relics), mentions their soteriological potential, and their function conditioned on faith expressed by the practitioner. These basic elements provide a basic overview of the entirety of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki*.

Second, by sponsoring the publication of Gahō's commentary and authoring its preface, Kakugen has endorsed its contents as an authoritative interpretation of Kakuban's liturgy. This point cannot be understated, especially when we consider the efforts made by Kakugen, Unshō, and several other high-ranking clerics in their revival of ceremonial instruction and assessment tied to the Shingi founder, Kakuban. Kakugen's direct involvement in bringing Gahō's commentary to early modern audiences roughly four hundred years after its initial composition speaks to his confidence in both Kakuban's authoritative expression of relic devotion as emblematic of Shingon practice, and Gahō's expansive interpretation that sought to highlight the core elements of faith within that practice.

Finally, the publication and its preface suggest the likelihood that this commentary circulated among clerics in training. Were this publication intended for personal use, especially by Kakugen himself, there would be no need for a preface. The presence of a preface suggests that Kakugen sought to present two or three major points drawn from Gahō's commentary in order to provide a brief synopsis of or glimpse into the content to follow. As the following chapter will show, there were indeed later instances of engagement by readers curious to know more about the nature of relics and relic devotion.

Conclusion

Devotion and monastic education were inextricable features of ritual life at Chishakuin during the early modern era. The integration of the Hōon-kō and

Denbōdai-e ceremonies into the broader ritual repertoire at Chishakuin highlight an intimacy between, on the one hand, devotion—whether expressed through a requital to a founder or faithful worship of the Buddha's remains—and, on the other, intellectual mastery over doctrines of faith and worship advanced by that very founder and, ultimately, by that very Buddha. The devotional circularity that emerged throughout the year during the performance of the Hōon-kō, Denbōdai-e, and *Shari kuyō shiki*, was a result of a concerted effort to reinvigorate liturgical performances tied to Kakuban, but that also had a practical purpose in streamlining the education of clerical training in Shingi doctrine. In this way, the effective formation of a Shingi Shingon denominational identity, which rested on its ties to Kakuban as founder and the provenance of his liturgical activities emblematic of his doctrinal views, depended on this close relationship between devotion and learning in ritual contexts. While the Shingi branch could have maintained some identity through the integration and standardization of rituals that were either wholly devotional or aimed only at internalizing doctrinal information, its formations appears to have been successful, in part, because the Hōon-kō, Denbōdai-e, and *Shari kuyō shiki* each offered a combination of devotional and intellectual opportunities. In each their own ways, these ceremonies provided forums for enacting a denominational identity through devotional expression aimed at the Shingi founder, while at the same addressed practical issues of doctrinal cohesion, social organization, and regional administration.

Denominational and Pedagogical Engagements with the *Shari kuyō shiki*

Introduction

Chishakuin's eleventh abbot, Kakugen 覺眼 (1643–1722), helped to maintain an intellectual and doctrinal discourse that emerged at Chishakuin during his abbotship and continued into the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. While the previous chapter explored how the *Shari kuyō shiki* shared connections to scholarly debate, intellectual study, and rituals for clerical advancement in the wake of sweeping reformations in monastic and educational life at Chishakuin, this chapter explores how the ritual text of the *Shari kuyō shiki* became the source of iterative writings that expanded upon its core themes and, eventually, how these writings emerged during a time when denominational identification was still in flux.

In this chapter I analyze parts of a Meiji-era reprint of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which is identical to the edition printed and prefaced by Kakugen at Chishakuin. This reprint is helpful for understanding the pedagogical potential of Kakuban's *kōshiki* because it contains several pages of symbolic scholia, or reading and notation marks made by users of the commentary, that indicate that users engaged with this reprint in order to study key concepts related to relic devotion. Alongside this commentary, I also analyze *Notes on the Gathered Meaning of [Kūkai's] Distinguishing the Two Teachings of Exoteric and Esoteric* (*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron satsugi shō* 辯顯密二教論撮義鈔; hereafter *Ken-mitsu shō*), written by Kakugen in 1697. The target of this commentary is Kūkai's *Distinguishing the Two Teachings of Exoteric and*

Esoteric (*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron* 辯顯密二教論, T no. 2427), in which he examines the basic differences between exoteric and esoteric teachings.

Similar to Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki*, Kakugen's commentary on the work of Kūkai also uses some of the exegetical superstructures discussed in Chapter 1, such as the use of textual organization (*kamon* 科文) techniques oriented for analysis, the use of dissemination sections (*ruzū bun* 流通), and an introductory preface (*jobun* 序文). Kakugen's techniques identify and organize key tenets drawn from several important sutras, commentaries, and treatises that relate to Kūkai's work. Overall, Kakugen's commentary, which he composed just one year after the 1696 publication of Gahō's commentary at Chishakuin, provides evidence that helps me to contextualize his efforts to maintain a Shingi denominational identity within a broader Shingon framework.

This chapter examines the issue of reception in a monastic environment through two perspectives, both of which relate to Kakugen's scholastic engagements with the works of Kūkai, as well as his role in publishing Gahō's commentary on Kakuban's *kōshiki*. First, from a doctrinal perspective, the content of the texts themselves suggest several ways that Buddhist readers may have interpreted, organized, and thematized doctrine for consumption among clerical audiences. By examining these texts within the broader network of denominational scholarship, we can project how certain themes and concepts found their way into the broader discourse of the religious community at large and, moreover, how those themes cohered as a unified doctrine.

From a social perspective, tracing the texts across a network of possible users suggests how this discourse spread through clerical communities. Seals, stamps, signatures, and marginalia indicates degrees of ownership or possession, but we may also consider peripheral materials such as archival holdings and book-seller catalogues indicative of how, where, and for whom Buddhist materials were circulated among clerics at Chishakuin in early modern times.

Shingi Shingon Doctrine and the Body of Empowerment

In Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*, he makes a series of distinctions between the meaning and profundity of esoteric and exoteric teachings. Kūkai's fundamental assertion primarily surrounds the difference in the expression of the dharma. Whereas the historical Buddha Śākyamuni expressed exoteric teachings according to the varied capacities of his audience, it was the dharma body (*hosshin* 法身), personified as Mahāvairocana, that expressed esoteric teachings in ways that were beyond the capabilities of living beings:

> Question: What is the distinction between the two teachings of exoteric and esoteric?

> Answer: [Whatever is] preached by the response body for the use of others in accordance with the spiritual potential [of those in audience] is called exoteric. In knowing [His] own dharma nature, the Buddha's preaching of the content of wisdom verified internally is termed secret [esoteric].

問。顯密二教其別如何。答。他受用應化身隨機之説謂之顯也。自受
用法性佛説内證智境是名祕也 (T2427.375a21–375a23)

Kūkai's most basic point that "secret," or esoteric, teachings are deeper, subtler,
and outside of the realm of immediate understanding frames the following
analysis in at least two ways. First, his assertion raises the basic question as to
how practitioners are able to access hidden teachings at all. In the case of the
Shingon school, ritual techniques constitute the hallmark practice that allows
followers access to these deeper truths, and by the early modern era, ritual
lineages of transmission became the identifying feature of networked Shingon
temples across Japan (Ambros 2011, 1010–1011).

Second, the inclusion of Kūkai's fundamental works such as *Ben ken-
mitsu nikyōron* establish, for clerics at Chishakuin, a doctrinal precedent that
authenticates their Shingi interpretation of doctrine. That is, Kakugen recognizes
Kūkai as foundational to all of Shingon Buddhism in Japan and uses Kūkai's
fundamental doctrinal position to highlight and distinguish the positions
represented by Shingi Shingon Buddhists. In this way, Kakugen's commentary,
along with his publication of Gahō's commentary, worked to clarify some of the
core Shingi Shingon doctrinal tenets by establishing their connections to Kogi
doctrinal tenets.

In order to establish Kakugen's role in maintaining a denominational
interpretation of doctrinal issues represented by Kūkai in his *Ben ken-mitsu
nikyōron*, I present below a summary of debates concerning the form of the

Buddha's preaching body that developed in the years after the death of Kakuban. This debate is important for the present analysis because it became one of the principal reasons for the revival of Kakuban's lineage and eventual institutionalization of Shingi Shingon Buddhism.

The *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* refers to its expounder (*kyōshu* 教主) as *Bhagavat* (*Bagabon* 薄伽梵), or "Honored One," but does not equate this narrator with Mahāvairocana Buddha, nor as exclusively synonymous with the dharma body. In his *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* the exegete Yixing 一行 (683–727) attempts to explain the meaning of the term *Bhagavat*:

> The *Sūtra* says: "*Bhagavat*, master, and Tathāgata of empowerment," [and this] *Bhagavat* are none other than the underlying dharma body of Vairocana. Next, [the *Sūtra*] says "Tathāgata." This is the body of mutual empowerment of the Buddha. It is [His] dwelling place.

> 經云薄伽梵住如來加持者。薄伽梵即毘盧遮那本地法身。次云如來。是佛加持身。其所住處。(T no. 39, vol. 1796, line 580a13)

Yixing's interpretation of the "Honored One" referred to in the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* as both the underlying dharma body (*honji hosshin* 本地法身) and the body of empowerment (*kajishin* 加持身) may appear simple, but this has remained a contentious issue for Shingon Buddhists. It is not simply a problem of commentarial interpretation, but rather a problem of doctrinal understanding that

has had ramifications for the development of the Shingon school generally, and for the formation of the Shingi branch.

In Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*, he identifies the preacher of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* as the dharma body of Mahāvairocana, though does not explain how the dharma body was able to preach the sūtra. While Yixing's interpretation of the sūtra includes what appears to be at least two bodily divisions of the dharma body of the Buddha, he too does not identify which aspect of the Buddha's body preached the sūtra itself. Kogi Shingon followers maintain that it was the underlying (*honji* 本地) aspect of the dharma body, which encompasses all of reality, that preached the sūtra.

Matsunaga Yūkei (1969, 238–239) provides a concise explanation of the doctrinal issues at the center of this debate. The central issue surrounds the interpretation of Kūkai's own identification of the expounder of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* as he presents it in his *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*. The position maintained by Kogi Shingon Buddhists states that the underlying body (*honjishin* 本地身), or the all-encompassing field of the Buddha's dharma activity, is synonymous with the dharma body and preached the sūtra precisely because of its all-encompassing characteristics. The Shingi Shingon position, however, maintains that the underlying body is accompanied by the body of empowerment (*kajishin* 加持身), or the observable and communicative aspects that arise through and within the all-encompassing field of activity, and that together they comprise the dharma body as it appears as itself (*jishōshin* 自性身). This generally aligns with the perspective expressed by Yixing in his

173

commentary. Shingi Buddhists maintain that the body of empowerment, which makes itself visible within the field of dharma activity, is the body that preached the *sūtra*.

After relocating Kakuban's Denbō-in lineage to Negoroji, the medieval scholar monk Raiyu 賴瑜 (1226–1304) began to codify this Shingi interpretation. Some scholars, such as Hendrick van der Veere (2000, 91–93), argue that Raiyu had a measurable impact on our modern picture of Kakuban as a representative of the Shingi interpretation due, in large part, to Raiyu's composition and dissemination of writings that aligned Kakuban's thought with the Shingi position in the debate over the identification of the expounder of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*.

As van der Veere points out, though, the development of theories in support of the preaching of the underlying body (called the *honjimon* 本地門), on the one hand, or theories in support of the preaching of the body of empowerment (called the *kajimon* 加持門), on the other, had not assumed their oppositional relationship during the life of Kakuban. Kakuban does refer to similar ideas in *Uchigikishū*, the compiled notes referred to in the previous chapter of this dissertation with regard to ceremonies for monastic advancement. In *Uchigikishū*, he refers to the body that mutually empowers (*nōkajishin* 能加持身) and that which is [the target of] the body of mutual empowerment (*shokajishin* 所加持身), both of which were adopted from Yixing's *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra*. As theoretical categories that explain a doctrinal position, however, *honjimon* and *kajimon* appear to have been the product of Raiyu's efforts after the

174

death of Kakuban. In this way, Kakuban's doctrinal positions on the provenance of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra* may have been closer to Kūkai's than modern scholars maintain.

Since at least the Muromachi period (1336–1573), scholar-monks have continued to express Raiyu's doctrinal interpretation, which he appears to have retroactively attributed to Kakuban as representative of a Shingi Shingon denominational identity. This process began when the seventh abbot of Chishakuin, Unshō 運敞 (1614–1693), co-authored the *Kenmon zuihitsu* 見聞随筆 in 1665, in which he first deployed the term "Shingi" with reference to the doctrinal position among clerics on Negoroji. Unshō's use of this term set Negoroji and, later, its constituent Chisan and Buzan factions, apart from the Shingon Buddhism centered around the doctrine of Kūkai on Mount Kōya, which favored the interpretation of the underlying body of the Buddha as having preached the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*.

While the maintenance of a denominational identity became crucial for reconstituting a splintered Shingon branch after its destruction in 1585, this chapter demonstrates how this maintenance continued as an ongoing initiative into the Meiji era. By the time of his tenure as abbot at Chishakuin, and three decades after Unshō's use of the term Shingi in his *Kenmon zuihitsu*, Kakugen seized upon opportunities to support an institutional identity by expanding upon and sponsoring writings and publications with ties to both Kūkai and Kakuban. The circulation of these works among temples inside and outside of the Shingon school offered even later opportunities for readers to study them. In this way,

denominational and pedagogical engagements with the works of Kakuban extended well beyond the early modern era.

Commentary, Audience, and Reception

I make the following analyses on the premise that Gahō's and Kakugen's commentaries constitute only part of a larger network of Shingi Shingon denominational discourse and, more generally, that Buddhist commentators enact such discourse for an interactive audience. Buddhist commentaries can serve many purposes, but one of the fundamental motivations behind the work of a commentator is to attempt to clarify the content of a target text. In the cases of Gahō's commentary on Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and, as we will see, Kakugen's commentary on Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*, the content was clarified and made more accessible to readers interested in these texts with ties to Chishakuin.

Gérerd Genette (1997, 2–6) describes intertextuality as a "copresence between two texts" and proposes that texts contain collected substrata of meaning. He describes the layering of meaning as reflective of the relationship between the core texts, their commentaries, and their marginalia. Marginalia itself can often contain metatextual material, or critical references to other written works in reference to the core text, and paratextual material, or references made to surrounding writings concerning the authorship, publication, editorialization, or printing, drawn out of the core text. Sub-commentaries embedded within a text may also share links with symbolic scholium that are marginally or interlineally

applied to the text. I use the term scholium to refer to discursive writing that elaborates on selected portions of the text by introducing new information. In my use I draw primarily from H.J. Jackson (2001, 45), who distinguishes scholium from glosses, which tend toward linguistic transliteration, translation, and paraphrase.

Paratextual material, namely the titles, subtitles, prefaces, postfaces, and other writings that contextualize the work in relation to the world outside of it, creates the setting of a text. Thus, interacting with a target text by producing extraneous writings on it, from Genette's view, is an act of literary assembly that draws together and networks ideas across several possible texts. This aggregation is clear in the case of Gahō's and Kakugen's commentaries and their target texts because they each reference networks of other texts; likewise, the producers of marginal writings and symbolic markings also focus on related texts. An attention to a much broader network of textual materials and their handlers that exist beyond these commentaries is important for understanding how a doctrinal or denominational discourse is maintained by communities of actors.

In his work on marginal writings in Chinese fiction, David Rolston (1997, 16–17) describes how marginalia, marginal glosses, criticisms levied against other scholars, imperatives to pedagogy, and the privileging of the target text and author illicit interactions with readers of Chinese fiction.[50] The proximity of these marginal writings impels an interaction with them alongside the core text, and thus the reader is introduced to ideas, concept, and perspectives of those who composed the marginal writings. Chinese fictional commentarial standards

influenced Japanese conventions in both the popular and religious realms, though in some cases the commentarial focus was on educating readers about genre styles rather than imputing new meaning onto the text (pp. 94–96). In a general sense, Rolston shows how there has been some precedent in East Asia for marginal writings in religious texts to have been instructive or, at a broader level in popular fiction, to have shaped the conceptual contours of the genres to which certain works belonged.

Two types of marginal writing pervade the Meiji-era reprint of Gahō's commentary on the *Shari kuyō shiki* and Kakugen's commentary on Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*, and each type functions differently in supporting the maintenance of a unified Shingi Shingon doctrine. First, in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, we find symbolic markings in red ink beside a range of terminological, bibliographic and authorial references throughout the entire commentary. These marks appear as circles, dashes, brackets, and underlines near individual characters, compounds, and short phrases. In isolation, these symbolic marks leave little explicit evidence as to why the text's handlers found certain compounds compelling as there appears no accompanying interlinear or marginal writing to explain the thought process of the handler. Yet, if we consider these marks within the broader context of Shingi Shingon discourse at play in the core texts, we can begin to build a composite picture of the handler's attention to the very doctrinal features that became central to Raiyu's and, later, Kakugen's efforts to maintain a Shingi Shingon denominational identity.

Second, in the *Ken-mitsu shō*, we find expository scholium beside blocks of writing in the target text. Much like the symbolic markings in the *Shari kuyō shiki shō*, the expository scholium indicates a spatial focus within the text, but they also supplement the core text in more explicit ways. These scholia directly build bibliographic and authorial pedigree by incorporating references to many texts beyond the target text.

The presence of marginalia reflects an interactive use between the marginal writer, author of the target text, author of the commentary, and the subsequent readers of each of these sets of writings.51 Interlinear and marginal writings more easily demonstrate specific areas of interest for the writer and, possibly, areas of projected interest for subsequent readers. Above all, marginal writings suggest that an interactive process has taken place with the commentary and, by association, the target text; the marginal writer has consumed the text, thought about, and committed to writing new or clarifying thoughts important enough to add in the margins.

Kakugen's *Ken-mitsu shō* and Interactions with the Text

Kakugen's commentary is supplemented by what appears to be more than one marginal writer. There are two identifying marks that give us some clue as who handled the text. The first is the signature of a one Shimono Jun'yū 下野順有 (or Shimotsuke Jun'yū) in the inside cover of the work. While it is difficult to be sure, the first character in this individual's name, Shi 下, appears to match another use of the same character in upper-margins on leaf four of the commentary. If this

is the same individual, it appears that they have contributed much more writing than the other marginal writer, who used red ink to mark the linguistic features of the text. As to the distinction between the red- and black-ink users, and as I describe in the following paragraph, the red and black ink appear as observably distinct layers of written contributions. It is, however, entirely possible that either all marks have been made by a single individual, or the signature of Shimono Jun'yu, the black ink explaining the meaning of the text, and the red ink indicating linguistic features of the text all belong to different individuals.

The second mark is a dated stamp that gives the name Nara Shōjun 奈良生順. A final character attached to his name denotes that the work was part of a gift (*zō* 贈), perhaps issued from Nara Seijun to Waseda University, current holder of Kakugen's manuscript since 1922, as noted within the stamp. A second set of red-ink interlinear writing and markings appear atop those of Shimono Junyu's, which suggests that this second writer engaged in sub-commentary to Shimano's commentary. While it is unclear, it is possible that these sub-commentarial markings were made by this very donor, Nara Seijun.

Kakugen begins his treatment of Kūkai's taxonomy with initial attention paid to the format and structure of the text. Within the first few lines he addresses the title of Kūkai's original text:

> The bulk of this writing is separated into two [parts] and within the title page at the beginning is the title. This title is, among the seven types of name-and-content designations, like the type that designates a discourse central to scripture. In separating subject and object within this [title], the

central four characters *ken mitsu ni* [and] *kyō* are the objective essence of

clarification and explanation. The initial and final characters *ben* [and] *ron*

are the subjective letters and words of clarification and explanation. Now,

if we discuss [that which is] shared and distinct, [the characters] *ken*,

mitsu, *ni*, [and] *kyō* are distinct. *Ben* and *ron* are shared. For example, [this

is similar to] Dao'an's *Nikyōron*.52 As for *Ben ken-mitsu*, that which is

called *ben* [means] distinguish. It is the parsing and distinction of

differences. That which is called *ken* [means] making manifest and

succinct a disclosure.

此ノ書大ニ分テ二是初ニ題額中ニ於テ、初ニ題目也。此ノ題號ハ人

法喩ノ七種ノ中ニハ單法ノ題目也。此ノ中ニ能所ヲ分別ニ者中間ノ

顯密二教ノ四字ハ所詮所釋ノ法體也。前後ノ辯論ノ二字ハ能詮能釋

ノ文言也。又通別ニ論ゼ者、顯密二教ハ別ナリ。辯論ハ通也。例セ

バ辯中邊論ノ如シ也。又二教論ノ三字ハ通也。例セバ道安ノ二教論

ノ如シ也。辯顯密等ト者、辯ハ謂ク判也。辯釋ノ分辯也。顯ハ謂ク

顯露ノ顯略也。（*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron satsugi shō*, leaf 2a）

The title itself thus communicates the precise content of the text and, more

importantly, provides Kakugen's first major opportunity for framing the work in

terms of East Asian standards in the titling of sutras, commentaries, and other

Buddhist treatises. The format of Kūkai's title derives from models later

standardized by de facto Tiantai founder Zhiyi 智顗 (538–597); (Mochizuki 1954, 1902b).

The black ink marginal writer, possibly Shimono Jun'yū, seizes upon Kakugen's explanation of Kūkai's work. The writer further explains the fundamental dissimilarity between exoteric and esoteric teachings and, even further, reassures readers that Kakugen's treatment of Kūkai's text will dispel any lingering doubt about this dissimilarity:

> These compiled and collected thoughts are like the following questions and answers. Recently, the school of exoteric teachings has become attached to its teaching that the [qualities of] inferior and superior and shallow and profound among the two teachings of exoteric and esoteric are not alike. Therefore, in drawing out [Kūkai's] main text and exhortation of the exoteric and esoteric [schools] and distinguishing the differences between the discourses on the two teachings, doubt should be dispelled among all.
>
> 撰述意趣下ノ問答ノ如ク。顕教ノ宗、近ニ自リ宗ノ教義ヲ執テ顕密二教ノ優劣浅深ヲ不如［ナリ］。故今ノ顕密ノ正流ヲノ引ク。論二教ノ差別ヲ辯ズ。衆ヲシテ疑問ヲ散也。（*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron satsugi shō*, leaf 2a, center margin）

This marginal writer highlights the utility of Kakugen's treatment of Kūkai's text in dispelling any doubt as to the superiority of esoteric teachings. By these means,

the writer also establishes Kūkai's work as fundamental to identifying the profundity of esoteric teachings. In a marginal sub-commentary to the title alone, the writer has linked both Kūkai and Kakugen together as principal co-expositors of doctrine tied directly to the esoteric schools.

In an earlier section, Kakugen lays out the historical and denominational context for Kūkai's composition and focuses on the doctrinal profundity of the composition. He does so not only from within a denominational context but also by addressing the work on more symbolic terms. He describes how Kūkai's taxonomy grew out of a time of great doctrinal debate and how its two parts symbolically represent the the Vajradhātu (*kongō kai* 金剛界) and Garbhadhātu (*taizō kai* 胎藏). Kakugen extols Kūkai's efforts in distilling Shingon teachings, and at the same time focuses on how denominational debate was the very opportunity that gave rise to this profound distillation:

> If we discuss the time period of this text, things have been unclear since long ago. However, within a certain old account, during the time of doctrinal discussions among the two schools of the North (i.e. the Tendai of Mount Hiei) and South (i.e. the Hossō of Kōfukuji), this [record] was composed by [the Hossō monk] Gomyō [750–834] of the South. If we look at this [record], at that time that doctrinal discussion was incidentally put to writing. [Sub-commentary ▲] Those inclinations [from doctrinal discussions] were compiled in writing and are attended to in the following question-and-answer section. [Sub-commentary ▲] [Kūkai's] present distinction of the two realms on which we depend takes a single meaning.

183

The two parts of this [Kūkai's] treatise resemble the two realms. The first part is the occupation of the teaching aspect of the Vajradhātu. The second part is the reliance on the doctrinal approach of the Garbhadhātu. We rely on the single meaning that penetrates both realms.

此ノ書撰述ノ時代ヲ論ゼ者、古来ヨリ分明ナラ不ル也。但シ或ル舊記ノ中ニ南北ノ両宗, 宗論ノ時、之ヲ撰ズト南都ノ護命、此ノ書ヲ見テ、哭スト云フ爾ハ彼ノ宗論ノ因ニ作スルガ之ヲ製ズ歟。▲其ノ書撰述ノ意趣者于不ノ問答ノ段ニ詳カナリ也。▲今ノ論所依両部ノ分別ト者一義ニ云フ此ノ論上下二巻両部ヲ象レリ、上巻ハ金界ノ教相ニ據リ、下巻ハ胎藏ノ義門ニ依ル也。一義ニ云フ通ノ両部ヲ所依ト為ル也。（*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron satsugi shō*, leaf 2a）

Here, Kakugen presents historical context for the composition of Kūkai's work by highlighting not only the issues and concerns at play for Tendai and Hossō clerics, but Kūkai's ability to reconcile some of these issues within his own doctrinal treatise. Even in contextualizing the historical origins of the work, we find the primacy of esoteric doctrine at play in the background.

The marginal writers give us an even more vivid picture of this context by listing the names of notable figures involved in this discourse directly above Kakugen's short passage:

[Pǔguāng's] *Kusharon ki*[53] states: "Gomyō[54] [750–834] of the Hossō [school], Genge of the Sanron [school], Genshin [942–1017] of the Tendai

[school], [and] Fuki of the Kegon [school]." A Genkō era (1321–1324) commentary mentions: "Superb Dōshō[55] [798–875] of the Sanron [school], determined Gennin of the Yuishiki [school], [and] outstanding Enchō of the Tendai [school].

光記云ク：「法相ノ護命、三論ノ系戯、天台ノ系真、花嚴ノ普機云。」元亭釋書左順云：「三論之俊道昌、唯識之頑源仁、花嚴ノ英道雄、天台之傑圖澄等ト云云。」(*Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron satsugi shō,* leaf 2a, upper-right margin)

The short section ends with a mention of three figures with ties to Kūkai himself: Dōshō received training from Kūkai in the Vajra and Garbha realm rituals, Gennin was a disciple of Shinga 眞雅 (801–879), Kūkai's brother, and Enchō advanced to abbot (*zasu* 座主) in 814 through the help of Kūkai and Gomyō, both of whom had, by that time, become the Office of Monastic Affairs' highest ranking and most influential clerics (Saitō and Naruse 1986, 319, 235; Groner 2002, pp. 18–20). It seems clear that if this marginal writer is, in fact, Shimano Jun'yū, he was impelled to more discreetly trace historical and denominational context that gave rise to Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*. By association, he also highlights the role of Kakugen in further distilling the depths of esoteric teachings for readers.

Interactions with Gahō's *Shari kuyō shiki shō*

There is no direct claim to authorship of the symbolic marks that run throughout Gahō's commentary. Rather, we have three seals that indicate some form of ownership or possession of this text, the first two of which appear close to one another on the first page. First, a rectangular seal contains the name San'enzan shinjin hosshōkutsu zōsho 三緑山新深法性窟藏書, which refers to a literary storehouse belonging to the Pure Land temple Zōjōji 増上寺, located in modern-day Tokyo. Prior to 1385, Zōjōji was a Shingon temple originally founded by Shūei 宗叡 (809–884), a disciple of Kūkai (Mochizuki 1954, 3071b). An additional, circular seal appears nearby with the name *Jōdoshū toshokan zōhon* 淨土宗圖書館藏本, another Pure Land library. There is a third, vase-shaped seal applied to the end of the first volume with the name Den'ō kai 田王貝. Little is known of this third seal, though it is possible that it indicates a bookseller who handled the text at some point.

In this Meiji-era edition of Gahō's commentary we find evidence of an interest in a basic understanding of relics and their function. Red emphasis marks (*kenten* 圈點 or *bōten* 傍點) beside or surrounding proper names of people, places and texts, Sanskrit transliterations, as well as important passages and citations related to Buddha relics appear across twenty-four pages of the entire document. Just as one might highlight an important part of a text, underline a key turn of phrase, or circle a pivotal word, these emphasis marks clearly suggest an intellectual engagement with Gahō's commentary.

More implicitly, they also suggest the possibility of internalization; these marks are pronounced, permanent, and deliberate. They do not appear to be made haphazardly or in passing and, in fact, appear to follow a systematic pattern of use. Non-linguistic marks, or "signs of attention," as Jackson (2001, 28) describes with regard to eighteenth century English literature, can be readily understood, indicate approval, are systematically established and, crucially, gain potency through the multiplication of signs.

It is quite easy to identify similar patterns of use in Gahō's commentary. For example, a single line to the right of a character denotes citation; a double-line center denotes a text title; a solid circle denotes transliterated vocabulary; sequential ticks denote a key phrase, and so forth. Taken together, this system suggests that the text was not meant solely for personal consumption. Rather, it was likely meant to be shared and consumed by others with a prior understanding of this symbolic system, as red marks in Kakugen's *Ken-mitsu shō* also suggest. While it is therefore impossible to know the identity of each individual who engaged with this text, the systematic and deliberate nature of the marks makes it possible that Gahō's commentary was consumed by more than one individual and that, more broadly, the text was meant to be studied.

While these marks lack the discursive content of the scholium in the *Ken-mitsu shō*, they are not without value in meaning and suggest two potential modes of engagement. First, and at a fundamental level, these red marks indicate a focus of heuristic activity surrounding the nature of relics. In nearly every instance of added marks, the reader has focused on areas that explain the definition of relics,

187

the soteriological benefits of taking refuge in relics, the doctrinal implications of

relic worship, and related texts that support these explanations. Notable in these

instances is that the focus is on the commentarial content rather than the cited

portions of the *Shari kuyō shiki*. Nearly all marks focus on Gahō's interpretation,

which suggests that either the reader had access to the *Shari kuyō shiki* and was

already familiar with the text, or that the reader was interested in Gahō's

interpretation of the *Shari kuyō shiki* and viewed the text as particularly

instructive on otherwise unknown features of relics.

Second, these marks suggest an engagement with the broader network of

Buddhist texts that Gahō cites in his commentary. Major figures, citations from

sūtras, and Sanksrit transliterations also appear as sites of emphases for the

scrutinizing reader, though to a lesser degree than emphases on Gahō's

interpretation of relics mentioned above. In one early example, parts of early

Buddhist scriptures are cited in sections during which Gahō explains the meaning

behind the limitless benefits offered through relics. Here, the reader focuses on

these texts by bracketing their titles, marking their citations, and circling the

compound for relic (*shari* 舍利) in each:

> The *Āgama Sūtras* say: "[In] producing a single offering of relics of the
>
> Tathāgata, [one will] be born into the Heavens thousands of times.
>
> Afterward, [one will] realize enlightenment."[56]

> 阿含經ニ云ク如來ノ舍利ニ一ヒ供養を興セバ、千遍天ニ生レ。後ニ
> 涅槃を證スト文。

Similar to many other areas where the reader focuses on Buddhist terminological precedents in defining the term *shari*, the *Āgama Sūtras* describe the soteriological benefits made possible by performing relic offerings.

In one longer sequence of markings, the reader seizes upon the issue of taking refuge (*kikyō* 歸敬) in relics discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2 of this dissertation. As Gahō describes, encountering and taking refuge in relics can yield immense soteriological benefits though, conversely, not encountering relics is considered a sign of some prior offense performed during the present lifetime or a previous lifetime. The reader's frenzy of activity begins with emphasis marks, a dot with a surrounding circle, placed next to each of the four characters in the phrase "three mysteries of relics" (*shari no sanmitsu* 舎利ノ三密), or the enlightened activities of body, speech, and mind embodied by the Buddha and physically instantiated by relics. Ticks then appear next to each of the following characters in the next four lines of text:

If one transgresses [one of] the four [grave offenses], even though they enter the Buddha path they will not encounter a relic. In entering the Buddha path, if [a person] does not possess relics, this is a person who has committed [one of the four] grave offenses (*pārājika*). If one possesses relics, this is none other than ascending to the rank of Buddha in his own right, and for this reason, even though the teachings and practices of the other various Buddhas have flourished, encountering a relic is a method to necessarily become a Buddha. If one goes against this, for example, even

189

though one practices and vows without limit over the time period of three *kalpas* one will never become a Buddha.

若レ四重ヲ犯スル者佛道ニ入ルトイエドモ、舎利ニ遇ハ不。佛道ニ入テ、若レ舎利ヲ持タラ不ル者即チ波羅夷ヲ犯タル人也。若レ駄都ヲ持ハ即チ佛頂ノ位ニ登ルニ、故ニ自餘之諸佛ノ教行ニ泄ルト雖モ、舎利ニ遇ハ必ズ成佛スベレ。之ニ背ケバ、縦ヒ三祇ノ時分ヲ送テ、無量ノ行願ヲ修スト雖モ永ク成佛セ不。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaves 58–59)

The ethical implications of relic devotion, or the potential lack of devotion among practitioners, drive home one among many possible pedagogical aspects of Gahō's commentary. The reader's focus not only on the textual and terminological associations with the term *shari*, but also on the ethical aspects of relic worship suggest an interest in the role of relics in greater Shingon soteriology; they are a physical representation of the fruits of enlightened activity. This focus also indicates, especially when we consider the several stamps and seals throughout this edition, that Gahō's interpretation held value for many Buddhists inside and outside of the Shingon community.

Many of these marks also suggest an interest in Shingi Shingon denominational doctrine. In particular, focused activity surrounds areas of Gahō's text that deal with the same phrase above concerning the three mysteries of relics. As Tomabechi Seiichi (2017, 103) describes, the three mysteries of relics is

related to another concept, the three mysteries of mutual empowerment (*sanmitsu no kaji* 三密ノ加持), which indicates how the activities of body, speech, and mind are also each modes of the Buddha's empowerment of sentient beings. Relics, which Kakuban asserts are none other than the perduring existence of the Buddha in the world, instantiate the empowerment of enlightened activities when practitioners take refuge in relics. While Tomabechi (p. 103) recognizes that there is no single set of homological associations tied to these phrases, he notes one primary interpretation: that relics are the physical dharma (色法 *shikihō*) of the dharma body, the mental dharma (心法 *shinbō*) of the reward body, and the oral activities (口業 *kugō*) of the response body. In other words, the activities of the Buddha through his three bodily forms are the same activities through which relics (i.e. the Buddha) empower practitioners who take refuge in them.

In his commentary, Gahō deepens this link between relic devotion, taking refuge, and the three mysteries by establishing even more homological associations. In one area heavily marked with ticks by the reader, Gahō writes the following:

> Now, as for the three mysteries, Samantabhadra is the mystery of the Buddha, Avalokitêśvara is the mystery of the dharma, and Ākāśagarbha is the mystery of the *saṃgha*. One should deeply consider this. This is the three mysteries of relics. One should look at the full details [of this explanation] in the fifth section of the *Commentary on the Sutra that Transcends the Principle*.

今此ノ三密ト者金剛薩埵ハ佛密觀自在ハ法密虛空藏ハ僧密ナリ。深
ク之ヲ思フ可シ。是ハ舍利三密也。理趣釋ノ第五段之ヲ見ル可シ。
委細ハ理趣經ノ第五段ニ之ヲ見ル可シ。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaf 20)

In the very section in the *Commentary on the Sutra that Transcends the Principle*
to which Gahō refers in his commentary, and to which our reader seems interested
according to their marks, this homology is explained in greater detail:

As for Samantabhadra, he resides before the crescent shape of the

[five-]wheeled stupa [that is] Vairocana and represents the awakened mind

of all Tathāgatas. At the beginning, he gives rise to an awakened mind,

which originates through Samantabhadra's mutual empowerment. By

aspiring for the cultivation and realization of Samantabhadra's practice [of

mutual empowerment], others may realize [their status] as Tathāgatas. As

for Avalokitêśvara, he resides behind the crescent shape of the [five-

wheeled] stupa [that is] Vairocana and represents the great compassion of

all Tathāgatas. According to the conditions of the six courses [of rebirth],

there is [within him] a tendency to rescue all [sentient beings]. [In] birth,

death, defilement, and suffering, [sentient beings] can quickly realize

purity in *samādhi*, non-attachment to birth and death, and non-attainment

of nirvana, all of which originates from Avalokitêśvara's indestructible

realization of the dharma. As for Ākāśagarbha, he resides on the right of

the crescent shape of the [five-]wheeled stupa [that is] Vairocana and

represents the true state of gathered innumerable stocks of merit and virtue

今此ノ三密ト者金剛薩埵ハ佛密觀自在ハ法密虛空藏ハ僧密ナリ。深

of all Tathāgatas, which originate from the repeated practices of
Ākāśagarbha.

金剛手菩薩者。在毘盧遮那前月輪中。表一切如來菩提心。初發菩提心。由金剛薩埵加持。修證普賢行願。證如來地。觀自在菩薩者。在毘盧遮那後月輪。表一切如來大悲。隨緣六趣。拔濟一切有情。生死雜染苦惱。速證清淨三摩地。不著生死不證涅槃。皆由觀自在菩薩金剛法現證。虛空藏菩薩者。在毘盧遮那右月輪。表一切如來眞如恒沙功德福資糧聚。由修虛空藏菩薩行。(T1003, no. 19, lines 607c20－0607c29)

If we consider the reader's focus on Gahō's assertion about the three mysteries of relics through reference to sutras that explain how the divinities embody these three mysteries as refuges for practice and cultivation, we can begin to discern what Gahō's commentary may have offered its readers. From a wide perspective, Gahō's commentary provides both a distillation and a comprehensive contextualization of the basic features, soteriological implications, and doctrinal linkages surrounding Buddha relics. Narrowly, the marked areas of Gahō's text indicate that the reader sought out Gahō's exposition relics as necessary targets of devotion, as well as how doctrinal features surrounding that devotion shape the practices necessary to receive the potential benefits lodged in relics. This is a practical engagement with the text that suggests the reader was interested in

193

learning about the function of relics within the broader Shingon program of practice.

One final example drives home this focus on the soteriological benefits of relics, especially as they relate to Shingi Shingon doctrine. In one section, Gahō explains, once again, the potential benefits offered through relic devotion by explaining a few lines drawn from Section Two of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki*. In this section of the *kōshiki*, Kakuban describes how Śākyamuni's teachings delivered during the eight phases of his lifetime are all activities of his mutually empowering (*kaji* 加持) aspects:

[As for] the benefit of the respondent teachings [delivered] during the Buddha's lifetime, these are all the subtle activity of the three mysteries of mutual empowerment. The methods of teaching [during the] eight phases of the Buddha's lifetime are none other than the function of wisdom of dharma bodies comprised of the six great elements. The disappearance of [His] causal conditions is none other than the cessation of the honorable form [of Śākyamuni], and there has since been trust in the remains of [His] transformation. The main point is that [these remains] are the same thing as relics of the living [body of Śākyamuni], and in the presence of their benefits, who would produce doubt?

一代利物之應跡皆是三密加持妙業。八相成道之化儀、莫非六大法身智用。縁謝卽滅之尊形、遺化既有恃。機興卽生之舍利、當益誰作疑。(*Kōshiki Dētabēsu*, lines 78–81)

194

In his exposition of these lines, Gahō confronts the fact that at least two editions of the *Shari kuyō shiki* exist and that Section Two of each edition focuses either on rebirth in Tuṣita Heaven (*Tosotsu* 都率) or rebirth in the Pure Land of Sukhāvati (*Gokuraku* 極樂), an aspect of textual production discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Gahō goes on to explain how Śākyamuni is the physical source of relics, and faithful devotion to his relics can bring the practitioner into closer proximity with the more fundamental manifestation of Śākyamuni, namely Mahāvairocana. The reader has heavily engaged this area of Gahō's commentary and focuses their marks on Gahō's ranking of merit that derives from relic offerings. Ticks appear beside each of the characters in the following lines:

[Sub-commentary ▲] [As for] offering relics and vowing to be reborn in the Pure Land, in making offerings of relics there are two types of merit. The upper class [of merit yields] sudden awakening in this very body. The lower class [of merit yields] birth in the Pure Land.

▲供養舎利願生極楽ト者舎利ヲ供養スルニ二種功徳有リ。上品ハ即身頓悟ナリ。下品ハ十方浄土ニ生ス。(*Shari kuyō shiki shō*, leaves 71–72)

In similar fashion as the above example, wherein Gahō, by way of the *Commentary on the Sutra that Transcends the Principle*, associates Ākāśagarbha with the *saṃgha* and its representation with stocks of merit and virtue, this section

195

also focuses on the results of the activities of the practitioner. In particular, it highlights the soteriological possibility inherent to relic devotion and the centrality of merit, made through that very devotion, for practitioners.

Conclusion

Engagements with both Kakugen's commentary on Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron* and Gahō's commentary on Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* suggest that Chishakuin became the site of a slowly unifying Shingi Shingon doctrine only three decades after Unshō's use of the term "Shingi" in his *Kenmon zuihitsu*. Moreover, Kakugen's connection to both texts—as author of his own commentary and sponsor to the publication of Gahō's commentary—suggests that he used his tenure as Chishakuin abbot to produce and maintain this unified doctrine using texts with pedagogical potential.

Readers of Kakugen's commentary seized upon areas in which Kakugen provides denominational context for the composition and development of Kūkai's treatise. In these areas, Kakugen explains the provenance of the text and how it grew out of doctrinal discussion among various sects. Readers of Kakugen's commentary narrow this discussion further by providing individual names of important monks central to those discussions. This network of users thus provided a telescopic view of esoteric frameworks as they developed in the work of Kūkai, whereby this single commentary contains several layers of growing detail within the margins.

More narrowly, readers of Gahō's commentary seized upon basic explanations of the nature of relics, but also upon the role of the Buddha's mutual empowerment (*kaji* 加持) that emerges through relic devotion. While this text lacks marginal writing, the marks of emphasis indicate a distinct and deliberate focus on connections between the Buddha's physical form and his aspect of mutual empowerment, one of the defining doctrinal features of the Shingi branch. In this way, we can observe one possible reason why Gahō's commentary was printed for Chishakuin during Kakugen's tenure as abbot. Just as Gahō may have seen a pedagogical potential in Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and sought to draw out that potential through commentarial analysis, Kakugen, who wrote the preface to Gahō's commentary upon its printing at Chishakuin in 1696, may have seen a similar pedagogical potential in Gahō's text. If the symbolic marks of the reader are any indication, this potential continued to be seized upon by those interested in the function of relics and their mutually empowering potential long after the publication of this text. Much like in the case of Kakugen's commentary on Kūkai's treatise, we find a network of users contributing to a cohesive Shingi doctrine issued, by the end of the seventeenth century, from Chishakuin.

Conclusion

The beginning of this dissertation offered a likely scenario of ritual performance and observance at Chishakuin during the early modern era. The scenario, which depicts clerics and laypeople absorbed in their respective religious activities during *higan* festivities, highlighted the observability of divisions between such activities. At first glance, the performance of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* appears to separate two religious groups; clerics, focused in performance, bore direct witness to content of the *Shari kuyō shiki*, while laypeople became a partial witness while tending to other religious and social responsibilities. In a general sense, this scenario reflects the ease with which social and religious divisions tend to emerge between Buddhist performers and audience members.

As this dissertation has attempted to demonstrate, however, this scenario would likely have played out quite differently. The performance of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* may not have been a source of such clear divisions. In fact, as the above analyses of performances suggest, Kakuban's *kōshiki* drew in laity alongside clerics in order share in witness to the exposition of the theme of relic worship and its merits. The inclusion of the *Shari wasan* in direct succession of the *Shari kuyō shiki* offered lay individuals, like those in the imagined scenario above, an alternate route toward understanding this theme. While it is still likely that, among the bustle of the temple during *higan* festivities, lay individuals may not have borne witness to every aspect of the performance, the co-delivery of Kakuban's liturgies makes it difficult to assume the same social and religious

divisions of this scenario as were assumed at the beginning of this dissertation. In this way, while the religious activities of these two groups in the scenario differed in basic purpose, Kakuban's *kōshiki* and *wasan* provided a shared aural and spatial environment for degrees of the transmission of religious knowledge.

This dissertation has therefore sought to clarify several key issues surrounding the relationship between religious performance and reception in early modern Japanese Buddhism. In my above analysis, I have attempted to address two overarching topics related to Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki.* These concern (i) establishing methods for identifying the parameters of religious reception when varied Buddhist audiences interacted with the text and performance of Kakuban's liturgies, and (ii) delineating how early modern performances of Kakuban's liturgies addressed concerns of denominational revival, especially in the midst of sweeping educational reforms across the Shingi Shingon school. Below, I describe how this dissertation has addressed these issues. I also describe how this study provides a point of departure for future studies on related issues.

With regard to the first topic, one helpful method of categorizing the reception of both Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* is by focusing on how, and under what performative and social circumstances, these liturgies supported one another in their communication of doctrinal tenets to attendees. In a performative sense, these liturgies followed in direct sequence of one another and together focused on the theme of relic devotion, its merits, and the doctrinal implications of such activities. Since the *Shari kuyō shiki* was performed before the *Shari wasan* in this sequence, and since the *wasan* offered praise through

metered verse rather than exposition, I have identified a graduated complexity in the co-delivery of these liturgies that allowed for their reception across varied audiences.

My above analysis of the content of these liturgies has revealed at least two possible registers through which witnesses could learn about doctrinal features surrounding relics as objects of devotion. At a textual and performative level, key differences in the ritual scripts widened the scope of reception to include laity alongside clerics. The *Shari wasan* offered a simplified, metered complement to the *Shari kuyō shiki* insofar as it lacked much of the referential and expository information present in the *kōshiki*. Despite the alternative form of the *Shari wasan*, however, it still focused on the same imperative to relic devotion in the context of Shingon doctrine. At a social level, lay reception was supported by an array of other devotional ceremonies concurrently offered at Chishakuin that drew interest during key moments throughout the year. Chishakuin's status as a *metsuzai* temple, moreover, drew in supporters on a voluntary basis to contribute in exchange for ritual services during these key moments.

Through the models of analysis above, it is possible to see how the scenario that began this dissertation likely played out much differently. Returning from their visit to the gravestone at the rear of the temple, and with their *botamochi* in hand, perhaps the laypeople pass by the lecture hall once more and hear the *Shari wasan*, an alternate version of the *kōshiki* they heard on their way to the gravestone. This time, the metered verse and restrained exposition allows them to discern the content more precisely than before. They therefore linger

longer than before and find a suitable place to stand just outside the lecture hall

and finish their confections. Here, they follow the pattern of each verse and are

better able to understand the praise being expressed for the bodily remains of the

Buddha in the present world, the Great Compassion lodged in relics, and the

injunctions to devote themselves to them. In this way, we can observe degrees of

union, rather than division, between the religious experiences of the clerical

performers within the lecture hall and the lay witnesses to the ritual observing

from nearby. The textual, performative, and social circumstances surrounding the

Shari kuyō shiki and *Shari wasan* thus reveal one register in which laity could

understand some of the core doctrinal tenets surrounding relic worship.

At the same time, they indicate another register in which performing or

observing clerics could understand these same tenets in the context of narrative

elaborations, scriptural references, and clerically oriented practices represented in

the *Shari kuyō shiki*. In this register, we might imagine a different scenario

unfolding for the clerics preparing in their monastic residence as well. Perhaps,

prior to joining the procession to the lecture hall, they take up their portions of the

ritual script and scan the verses they are about to perform. Beyond their ability to

recognize the phonetic pronunciation of their parts, their clerical education and

training in Shingon doctrine allows them to recognize and interpret the narratives

and references at play in their script. They then proceed to the lecture hall to

embody and express that doctrinal understanding. Through these alternative

interpretations of the original scenario, it seems clear that the sequential

performance of both of these liturgies cut across divisions that separated

performers from audiences and, together, sought to explain doctrinal tenets surrounding relic devotion in accessible terms.

This latter, clerically oriented register of reception is corroborated by the clerical activities surrounding the *Shari kuyō shiki*, which engaged the heuristic potential inherent to the ritual. This register is also connected to the second issue addressed by this dissertation. At an institutional level, the clerical reception of Kakuban's liturgies was supported by other ceremonies focused on monastic learning and a denominational revival during the seventeenth century. The Hōon-kō and Denbōdai-e, especially, represented direct symbolic and liturgical connections to Kakuban as founder figure of the Shingi branch of Shingon Buddhism. In addition, the shared calendrical space between these two liturgies and the *Shari kuyō shiki* directly linked Kakuban's doctrinal ideas with pedagogical performance. The co-constituent relationship between devotion and learning that emerged in these ritual spaces did so through the heuristic potential in the *Shari kuyō shiki*, as it communicated fundamental ideas surrounding relic devotion.

At the same time, the performance of his liturgy occurred within the same timeframe as others focused on devotion to Kakuban himself and to learning about similar fundamental ideas. This circularity of devotion between Kakuban and relics only amplified the denominational revival that developed at Chishakuin. This suite of rituals supported the formation of a Shingi denominational identity by linking Chishakuin with liturgical authority derived from Kakuban as a founder symbol and monastic learning tied to Kakuban's own

doctrinal perspective. Additionally, Kakugen's early modern sponsorship of the publication of Gahō's commentary and his preface to it, as well as the symbols and notes made by later readers that focused on key terminology all corroborate a similar relationship between religious devotion and learning in this upper register. While the identity of readers such as Shimono Jun'yu are unclear at this time, this individual's engagement with the text is broadly representative of a continued intellectual curiosity surrounding the doctrinal features of relic devotion. This curiosity appears to have been met through an engagement with Kakugen's publication of Gahō's commentary. Thus, just as in the textual, performative, and social senses outlined above, the examples summarized in an institutional context here also make it difficult to define devotion and the intellect as disconnected modes of religiosity in this upper register.

The conclusions drawn in this dissertation implicate several broader issues worth further attention in the study of Japanese Buddhism. First, the model of registers of reception may help to guide approaches to other studies on the relationship between religious performance and learning in the field. Explorations of such features from outside of the Shingon school, especially, can widen our view of how other Japanese Buddhists understood the *kōshiki* genre and its utility among varied audiences. If the variability of ritual reception and understanding is observable within a school that maintains a secrecy in its esoteric teachings, it may be possible that analyses of other, exoteric schools may yield similar, or perhaps more telling, conclusions.

One rich area of potential is the direct circulation of *kōshiki* and *kōshiki* commentaries within regional academies (*danrin*). The eighteen Kantō-area regional academies (*Kantō jūhachi danrin* 関東十八檀林) provided teachings in the Pure Land traditions of Shinran during the early modern era, and they may provide opportunities to further explore the relationship between ritual, education, and clerical administration. The eighteen *danrin* belong to the Pure Land school (*Jōdo-shū* 浄土宗) and their network formed after the Tokugawa government issued, just as in the case of Chishakuin, regulations for organizing and hierarchizing temples and their educational systems. The *Hōon kōshiki shō* 報恩講式鈔, written by Ekai 慧海 (d.u.) is a *kōshiki* commentary based on a *kōshiki* written by Kakunyo 覺如 (1270–1351), great-grandson and biographer to Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1263). Judging by the perceived heuristic value of *kōshiki* commentaries within the Shingon school, I suspect that clerics at more than one of these Kantō-area *danrin* may have similarly perceived of Ekai's text. This dissertation is meant as an initial inquiry for further studies that approach ritual from curricular or pedagogical perspectives, and *kōshiki* and *kōshiki* commentaries like this may provide additional corroborative evidence of the integration of the genre into forums for monastic learning.

Further investigation into the life and editorial activities of Kakugen is also warranted. As the above analysis makes clear, this individual had lasting effects on the development of monastic learning at Chishakuin and within the Shingi branch generally. If the Meiji and post-Meiji era interactions with his sponsored printing of Gahō's commentary are any indication, his efforts to

integrate ritual and learning have continued well beyond his time. In addition to his commentary on Kūkai's *Ben ken-mitsu nikyōron*, which was explored in the final chapter of this dissertation, he also composed *Notes on the Gathered Meaning of the Ten Sections and Chapters* (*Jikkanjō satsugi shō* 十巻章撮義鈔). This text provides commentary to several important treatises central to the Shingon school, the majority of which were written by Kūkai or attributed to Nāgârjuna. His most famous work, *Accounts of the Transmission [Presented in the]* Hishō (*Hishō denjuki* 祕鈔傳授記), which traces the transmission of teachings from Shōken 勝賢 (1138–1196) to Shūkaku 守覚 (1150–1202), two major representatives of the Sanbōin 三寶院 lineage within the Ono school, remains untreated by scholars outside of Japan. Further clarification of Kakugen's doctrinal focus in his interpretations, especially those written during his abbotship at Chishakuin, will help to develop a fuller picture of this figure as an editorial and scholastic innovator who sought to define and maintain a denominational identity during the early modern era. Further study of Kakugen may also help to develop our understanding of the integration of his written works in modern curricular models at Chishakuin.

This dissertation has attempted to problematize the dichotomous categories of premodern lay and clerical participation in ritual practices by showing how these groups comingled during the delivery of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and *Shari wasan* at Chishakuin. I have suggested the possibility that similar themes of relic devotion were communicated across these varied audiences, and that laity were not simply passive observers to ritual

demonstrations. Rather, laity were equally active in their observance of Kakuban's liturgies and this activity was made possible through the textual form, performance, and social circumstances of the liturgies themselves. At the broadest level, therefore, this project constitutes on point of departure for further studies on the issue of participation in religious ritual.

Several decades ago, in his work on the relationship between ritual and theater, Richard Schechner (1974, 467–468) explored what he called the "efficacy-entertainment dyad," or a model that describes the divisions between the intended result of both ritual and theater arts. In this model, Schechner links ritual participation to the efficacy of ritual performance (i.e. what the ritual ought to accomplish). He also links the entertaining aspects of theater performance to the passive role played by the audience (i.e. they are mere witnesses). As he argues, however, the divisions between these categories often dissolve when one views either performance in relation to its surrounding context. For example, the aural, architectural, visual, and olfactory aspects of ritual performance may give way to forms of entertainment assumed by the observer. Likewise, the formality of rehearsals, backstage protocols, and the arrival and seating of the audience during a theater performance may appear ritualistic.

The accounts of ritual performances above, which took place concurrently with several other ceremonies, each with their own sensual contexts, also appear to blur the line between passive observance of a theater performance and the efficacy of ritual participation. Further investigations into the intimate links between ritual, entertainment, and the effects of participation may help us to

better understand how religious performers engage their audiences beyond their immediate religious concerns.

One of goals of this study has been to destabilize categorical conceptions of lay and clerical ritual experience. In my analysis of the comingling of both groups within the same ritual space and timeframe, I aimed to show that ritual participation may have been more inclusive during early modern performances, especially within the Shingon school. For further analyses of the category of ritual participation, especially in those that deal with several versions of ritual texts, this study may provide a framework for expanding the category of participation to include degrees of observation and understanding among witnesses as part of that category.

Notes

---

1 As Barbara Ambros, James Ford, and Michaela Mross have explained (2016, 2–3), several translations of the term *kōshiki* have found their way into scholarship. Among these have been, "ritual," "litany," "Buddhist ceremonial," "chanted lecture," and others. The authors point out that these terms do not fully capture the wide-ranging features of this genre, and therefore they choose to retain the original Japanese term in their publications. While I am sympathetic to their argument, I have chosen to render *kōshiki* as "ceremonial lecture." There are two reasons for this decision. The first is to provide some English referent for readers unfamiliar with Japanese characters and their meaning. Second, and as for the translation itself, "ceremonial lecture" simultaneously captures the formal elements of a liturgy along with elements of an oration delivered to an audience. My rendering implicitly identifies the lecture portion of the ritual as the dominant textual and performative feature of *kōshiki*. Indeed, while there are other features important to the genre in considerations of performance and reception, the lecture portions of *kōshiki* most clearly indicate the overall thematic focus of the liturgy. Thus, while my own rendering may disregard some aspects of the genre in favor of the lecture portion, it is helpful in the context of this dissertation, which attempts to highlight the thematic focus of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* for both specialists and on-specialists.

2 Austen offers, among others, "I do" (in a common Western-style marriage ceremony), "I name this ship the *Queen Mary*" (at the Christening when

launching a ship), and "I give and bequeath my watch to my brother" (in a will) as examples of "performative utterances" (p. 5).

3 In her discussion, Bell draws significantly from Pierre Bourdieu (1972), who, in his standard-setting theorization of social behavior, argues that human actors habituate themselves to behaviors that reinforce and legitimize the very social structures, which include religious activities with all manner of meaning, they populate. Bodily, cognitive, affective, and attitudinal tendencies not only take shape under the governance of past (and similar) tendencies, but also structure future tendencies to be assumed in pattern. From a behavioral perspective, therefore, and in following Bourdieu's assertions about social meaning, the body and cognition have a particularly formative hold over how human actors perceive of action, its purpose, and meaning in social contexts.

4 James Ford (2005, p. 65, n. 81) describes *jinbun* as referring to the chanting of specific sutras as a petition to gods.

5 On the contrary, Bell follows Clifford Geertz in his thoughts on ritual as a point of access. As she states, rituals are "portrayed as enactments exhibited *to others* for evaluation or appropriation in terms of their more purely theoretical knowledge" (p. 31). Rituals, in this sense, provide a glimpse of experience and an entryway to assessment from many angles. She warns, however, of the danger of too harshly pitting theorist and ritual against one another in a stark dichotomy whereby the theorist sees only the ritual, absent of the intrinsic and extrinsic social, political, and ideological mechanisms that support the ritual in the first place.

6 Foucault is also in play behind many of my assertions in this chapter. In his exploration of "the archive" as a site of historical endurance, whereby statements are granted historical existence within a specific ruleset defined by the parameters of language, Michael Foucault (1972, 41–63) describes the construction of an epistemological substratum that guides both present and future historical positions. Tyrus Miller (2007, 80–85) argues for an extension of this model to ritual acts, during which speech-acts, repetition, bodily performance, and the presence of witnesses give shape to a sense event within theatrical time, the speech of which "may function as simulacra, affecting bodies, creating the turbulence of passion, projecting hypothetical experiences, generating phantasms, rising into appearance and passing into nothingness." The present study follows this line of thought insofar as it maintains that ritual spaces allow for the active and sustained production of meaning and understanding based, though not exclusively, on sensory apprehension.

7 According to anthropologist Harvey Whitehouse (2004, 87–105) and others, this is true from a cognitive and evolutionary perspective. Whitehouse's theory of "doctrinal modes of religiosity" helps to bridge the gulf between ritual action and knowledge acquisition. In arguments he derived from fieldwork in Papua New Guinea, he describes the transmission of knowledge during ritual acts, whereby high-frequency, low-arousal rituals tend to set the stage for the codification of an authoritative canon, the homogenization of a regional tradition, or the standardization of teachings and practices because of the collective reliance on ritual leaders skilled in routinized oration, dramatism, and systems of

transmission. The religious knowledge transmitted during ritual, Whitehouse says in following the earlier models of Stanley Tambiah (1985), is highly motivating insofar as it is upheld as an authoritative truth that legitimizes collective understandings of social history.

8 Asano Shōko (1997, 110–111), who has traced the thematic origins of this liturgy, suggests that the text may have been directly influenced by the "Secret Ceremony on Dhātu [Relics]" (*Dato hishiki* 駄都祕式), written by Kūkai (774–835), in which he describes the nonduality between Mahavairocana and relics as sources of benefits in the world. For Kūkai's *Dato hishiki*, see *Kōbō daishi zenshū*, vol. 14, p. 250. Steven Trenson (2018, 119) details the medieval development of relic rites (*dato hō* 駄都法), which acted as liturgical templates for a variety of devotional rituals that take central objects of devotion. These objects ranged, as he says, from various Buddhas and bodhisattvas, to texts and even grains of rice. Notably, Gahō, the chief commentator discussed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation, has much to say of rice grains and their similar appearance to Buddha relics.

9 The *Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra* (*Dai hatsu nehan gyō* 大般涅槃經, T no. 374), translated by Dharmakṣema (Don Musen 曇無讖), describes these virtues as eternity (*jōtoku* 常德), bliss (*rakutoku* 樂德), selfhood (*gatoku* 我德), and purity (*jōtoku* 淨德).

10 For example, on the topic of attaining Buddhahood in one's very body, Kakuban describes sets of practices meant for those of either Great Vehicle

faculties (*daiki* 大機) or Mainstream faculties (*shōki* 小機). He delineates these

faculties even further by sharpness and dullness (*ridon* 利鈍). He then furnishes

among these four categories a range of appropriate practices—entering [through

contemplation] the *dharma* realm essence (*nyū hokkai taishō* 入法界體性),

contemplation of the seed syllable A (*aji kan* अ 字観), and the gradual passage

through the sixteen great bodhisattva stages (*shidai ni jūroku dai bosatsu'i o heru*

次第經於十六大菩薩位), among others—that can effect Buddhahood in one's

very body. In other words, despite his delineation of faculties among practitioners,

the practices best suited for attaining Buddhahood in one's body are those that are

cultivated through proper initiation and clerical training (T no. 2514, 21c03–

22a16).

11 While he does not delineate which, it is possible that he refers here to the

Heaven of Merit Production (*Fukushō ten* 福生天) or Heaven of Extensive

Rewards (*Kōka ten* 廣果天), one of the ascendant Heavens of the form realm,

described in the *Discourse on the Stages of Contemplative Practice* (*Yuga shiji

ron* 瑜伽師地論) as a destination attainable through repeated contemplative

practice. See, for example: 無雲天福生天廣果天。此三由軟中上品。熏修第四

靜慮故。 (T no. 1579, lines 295a08–296a09).

12 For example, in the following excerpt from *Unjigi*, Kūkai taxonomizes the

meaning of the syllable *hūṃ* by ranking the aspects of syllabic understanding

versus syllabic interpretation. He then describes other syllables that are subsumed

by the syllable *hūṃ* and the significance of each as they relate to central Shingon

honzon and the fundamental reality of nonduality: 一吽字相義分二。一解字

相。二釋字義。初解字相者又分四。四字分離故金剛頂釋此一字具四字義。

一賀字義。二阿字義。三汚字義。四麼字義。一賀字義者。中央本尊體是其

字也。所謂賀字是因義也。梵云係怛嚩二合即是因縁義。因有六種。及因縁

義中因有五種。如阿毘曇廣説。若見訶字門即知一切諸法無不從因縁生。是

爲訶字字相。二阿字義者。訶字中有阿聲。即是一切字之母一切聲之體一切

實相之源。凡最初開口之音皆有阿聲。若離阿聲則無一切言説。故爲衆聲之

母。若見阿字則知諸法空無。是爲阿字字相。三汚字是一切諸法損減義。若

見汚字則知一切法無常苦空無我 等。是則損減即是字相也。四麼字義者。

梵云怛麼此翻爲我我有二種。一人我二法我。若見麼字門則知一切諸法有我

人衆生等。是名增益。是則字相。一切世間但知如是字相。未曾解字義。是

故爲生死人。如來如實知實義。所以號大覺二解字義有四。(T no. 2430,

lines 404b17–404c08)

13 This gold, according to the *Sūtra on Buddha Discourse on Buddha-Mother*

Precious Merit Storehouse Perfection of Wisdom (*Busetsu butsumo shussan hōzō*

hannya haramitta kyō 佛説佛母出生法藏般若波羅蜜多經) is also likened to the

appearance of the Buddha among the myriad living beings of the world: 譬如大

地少出閻浮檀金多諸荊棘砂礫草木等類。一切衆生亦復如是。(T228,

659a17–659a18)

14 Nakamura (1975, 546b) describes this purple-tinged gold as the best among this

class of mineral, and notes that the predominant use of *suvarṇa* ("gold";

213

"golden") in Sanskrit texts suggests that the glyph denoting the purple tinge was a later addition by translators. I have not analyzed the texts to which Nakamura refers.

15 The prefaces of this text are dated 1769 and 1773 and authorship is attributed to Reizui 靈瑞 (1740?–1804).

16 Kakuban's lineage was originally founded on Mount Kōya, but later relocated to Mount Negoro 根來山 by Raiyu in 1286 following a factional dispute between followers of Kakuban and Kongōbuji 金剛峰寺, the central temple on Mount Kōya.

17 It is necessary to acknowledge here the inherent possibility that ritual attendees may have only witnessed parts of these rituals, or perhaps none at all, despite their presence the temples during *higan* celebrations. Studies of all ritual practice, especially those conducted in premodern periods, must confront the reality that in the frenzy of social events, the possibility of distraction and misdirection was, more than likely, a common part of the ritual experience. Rather than cast aside this reality or over-qualify my assertions on the nature of apprehension, I maintain that distraction, misdirection, and all manner of "interference" only enhanced the formation of the sensual event. That is, to echo the assertions of Tyrus Miller above (see note 5) on the productivity of "theatrical time" in creating spatial, social, and aural opportunities for meaning-making, the peripheral social and ritual distractions may have only heightened the sensual experience and, even in moments of partial witness to the *Shari wasan* and *Shari kuyō shiki*, may have instigated the physical, emotional, and cognitive faculties of those in attendance.

18 In these and other temple records, including *Chishakuin shi*, compilers denote Kakuban's works by the use of the Sanskrit syllable *ban* वं.

19 This dharma seal (*hō-in* 法印) refers to one of the four dharma truths (*shi hō-in* 四法印), which are that all phenomena are impermanent, all phenomena are sources of suffering, all phenomena lack self, and that nirvana is possible (Nakamura 1975, 531b).

20 The four service records are *Hōreki nenchū gyōji* 寶曆年中行事, *An'ei nenchū gyōji* 安永年中行事, *Kyōwa ganryō nenchū gyōji roku* 享和岸寮年中行事錄, and *Kaei Chisan nenchū gyōji* 嘉永智山年中行事.

21 This service is not exclusive to Chishakuin, nor to the Shingon school.

22 The *Shari raimon* is a short verse extolling the virtue of the Buddha Śākyamuni and its presence in relics. Authorship of this verse remains unclear, though many scholars attribute it to either Amoghavajra (705–774), Yixing (683–727), or Śubhakarasiṃha (637–735) (Ishikawa 1963, 650–651).

23 This mention of merit-dedication for the recently deceased is preceded with a locative mention of a study hall (*kangaku'in* 勸學院). It is unclear whether this dedication was performed by members of this hall at the time, or whether the dedication was performed for the recently deceased tied to the study hall.

24 In defining *shō* in this way, Nakamura Hajime (1975, vol. 1, 725a) cites the *Yuishinshō mon'i* 唯信鈔文意, written by Hōnen (1133–1212), as his source. Strikingly, and in much the same way as Gahō's treatment of Kakuban's *Shari*

kuyō shiki, the target of Hōnen's *shō* refers not only to sutras, but also to other essential texts (*yōmon* 要文) within the Pure Land tradition.

25 Gahō uses a degree of textual organization (*kamon* 科文) that operates in the spirit of techniques standardized by prolific commentator Dao'an 道安 (314–385) and later utilized across East Asia. He breaks down the liturgy line by line, uses individual lines as typographic markers for self-contained commentarial sections, and refers back to these sections accordingly. In some areas, he also follows the style of dissemination sections (*ruzū bun* 流通) whereby he refers to the purpose of the liturgy and, more often, to the potential merit gained by engaging with the text. Finally, a preface (*jobun* 序分) was later added by Edo period publisher and Chishakuin abbot Kakugen 覺眼 (1643–1722), in which he discusses the text by way of terminological emphases. Notably, Kakugen also used these and other hermeneutical techniques in his own commentaries on Kūkai's works.

26 This commentary is, by contrast, only a few short paragraphs in length. Unlike in the *Shari kuyō shiki shō*, Gōkan does not engage the details of the *Jizō Bosatsu kōshiki* in any way. Instead, he writes vaguely about the contents of the work and remarks on his personal relationship with the central object of devotion, the bodhisattva Jizō (Sk. Kṣitigarbha), and his stay at Chishakuin (*Kōgyō Daishi denki shiryō zenshū*, vol. 2, 1223).

27 For the standard format of this ritual in an East Asian context, see T. no. 278, 9.430c–431A.

28 For a comprehensive overview of the efforts of Shingon Buddhists to harbor and preserve relics during the late-Heian period, see Ruppert (2000).

29 Extant holdings include: Taisho University (Tokyo), Kyoto University (Kyoto), Mount Kōya (south of Kyoto), the Hikone Municipal Library (Shiga Prefecture), Zentsūji 善通寺 (south of Okayama), and Chishakuin 智積院 (Kyoto). I own color copies of the Taisho holding as well as black and white digital copies (PDFs) of the Hikone Library holding (a Meiji-era print, the original of which likely belonged either to Chishakuin or Mount Kōya). I have examined, page-by-page, the Chishakuin holding in person. I discern no alterations made to any of the versions that I encountered during research, save for symbolic scholia present in the Taisho University copy (See Chapter 5 for further details).

30 Kakuban uses 群 in his *Shari kuyō shiki*, while Gahō uses 羣. These characters have identical meanings.

31 Throughout my analysis of these selections, I refer to line numbers drawn from Neils Guelberg's *Kōshiki Database*. See Appendix, Table 1 for corresponding line numbers drawn from the *Kōgyō daishi zenshū*.

32 For more on the basic theoretical differences between Kogi Shingon and Shingi Shingon *vis-à-vis kaji*, see van der Veere (2000, 92–93). Matthew McMullen (2008) has written perhaps the most comprehensive English-language overview of the role of Raiyu in the institutionalization of the Shingi Shingon school and focuses largely on the debates surrounding the expounder of the *Mahāvairocana Sūtra*.

33 For more on this process of petitioning for agricultural purity, see Kleiner (2016, p. 495).

34 I have divided the entire *Makino-o Commentary* by the following thematic categories. Practice, 23 sections (11 ritual, 12 cultivative): I define cultivative practice as practice that meant to contribute to an overarching soteriological goal, which, in the Shingi Shingon school usually refers to becoming a Buddha in one's immediate body (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成佛). Kakuban's understanding of this goal was, as Henny van der Veere (2000, 101) outlines, equally informed by Kūkai's *Sokushin jōbustu gi* 即身成佛義 and *Bodaishinron* 菩提心論, attributed, by the Shingon school, to Nāgârjuna (Ryūju 龍樹). Doctrine, 61 sections (30 terminological, 31 expository): I define terminologically oriented sections as those that deal with defining, clarifying, or explaining key terms, phrases, or the names of principal figures. I define expository sections as those that provide background information or textual references in order to clarify meaning or significance. Material/Regulatory, 16 sections: I define material/regulatory sections as those that deal with, on the one hand, the material constituents of ritual or image-making practices and, on the other, disciplinary practices during day-to-day monastery life.

35 In the grand scheme of Shingon, and of Tantric Buddhism more generally, the importance of Yixing's commentary cannot be understated. As Koichi Shinohara (2014, 147–148) describes of Yixing's authority, he was well versed in Tantric literature and collaborated with the Indian scholar-monk Śubhakarasiṃha (Jp.

Zenmui 善無畏; 637–735). His commentary is particularly meticulous in its elucidation of detailed ritual instructions.

36 CBETA locates this passage in 『大日經疏指心鈔』no. 8863, vol. 8, p. 316, lines b6–8.

37 CBETA locates this passage in 『大日經義釋』no. 438, vol. 5, p. 342, lines a1–5.

38 When read in relation to the final sentences in the previous paragraph, I interpret this metaphor to mean that if one method of connecting to a Buddha or bodhisattva is not a natural fit for the practitioner, the practitioner may use a suitable alternative method. Likewise, and to use Gahō's metaphor, if one finds flavors unsuitable for a particular sense faculty, they can be enjoyed in other ways by other sense faculties.

39 As a signal of one's degree of insight, this compound is important because Kakuban's use of it underscores the imperative to support one's correct perception through faith and trust. Here, even on the surface, we find a clear thematic continuity between Gahō's exposition of Kakuban's *Shari kuyō shiki* and the present work: one's perception of the nondual nature shared between Buddhas, bodhisattvas and, ultimately, relics as objects of devotion, is not wholly a product of cognitive capacity. It is informed by one's confidence in it as an unquestionable facet of reality and, moreover, one can demonstrate that confidence through devotional practice.

40 Milkwood refers to the fleshy, inner portions of a tree used as an alternative to sandalwood in the *goma* ritual (*Mikkyō daijiten*, 1712–1713).

41 The eight consciousnesses comprise one of the major features of Yogâcāra 瑜伽行派 Buddhism. They amount to the first five bodily senses, two types of mental consciousness, and the storehouse consciousness (Buswell and Lopez, 2014, 1079).

42 On Jīvaka, see Buswell and Lopez (2014, 394-395). Information on Biànjuān has been difficult to locate. Marcus Bingenheimer (2017, 163–164) describes several physicians that appear alongside Jīvaka in later recensions of the Āgamas. Though Biànjuān is not named among them, Bingenheimer suggests that the physicians were added later to the texts and that, perhaps, they are the names of physicians in the audience during the delivery of sermons related to the sutras. It is possible that Biànjuān's name appeared in one of these versions at one time.

43 The text and glyphs that appear in brackets in my translation appear in the original text as smaller fonts inserted between each main compound. Rather than reduce the size of these fonts, I have distinguished their difference in the original text by using brackets.

44 Perhaps the most notable and widely read reference to the Buddha as a physician among East Asian Buddhists appears in Chapter 16 of *Lotus Sūtra*, "The Lifespan of the *Tathāgata*."

45 Gahō makes several other references to Kakuban in his *Makino-o mondō shō* not explored in this chapter. In his section on the *Necessity of Cultivating Good Roots for Use by the Mind in the Four Accesses [to the Śrāvaka Path]* (*Saku zenkon kanarazu shikō o michiiru beshi* 作善根必可用四向), Gahō cites Kakuban's *Brief Explanation of the A and Ban Realm maṇḍalas* (*A ban kai mandara ryaku shaku* अवं 界曼荼羅略釋). In his section on *Methods of Practice in Each Moment* (*Gyōhō jikoku* 行法時尅) he cites Kakuban's method, rather than *sūtra* regulations (*kyōki* 經軌), as precedents for daily practice. In his section on the *Three Types of Honorable [Forms of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas]* (*Shu sanzon* 種三尊), he cites Kakuban's *Profound Notes on Amida* (*Amida hishaku* 阿彌陀祕釋).

46 The *Explanation of Mahāyana Discourse* is attributed to Nagārjuna (Jp: Ryūjū 龍樹).

47 As described above, the curricular focus during each of these modes of study is on the *Explanation of Mahāyana Discourse* rather than the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* during the summer Hōon-kō.

48 At Mount Kōya, these phases are referred to as pre-lecture (*zenkō* 前講), main lecture (*honkō* 本講), and post-lecture (*gokō* 後講).

49 The line from the *Shari kuyō shiki* reads: "As a result, although [He] displays complete *nirvāṇa* in which His salvific activities [seem] to have finally ceased, his Great Compassion does not rest and still lodges in His relics." (遂乃化縁已、盡雖示滅度、大悲不休、尚留舍利); The sixth verse of the *Shari wasan*

221

reads: "Even though [the Buddha's] life-long method of guidance has ended, And [he has] returned to the city of four virtues [of enlightenment], [His] Great Compassion and skillful techniques do not stop, But yet still lodge within relics" (一代化儀事終て，四徳の都に皈れども，大悲方便止ずして，舎利を留め置き給う).

50 Rolston cites Lawrence Lipking (1977, 609, 612, 651) in defining marginalia as bodies of reactive writing that were originally paired with the text but published separately at a later date. Lipking defines marginal glosses as reactive writing that remains alongside the text, are "serious, dependent on the text, and aim as a higher synthesis."

51 H.J. Jackson (2001) describes marginal writers as engaging not only with their own thoughts, for which they pause reading long enough to commit that engagement to the margins, but also with the reader of the target text and the author of the target text. If we take seriously Genette's statements about extraneous writing as part of a network of related texts, I contend that this "conversation" carried much further than the texts immediate reader.

52 As the marginal writing above this very section indicates, Dao'an's text deals with the ways in which Buddhism relates to Confucianism and Daoism as a tripartite teaching.

53 The *Kusharon ki* 倶舎論記 is a commentary written by Pǔguāng (645?–664; Jp: Fukō; also called Daijōkō 大乗光) in which the author comments on the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (Āpídámó jùshè lùn 阿毘達磨倶舎論), written by Vasubhandu.

54 Gomyō was a monk of the Japanese Hossō school who began his monastic career by studying Yogācāra at the Nara temple Gangōji 元興寺. In 791 he was invited to the imperial court in Kyoto, where he gave a series of several lectures on the *Sūtra on the Original Vows of the Medicine-Master Tathāgata of Lapis Light* (*Yakushi rurikō nyorai hongan kōtoku kyō* 藥師琉璃光如來本願功德經) and on the *Sūtra of the Lotus of the Wonderful Dharma* (*Myōhō renge kyō* 妙法蓮華經); (Saitō and Naruse 1986, 164)

55 Dōshō was a Sanron monk who, like Gomyō, studied at Gangōji. He took precepts at Tōdaiji in 818. He also received special instruction from Kūkai in ritual techniques focused on the twin maṇḍalas (*ryōbu daihō* 兩部大法); (Saitō and Naruse 1986, 319).

56 This line also appears in the *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra*: T2218. No. 60, lines 326a20–326a21.

Appendix: Table 1

Table 1: Corresponding *Shari kuyō shiki* Line

Numbering Between the *Kōshiki Database* (Text #40)

and the *Kōgyō daishi zenshū* (vol. 2, pp. 1281–1292)

Kōshiki Database Line Number (from title)	*Kōgyō daishi zenshū* Line Number (from title)
1 (Title)	1 (Title)
2	2
3	3
4	3–4
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	7–8
9	8–9
10	9

11	9–10
12	10
13	11
14	11–12
15	12
16	12–13
17	13–14
18	14
19	14–15
20	15
21	15–16
22	16–17
23	17
24	17–18

25	18–19
26	19
27	19–20
28	20
29	20–21
30	22
31	22
32	23
33	23–24
34	24–25
35	25–26
36	26
37	26
38	27

39	27–28
40	28
41	28–29
42	29–30
43	30
44	30–31
45	31–32
46	32
47	32–33
48	33
49	33–34
50	34
51	34–35
52	35–36

53	36
54	36–37
55	37–38
56	38
57	38–39
58	39
59	39–40
60	40–41
61	41
62	41–42
63	42
64	42–43
65	43–44
66	44

67	45
68	45–46
69	47
70	47
71	48
72	49
73	49–50
74	50
75	50–51
76	51–52
77	52
78	52–53
79	53–54
80	54

81	54–55
82	55
83	55–56
84	56–57
85	57
86	57–58
87	58
88	58–59
89	59–60
90	60
91	60–61
92	61
93	61–62
94	62

95	63
96	63–64
97	64
98	64–65
99	65–66
100	66
101	66–67
102	67
103	67–68
104	69
105	69–70
106	70
107	71
108	72

109	73
110	73–74
111	74
112	74–75
113	75–76
114	76
115	76–77
116	77
117	77–78
118	78–79
119	79
120	79–80
121	80
122	81–82

123	82–83
124	83
125	83–84
126	84
127	84–85
128	85–86
129	86
130	86–87
131	87
132	87–88
133	88–89
134	89
135	89–90
136	90–91

137	91
138	91–92
139	92
140	92–93
141	94
142	94
143	95
144	95
145	96
146	108
147	108–109
148	109
149	109–110
150	110–111

151	111
152	111–112
153	112–113
154	113
155	113–114
156	114
157	114–115
158	115–116
159	116
160	116–117
161	117–118
162	118
163	118–119
164	119

165	120–121
166	121–122
167	122
168	122–123
169	123–124
170	124
171	125–126
172	126
173	127
174	127
175	128
176	129
177	129–130
178	130

179	130–131
180	131
181	132
182	132–133
183	134

References

Primary

Busetsu butsumo shussan hōzō hannya haramitta kyōi (Sūtra on Buddha
Discourse on Buddha-Mother Precious Merit Storehouse Perfection of
Wisdom) 佛說佛母出生法藏般若波羅蜜多經, T no. 228

Chishakuin shi 智積院史 (*History of Chishakuin*). 1934. Compiled by Murayama
Shōei 村山正栄. Kyoto: Kōbō Daishi Onki Jimukyoku 弘法大師遠忌事
務局.

Chizan yōkō 智山瑤光. 1933. Compiled by Kobō Daishi Onki Jimukyoku 弘法大
師遠忌事務局. Kyoto: Chishakuin.

Dato hishiki 駄都秘式 (*Relic Hymn*). Kūkai 空海. In: *Kōbō daishi zenshū* 弘法大
師全集, vol. 14. Compiled by Sofū Senʾyōkai 祖風宣揚会. Tokyo:
Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Denbōdai-e jugi kōyō 傳法大會堅義綱要 (*Proposed Meanings [of Doctrinal]*
Essentials of the Great Assembly on Dharma Transmission). 1937.
Compiled by Takai Kankai 高井觀海

Gien Jugō nikki 義演准后日記 (*Diary of Gien, Attendant to the Royal Consorts*).
Gien 義演. 1976–2006. Compiled by Yanaga Teizō 弥永貞三 et al.
Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijō Kanseikai 続群書類従完成会.

Gorin kuji myō himitsushaku 五輪九字明祕密釋 (*Esoteric Commentary on the*
Mantras of the Five Elements and Nine Seed-Syllables), T no. 2514.

Jōkei kōshiki shū 貞慶講式集. 2000. Compiled by Yamada Shōzen 山田昭全 and

Shimizu Yūshō 清水宥聖. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Kōbō daishi zenshū 弘法大師全集 (*Complete Collection [of the Works of]*

Kûkai). 1923. Compiled by Sofū Senʾyōkai 祖風宣揚会. 16 vols. Tokyo:

Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū 興教大師撰述集. Compiled by Miyasaka Yūshō 宥勝

宮坂宥勝. 2 vols. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshōrin. 1977.

Kōgyō daishi denki shiryō zenshū 興教大師伝記史料全集. 1942. Compiled by

Akio Miura 章夫三浦. Tokyo: Pitaka.

Kōgyō daishi zenshū 興教大師全集 (*Complete Collection [of the Works of]*

Kakuban). 1935. Compiled by Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧 and Kōjun

Tomita 斅純富田. 9 vols. Tokyo: Sesōken 世相軒.

Mansai Jugō nikki 滿濟准后日記 (*Diary of Mansai, Attendant to the Royal*

Consorts). Mansai 滿濟. 1918–1920. Compiled by Kyōto Teikoku

Daigaku bunka daigaku hen 京都帝國大學文科大學編. Kyoto: Rokujō

Kappan Seizōjo 六條活版製造所.

Misshū shohō-e gisoku 密宗諸法會義則 (*Ritual Protocols for Various Dharma*

Assemblies in the Esoteric Schools). 1774. Reizui 靈瑞. Ōsaka:

Kashiharaya Yozaemon 柏原屋與左衛門.

Shaji torishirabe ruisan 社寺取調類纂 (*Collection and Investigation [of*

Materials Concerning] Shrines and Temples). 1990. Fujii Sadafumi 藤井

貞文, Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄, and Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan 国立
国会図書館, eds. Tokyo: Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihon Bunka Kenkyūjo
國學院大學日本文化研究所

Shari himitsu wasan 舍利秘密和讃 (*Secret Hymn on Relics in Japanese*).
Kakuban 覺鑁. 1977. In: *Kōgyō Daishi senjutsushū* 興教大師撰述集.
Compiled by Miyasaka Yūshō 宮坂宥勝. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.

Shari kuyō shiki 舍利供養式 (*Ceremonial Lecture [on the Merits of] Relic
Offerings*). Kakuban 覺鑁. 1935. Compiled by Nakano Tatsue 中野達慧
and Tomita Kōjun 富田斅純. In: *Kōkyō Daishi zenshū* 興敎大師全集,
vol. 2, pp. 1281–1293. Tokyo: Sesōken 世相軒.

Shari kuyō shiki shō 舍利供養式鈔 (*Commentary on Ceremonial Lecture [on the
Merits of] Relic Offerings*). Gahō 我寶. Rare Books Collection, Taisho
University, Tokyo.

Unjigi 吽字義 (*The Meaning of the Syllable 'Hūṃ'*), T no. 2430.

Yuga shiji ron 瑜伽師地論 (*Discourse on the Stages of Contemplative Practice*),
T no. 1579.

Secondary

Abe Toshimasa 阿部俊正. 2019. "Butsuji kōshiki" 「仏慈講式」 *Sōtō shū sōgyō
kenkyū sentā gakujū daikai kiyō* 曹洞宗総合研究センター学術大会紀
要 20: 85–90.

Akatsuka Yudō 赤塚祐道. 2012. "Kakuban no 'Shari kuyō shiki' o megutte" 「覺鑁の『舍利供養式』をめぐって.」 *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenyū* 印度學佛教學研究 61 (1): 12–20.

Ambros, Barbara. 2009. "Clerical Demographics in the Edo-Meiji Transition: Shingon and Tōzanha Shugendō in Western Sagami," *Monumenta Nipponica* vol. 64: 1, pp. 83-125.

_____. 2011. "Shingon Buddhism in the Early Modern Period." In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*. Edited by Charles Orzech, Henrik Sørenson, and Richard Payne. Leiden: Brill.

Arai Kōjun 新井弘順. 1985. "Shingon shōmyō ni okeru han'ongyoku kihuhō: shichi bongosan wo chūshin ni" 「真言声明における反音曲の記譜法、四智梵語を中心に」. In *Tōyō ongaku kenkyū* 東洋音楽研究 48: 42–90.

Asad, Talal. 1983. "Anthropological Conceptions of Religion: Reflections on Geertz." *Man* 18 (2): 237–259.

Asano Shōko 浅野祥子. 1997. "Shari kuyō shiki shōkō" 舍利講式小考. *Bukkyō bunka gakkai kiyō* 佛教文化学会紀要 1: 109–119.

Asuka Sango. 2015. *The Halo of Golden Light: Imperial Authority and Buddhist Ritual in Heian Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Bell, Catherine M. 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bell, David. 1995. *What Nuns Read: Books and Libraries in Medieval English Nunneries*, Cistercian Studies Series, no. 158. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.

Bingenheimer, Marcus. 2017. "Two Sutras on Healing and Healers from the Chinese Canon." In *Buddhism and Medicine: An Anthology of Premodern Sources*, ed. C. Pierce Salguero. New York: Columbia University Press.

Boyer, Pascal. 1990. *Tradition as Truth and Communication: A Cognitive Description of Tradition Discourse*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Buswell, Robert E. and Lopez, Donald S. 2014. *The Princeton Dictionary of Buddhism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cabezón, José Ignacio. 1994. *Buddhism and Language: A Study of Indo-Tibetan Scholasticism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Cuneo, Terence. 2016. *Ritualized Faith: Essays on the Philosophy of Liturgy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ford James. L and Jōkei. 2005. "Competing with Amida: A Study and Translation of Jōkei's 'Miroku Kōshiki'." *Monumenta Nipponica* 60, no. 1: 43–79.

Foucault, Michael. 2003 (1972). *Archeology of Knowledge*. UK: Routledge.

Fuse Jōmyō 布施浄明. 2005. "Denbōdai-e jugi no jissai"「伝法大会豎義の実際」. In *Chisan no rongi: Denbō dai'e to Hōon-kō* 智山の論義：伝法大会と冬報恩講. Edited by Chisan Denbō'in 智山伝法院.

Gennete, Gérard. 1997. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln:

    University of Nebraska Press.

Gilchrist, Roberta. 1994. *Gender and Material Culture: The Archeology of*

    Religious Women. London: Routledge.

Gorai Shigeru 五来重. 2007 (1982). "Higan no taiyū to nenbutsu 彼岸の太陽と

    念仏." In *Shūkyō saijiki* 宗教歳時記. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten 角川書

    店.

Groner, Paul. 2002. *Ryōgen and Mount Hiei: Japanese Tendai in the Tenth*

    Century. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Guelberg, Niels. 2006. "Kōshiki to wa nani ka?" 「講式とは何か？」In *Shōmyō*

    shiryōshū 声明資料集, ed. Nishō Gakusha Daigaku 21-Seiki COE

    Puroguramu Chūsei Nihon Kanbun Han 二松学舎大学 21 世紀 COE プ

    ログラム中世日本漢文班, 30–40. Tokyo: Nishō Gakusha Daigaku 21-

    Seiki COE Puroguramu.

    _____. 講式データベース *Kōshiki Dētabēsu*. (Defunct as of 9/29/2019).

    http://www.f.waseda.jp/guelberg/koshiki/datenb-j.htm.

Gyatso, Janet. 1998. *Apparitions of the Self: The Secret Autobiographies of a*

    Tibetan Visionary. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Henderson, John B. 1991. *Scripture, Canon, and Commentary: A Comparison of*

    Confucian and Western Exegesis. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hill, Gabriel. 2015. "Pedagogy, Devotion, and Marginalia: Using *the Pore Caitiff* in Fifteenth-Century England." *The Journal of Medieval Religious Cultures* 41 (2): 187–207.

Hur, Nam-lin. 2007. *Death and Social Order in Tokugawa Japan: Buddhism, anti-Christianity, and the* danka *system*. Cambridge.: Harvard University Press.

Irvine, Martin. 1994. *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory 350–1100*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Ishikawa Ryōiku 石川良昱. 1963. "Shari raimon ni tsuite" 舎利禮文について. *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 22, pp. 650–654.

Ito Masahiro 伊藤 真宏. 1992. "Nihon Bukkyō ni okeru wasan no yakuwari" 日本仏教における和讃の役割." In *Indogaku Bukkyō kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究, vol. 40: 2, pp. 800–802.

Jackson, H.J. 2001. *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kleiner, Fred S. 2016. *Gardner's Art Through the Ages: A Global History*. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Koichi Shinohara. 2014. *Spells, Images, and Mandalas: Tracing the Evolution of Esoteric Buddhist Rituals*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuroda Hideo. 1985. "Sengoku/Shokuhō-ki no gijutsu to keizai hatten 戦国・織豊期の技術と経 済発展." In *Kōza: Nihon rekishi 4—chūsei 2* 講座日本

歴史四: 中世 二, edited by Rekishi Kenkyūkai and Nihon Shi Kenkyūkai.
Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

Le Breton, David, and Carmen Ruschiensky, trans. 2017 (2006). *Sensing the World: An Anthropology of the Senses*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Lipking, Lawrence. 1977. "The Marginal Gloss." *Critical Inquiry* 3, no. 4: 609–655.

Lowe, Brian. 2017. *Ritualized Writing: Buddhist Practice and Scriptural Cultures in Ancient Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Miller, Tyrus. 2007. "Situation and Event: The Destinations of Sense." In: Mark Franko, ed. *Ritual and Event: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Mizuno Kōgen. 1982. *Buddhist Sūtras: Origin, Development, Transmission*. Tokyo: Kōsei.

McMullen, Matthew. 2008. "Raiyu and Shingi Shingon Denominational History." Master's Thesis, University of Hawai'i.

Morgan, David, ed. 2010. *Religion and Material Culture: The Matter of Belief*. New York: Routledge.

Matsunaga Yūkei 松長有慶. 1969. *Mikkyō no rekishi* 密教の歴史. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店.

Nakajima Tami 中島田美. 1998. "Takaosan Rakuō'in no danrin saikō to Hōon-kō ni tsuite" 高尾山楽王院の談林再興と報恩講について. In: Murakami

Tadashi 村上直, ed. *Kinsei Takaosanshi no kenkyū* 近世高尾山史の研究.

    Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan 名著出版.

Nakamura Hajime 中村元. 1975. *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 佛教語大辞典. Tokyo:

    Tokyo Shōseki 東京書籍.

Ogasawara Kodo 小笠原弘道.2005. "Rakuto Chishakuin no rongi" 「洛東智積

    院の論義」. In *Chisan no rongi: Denbō dai'e to Hōon-kō* 智山の論義:

    伝法大会と冬報恩講. Edited by Chisan Denbō'in 智山伝法院.

Oliver, Ivan. 1976. "The Limits of the Sociology of Religion: A Critique of the

    Durkheimian Approach." *The British Journal of Sociology* 27 (4): 461–

    473.

Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙, ed. 1933–1936. *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 佛書解說大辭

    典. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha 大東出版社.

Parsons, Kelly. 2001. "The Red Ink Annotator of the Book of Margery Kempe

    and His Lay Audience." In: Kathryn Kerby-Fulton and Maidie Hilmo

    (eds.). *The Medieval Professional Reader at Work: Evidence from*

    Manuscripts of Chaucer, Langland, Kempe, and Gower. Victoria, B.C.:

    University of Victoria.

Plantinga, Alvin. 2000. *Warranted Christian Belief*. Oxford: Oxford University

    Press.

Power, Eileen. 2012 (1964). *Medieval English Nunneries c. 1275–1535*. Oxford:

    Forgotten Books.

Quinter, David. 2011. "Invoking the Mother of Awakening: An Investigation of

    Jōkei's and Eison's *Monju kōshiki*." *Japanese Journal of Religious*

    Studies 38, no. 2: 263–302.

Rechberger, Herman. 2018. *Scales and Modes Around the World*. Self-Published:

    Fennica Gehrman Oy (digital edition).

Rolston, David L. 1997. *Traditional Chinese Fiction and Fiction Commentary:*

    Reading and Writing Between the Lines. Stanford: Stanford University

    Press.

Rubinger, Richard. 2007. *Popular Literacy in Early Modern Japan*. Honolulu:

    University of Hawai'i Press.

Ruppert, Brian. 2000. *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early*

    Medieval Japan. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.

Ryūichi Abé. 1999. *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of*

    Esoteric Buddhist Discourse. New York: Columbia University Press.

Saitō Akitoshi and Naruse Yoshinori 斎藤昭俊、成瀬良徳. 1986. *Nihon Bukkyō*

    jinmei jiten 日本仏教人名辞典. Tokyo: Shin Jinbutsu Ōraisha 新人物往

    来社.

Sakaki Yoshitaka 榊義孝. 2000. "Shingi Shingon no rongi" 新義真言の論議. In

    Rongi no kenkyū 論議の研究, edited by Chisan kangakkai hen 智山勧学

    会編. Tokyo: Seishi Shuppan 青史出版.

Schechner, Richard. 1974. "From Ritual to Theatre and Back: The

    Structure/Process of the Efficacy-Entertainment Dyad." *Educational*

    Theatre Journal, vol. 26, no. 4: 455–481.

Scheid, Bernhard and Mark Teeuwen, eds. 2006. *The Culture of Secrecy in Japanese Religion*. New York: Routledge.

Seligman, Adam B. and Robert P. Weller, Michael Puett, and Bennett Simon. 2008. *Ritual and its Consequences: An Essay on the Limits of Sincerity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Thomas C. 1959. *The Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sonehara Satoshi 曾根原理. 2006. "The Establishment of Early Modern Buddhism." *Acta Asiatica* 91: 65–83.

Sperber, Dan and Alice L. Morton, trans. 1975. *Rethinking Symbolism*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

Suzuki Sanai 鈴木左内. 1969. "Kakuban saku no kōshiki to sono kanren wasan" 覚鑁作の講式とその関連和讃. In *Bukkyō bungaku kenkyū* 仏教文学研究, edited by Bukkyō bungaku kenkyūkai 仏教文学研究会. Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法蔵館.

Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄. 2008. *Meiji shonen jiin meisaicho* 明治初年寺院明細帳, vol. 7. Tokyo: Aruhifu.

_____. 1984. "Kaisetsu" 「解説」. In *Shinpen Meiji ishin shinbutsu bunri shiryō* 新編明治神仏分離資料, vol. 1, ed. Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, Murakami Senjō 村上専精, and Washio Junkyō 鷲尾順敬. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan 名著出版.

Tambiah, Stanley. 1985. *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tomabechi Seiichi 苫米地誠一. 2017. "Nihon Mikkyō ni okeru shari to hōju" 「日本密教における舎利と宝珠」. *Kōyasan daigaku mikkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 30: 95–114.

Trainor, Kevin. 1997. *Relics, Ritual, and Representation in Buddhism: Rematerializing the Sri Lankan Theravāda Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trenson, Steven. 2018. "A Study on the Combination of the Deities Fudō and Aiuzen in Medieval Shingon Esoteric Buddhism." In: Ann Heirman, Carmen Meinart, and Christoph Anderl (eds.). *Buddhist Encounters and Identities Across East Asia*. Leiden: Brill, 108–136.

Tsukudo Reikan 筑土鈴寛. 1976. "Kōshiki no rekishiteki kōsatsu" 講式の歴史的考察. In: *Tsukudo Reikan chōsaku shū: dai san kan, Chūsei, shūkyō geibun no kenkyū* 筑土鈴寛著作：第三巻、中世・宗教藝文の研究. Tokyo: Serika Shobō せりか書房.

Turnbull, Stephen. 2003. *Japanese Warrior Monks: AD 949–1603*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

Uranishi Tsutomu 浦西勉. 1986. "Higan-e: minkan ni okeru higan no fūshū 彼岸会—民間における彼岸の風習." In *Bukkyō nenjū gyōji* 仏教年中行事, vol. 6, "Bukkyō minzokugaku taikei 仏教民俗学大系." Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan 名著出版.

van der Veere, Hendrik. 2000. *A Study into the Thought of Kōgyō Daishi Kakuban: With a Translation of his* Gorin kuji myō himitsushaku. Leiden: Hotei Publications.

_____. 2007. "The Teaching Strategies of Kakuban Shōnin: A New Reading of Chōganbō Shōō's *Uchigikishū*." Unpublished Manuscript.

Vesey, Alexander. 2003. The Buddhist Clergy and Village Society in Early Modern Japan. Unpublished Dissertation, Princeton University.

Webb, Stephen D. 1972. "Crime and the Division of Labor: Testing a Durkheimian Model." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (3): 643–656.

Whitehouse, Harvey. 2004. *Modes of Religiosity: A Cognitive Theory of Religious Transmission*. New York: Altamira Press.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1987. *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Yamada Shōzen 山田昭全. 1995. "Kōshiki: Sono seiritsu to tenkai" 「講式―その成立と展開」. In *Bukkyō bungaku kōza 8: Shōdō no bungaku* 仏教文学講座 8―唱導の文学, Itō Hiroyuki 伊藤博之 et al., eds., 11–53. Tokyo: Benseisha.

Zeiman, Katherine. 2003. "Reading, Singing, and Understanding: Constructions of the Literacy of Women Religious in Late Medieval England." In: Sarah Rees Jones, ed. *Learning and Literacy in Medieval England and Abroad*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.