

## A Tale of Catalogs and Colophons: The Scope of the Lineage, the Touch of the Master and Discourses of Authenticity in Medieval Shingon Buddhism

Brian O. RUPPERT

*The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

This study starts by asking how monks promoted their monastic lineages in early medieval Japanese Buddhism. They created narratives to attempt to claim their activities were authentic and, by implication, that these discourses were themselves authentic—not *gisho* 偽書. Moreover, these were tales told in distinct textual genres. In this paper, I examine a genre of writing particularly representative of the discourse of authenticity: the colophon (*okugaki* 奥書, *shikigo* 識語). The analysis is part of an ongoing investigation of the sacred manuscript collections (*shōgyō* 聖教) of premodern Japanese Buddhism, but here I limit my focus to the Shingon lineages that were most active in the production of colophons pointing to the authentic hand of the master (*jihitsu* 自筆).

Focusing on colophons in the extant collections of the major Shingon temples of the traditional capital area (Tōji, Ninnaji, Daigoji, Kōzanji) as well as those of other areas (Shinpukuji 真福寺, Shōmyōji 称名寺, Kongōji 金剛寺, Takahatayama Fudōdō 高幡山不動堂), I analyze the relationship between the discourse of authenticity and the dissemination of lineages within, between, and beyond these sites.

Drawing on reports of temple research groups and participation in temple-manuscript studies (*chōsa*), I focus on the Shingon lineages that were most active in the production of texts claiming to be originals written in the hand of the master (*jihitsu*) or copies thereof. I demonstrate that A) although discourses referring to so-called authentic autograph manuscripts became slightly more prominent from the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century onwards, it was the period between the late 13<sup>th</sup> and mid-14<sup>th</sup> centuries that they came to constitute particularly striking features of Shingon lineages; that B) claims that manuscripts were *jihitsu* originals or their copies were especially prominent in the lineages spawned by the followers of the monk Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226-1304) and, to a lesser extent, by monks of lineages in the great temple complex Daigoji; that C) such discourse was particularly related to efforts to consolidate lineages as well as to transmit them anew to temples in Western and Eastern Japan; and that D) the discourse was related to concern over so-called inauthentic works (*gisho*, *gikyō* 偽經), which would potentially threaten efforts to

legitimate the sacred manuscript collections of lineages in either their original cloisters or in temples throughout the Japanese isles. I conclude by discussing the implications of this study for our understanding of early medieval Japanese Buddhist temples, their collections, and their dissemination of teachings. The figure of the master vividly informed his writing brush, and so access to his written words signified access to the authentic Dharma.

The status of masters' sacred works (*shōgyō*) within these collections was quite distinct, moreover, from that of the Buddhist canon (*issaikyō*); efforts to emphasize that copies were based on the master's hand were very common among the former, while invocations of the master's hand with regard to the canon were almost invariably confined to occasional questions regarding "apocryphal sūtras" (*gikyō*). The Buddhist canon occupied a transcendent and hence unassailed position discursively—yet the works most treasured in lineages were specific sacred works of the traditions themselves that were often written or assembled by their own masters.

### The Problem at Hand

A series of discourses were current in early medieval Japanese Buddhism that alluded to the authority of direct access to writings written in the master's hand. Prominent among these were phrases such as *hisseki* 筆跡 ("written remains"), *shuseki* 手跡 ("hand remains"), *on-hitsu* 御筆 ("august hand"), *shinseki* 真跡 (true remains), *shinpitsu* 真筆 ("true hand"), *jigō* 自毫 ("[his/her] own hand") and *jihitsu* ("[his/her] own hand"). Moreover, other terms, such as *shōhon* 証本・正本 ("true book") and *go-hon* 御本 ("august book"), alluded to the legitimacy of a particular work and its possession by a master which, by implication, would variously imply a close connection with the master or his authority. Interestingly, although many scholars have been interested in whether extant works were written in a particular master's hand, none have launched an in-depth study of the discourse of the master's hand.

Some scholars undoubtedly hesitated to engage in such a study due to lack of sufficient access to sacred manuscript collections. However, temple research groups (*chōsadan*) have over the past century undertaken the compilation of a series of collections of colophons (*okugaki*, *shikigo*), which is the genre in which such discursive claims most prominently occurred. Some of these compilations remain closed to public view, but large quantities of others have been published over the past two decades.

Among extant collections of medieval sacred works (*shōgyō*), the best preserved have been those affiliated with the Shingon lineages of esoteric Buddhism, which is the basic reason I have focused on Shingon temples in this study. Although Tendai lineages at Mount Hiei and Onjōji featured large collections historically, their great destruction over the course of the medieval era has made it difficult for scholars to undertake larger studies; the only exceptions have been the great collection of the cloister Shōren'in, that of Sanzen'in, of Tenkai's 天海 (ca. 1536-1643) re-collected treasury at Hiei, the collection of Myōhō'in, and a recently published set of works of Onjōji. And with the exception of the cases of Gyōnen 凝然 (1240-1321) and Sōshō 宗性 (1202-1278), the sacred writings of Tōdaiji, unlike the administrative records there, are only now to be subject to full cataloging by the research group. Even given the impediments to study, it is evident that the sacred manuscript collections associated with Shingon lineages were more numerous (Tōji [Kanchi'in, Hōbodai'in], Ninnaji, Daigoji, Kōzanji, Kajūji, Zuishin'in, Shinpukuji, Shōmyōji [Kanazawa Bunko], Kongōji [Osaka]), Ishiyamadera [Shiga], Takahatayama Fudōdō) and, arguably, larger than those of others even in the early medieval era.

This study draws on the colophons in the extant collections of the major Shingon temples, and based on examination of colophons in works of the major capital-area temples (Tōji, Ninnaji, Daigoji, Kōzanji), as well as those of other areas (Shinpukuji, Shōmyōji, Kongōji, Takahatayama Fudōdō), offers initial conclusions about the relationship between the discourse of authenticity and the dissemination of lineages within, between, and beyond these sites.

### Early Discourses of the Master's Hand

What, then, can be said about the early examples of discourses of the master's hand in Shingon traditions? Although there had always been interest in writings directly written by Kūkai, it was the writings of the monk Ningai 仁海 (951-1046), a great ritualist remembered as the founder of the Ono Branch of Shingon, that came to be sometimes explicitly noted as his "*hisseki*" (Tōji Kanchi'in and Kōzanji Archives).

During this earliest period, claims to the status of the master's hand were few, and the term *jihitsu* was extremely rare. With the seminal development of distinct new lineages as well as the related creation of new esoteric rites and the increased writing of ritual commentaries in the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century, claims to the status of "*jihitsu*" became more prominent. First, Dharma Prince Shukaku 守覺法親王 (1150-1202) and those around him at Ninnaji increasingly made such claims (Ninnaji Archives); at the same time, monks of the Nishi-no-in lineage there also

tended to do so (Kanazawa Bunko Archives). Meanwhile, students of the Kajūji prelate and Tōdaiji abbot Kanjin 寛信 (1084-1153), such as Kōzen 興然 (1121-1203) began to emphasize position of works in the master's hand; indeed, the disciples of Kōzen, including the well-known iconographic-commentator Kakuzen 覚禅 (1142-ca. 1217), would especially emphasize that they copied works written in Kōzen's own hand (Kōzanji, Kajūji Archives).

### Raiyu and the Master's Hand

It was, however, Raiyu 頼瑜 (1126-1304), his followers and the lineages they fostered which especially emphasized that writings they copied were written or otherwise signed in the master's hand. Indeed, it was Raiyu himself, known as the great heir to Kakuban's 覺鑊 (1095-1143) Negoroji temple in Wakayama, who began the process, emphasizing on numerous occasions that manuscripts he copied were based thereon. The works for which Raiyu made such claims were, most commonly, those he claimed to have been signed in the hand of the prominent Daigoji master Kenjin 憲深 (1192-1263), from whom he received Dharma transmission (Shinpukuji archives). Kenjin and his Daigo master Seigen 成賢 (1162-1231) had also made claims to jihitsu copies, albeit much more infrequently (Shinpukuji and Daigoji Archives).

Let's then consider Raiyu's context. Under what circumstances and for which works did Raiyu himself make such claims? From Kenjin, Raiyu received not merely Dharma transmission but also initiation into a whole series of esoteric rites and related sacred works—in fact, particularly in the Kōchō era (1261-64).<sup>1</sup> As is indicated by the Shinpukuji and Kongōji treasuries, it was the ritual texts for a series of venerables—the so-called *sonpō* 尊法 works—for which Raiyu particularly made claims to the original brush of his master. These included works for the Wish-Fulfilling King Aizen Rite 如法愛染王法, the Crown Buddha Buddha-

<sup>1</sup> The references, and dates where they are available: Wish-Fulfilling King Aizen Rite (Kōchō 3.3.10 [1263]; *Shinpukuji bunko satsuei mokuroku*) Box 48: 197a [hereafter referred to as “S”, with the term “Box” deleted], the Crown Buddha Buddha-Eye (Butsugen, S 45: 169b), the Kinrin Rite (S 45: 163a), the Single-Syllable Kinrin Rite (Kōchō 2.1.15; S 45: 167b), the Latter Seven-Day Rite (S 45: 171b), Kongō Dōji (2.8.23; S 57: 278a; “Usu”), Ususama Rite (Kōchō 2.8.23; *Kongōji shiryō* 392a [in Kawachi Naganoshi Shi Shippitsu linkai, ed., *Kawachi Nagano shi shi dai 5 kan, shiryōhen* 2; hereafter referred to as “KS”]), Five-Syllable Manjusri Rite (Goji Monju hō; Kōchō 2.2.29; S 47: 191a), Jirinkan visualization (Kōchō 2, near end of year; S 51: 237a), the Śākyamuni Rite (Kōchō 2.1.8; KS 360; “Usu”), the Maitreya Rite (*Kongōji koki* 53: 39 [in Ōsaka-fu, ed., *Amano angū Kongōji koki*, Ōsaka-fu shiseki meisshō tennen kinenbutsu chōsa hōkokusho dai 6 shū; hereafter referred to as “KK”]) as well as a series of venerable rites (*sonbō*) based on the *Dainichi-kyō* and related *tantras* (Kōchō 2.10.22; 2.10.7; S 108: 534b) of the Jizō'in Lineage.

Eye (仏眼 *Butsugen*), the Kinrin Rite 金輪法, the Single-Syllable Kinrin Rite 一字金輪法, the Latter Seven-Day Rite 後七日御修法, Kongō Dōji Rite 金剛童子法, Ususama Rite 烏樞沙摩法, Five-Syllable Manjusri Rite 五字文殊法 (*Goji Monju hō*), Jirinkan visualization 字輪觀, the Maitreya Rite 弥勒法 as well as a series of venerables rites (*sonpō*) based on the *Dainichi-kyō* and related *tantras* of the Jizō'in Lineage.

The *Usuzōshi kuketsu* 薄草紙口決 (sometimes referred to as *Usuzōshi ketsu*), is Raiyu's recording of Kenjin's oral transmission—yet even here Raiyu emphasized his master's inspection of the manuscript, claimed to be in the latter's original hand and often included his presumed authorizing signature.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed, almost every mention by Raiyu of his master's hand in extant works was made during his initiation into the venerables rites of the *Usuzōshi*, which occurred in the period between the first and eleventh months of the year Kōchō 2 (1262). (One exception was the Wish-Fulfilling King Aizen Rite work in the third month of the next year.)<sup>3</sup> The volume of Raiyu's claims to the master's hand throughout the text of *Usuzōshi kuketsu* was, in fact, remarkable—some 564 times; the number is, for example, far greater than the *entire* number of uses of the term *jihitsu* otherwise contained overall in the *Taishō* canon (*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*).<sup>4</sup>

Raiyu's invocation of his master's hand apparently *only* in the works of roughly a one-year period in his seventy-eight years testifies remarkably to the special relationship he had with Kenjin. Nagamura Makoto has noted that Kenjin's added

<sup>2</sup> Kōchō 2.3.5; 2.3.7; 2.3.13; 2.11.3; 3.4.3; S 84: 544b-545b; S 107: 561a; Kōchō 2.2.18, 2.2.13, 2.3.16, 2.8.20, 2.1.11, 2.2.4, 2.2.4, 2.11.3; KK 183: 101, 184: 105, 185: 106, 186: 108, 202: 118, 202: 119, 203: 122, 211: 127; Kōchō 2.1.8; KS 360a.); the extant fascicles in which the original hand is invoked includes those for the Bodhisattva Kannon (S 84: 544b), the Bodhisattva Manjusri (idem), the Celestial Divinities (idem, 545b), and the Awesome Kings (*myōō*; S 9: 597b). (There are also untitled ritual works with Kenjin's presumed "jihitsu" that were also a part of the *Usuzōshi* copying period (Kōchō 2.1.20, 2.1.14, 2.2.11; KK 26: 15; KS 377a). We can also take special note of the extant Daigoji version of *Usuzōshi kuketsu*, which includes a description of Raiyu's later initiation into the work and its rites from Kenjin as well as Kenjin's added comments in his own hand (*Daigoji shiryō* 443.1.12). See Nagamura Makoto's discussion, Nagamura 2005, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> S 82: 565a; 48: 197a [shorter, anonymous colophon]. Another possible exception is the anonymous reference to the master's hand in the colophon in *Yagoma kuketsu shō*, which similarly refers to the master's having examined the work (S 49: 205b), and gives the date of Kōchō 2.1.2—several days before the beginning of Raiyu's initiation into the *Usuzōshi* rites; interestingly, *Goma kuketsu*, which is in the same box as that work, uses very similar terminology (including reference to Raiyu, and an apparent reference to Kenjin), although it makes reference to Ono Sōjō (Ningai), and the date is given as Eichō 2.1.2 (1097) (idem: 208b).

<sup>4</sup> T 79, no. 2535. Note also the excellent translation into classical Japanese and annotation in Shibata 2002.

comments in the colophons offer evidence of his special attitude toward Raiyu.<sup>5</sup> This was undoubtedly the case, but we must also call attention to Raiyu's inclusion of such invocations of Kenjin's hand in these works.

First, repeated reference to Kenjin's hand undoubtedly suggests the unique influence of Kenjin over Raiyu's construction of his lineage. In particular, the ritual works of the *Usuzōshi* clearly occupied a central place within Raiyu's development as an esoteric practitioner and thinker. Moreover, Raiyu constructed a powerful tradition of scholarship, and made a clear distinction between ritual aspects, *jisō* 事相, and doctrinal aspects, *kyōsō* 教相, but his emphasis on the master's hand was, essentially without *exception*, made in connection with ritual initiations. The invocation of the master's hand placed Raiyu within the ritual traditions of Kenjin and the latter's masters—especially in connection with the earlier Daigoji abbot Seigen, author of the original *Usuzōshi* 薄双紙.

Finally, we should also recognize that Raiyu was not the only disciple receiving initiations in the year Kōchō 2; as Tanaka Yūbun has noted, the monks Jōzei 定濟 (1220-82) and Kōgi 弘義 (b. 1231) were also initiated by Kenjin together with Raiyu during the same period, at least into part of the *Usuzōshi* ritual teachings.<sup>6</sup> Invoking the master's hand may have thus drawn attention to the authenticity of Raiyu's initiation vis-à-vis his two fellow disciples.

### Raiyu's Followers

Raiyu's disciples and their students of the next generation emphasized their reproduction of the Master's hand on an *unprecedented* scale. Although colophons of the early modern era would feature numerous claims in this regard, those of the period from the late 13<sup>th</sup> century to the mid-14<sup>th</sup> century seem to have been the most numerous. The disciples who most prominently claimed to have copied works in the Master's hand were Gikai 儀海 (1280-ca. 1354), Nōshin 能信 (1291-1353), and Zenne 禪惠 (1284-1364).

#### Gikai

Gikai's story reflects the first major moment in the transmission of Raiyu's lineage to other parts of the Japanese isles. Gikai is known to have studied in Nara in his youth and copied works by figures such as Dōhan 道範 (1184-1252) in the Kyoto area as early as 1304. At an early stage, Gikai traveled—probably returned actually—to the Eastern regions, copying works on the *Yugikyō* and *Rishukyō* scriptures in Hitachi province. By 1306, Gikai had begun to copy works by Raiyu at

---

<sup>5</sup> Nagamura 2005, p. 22.

<sup>6</sup> Tanaka 2003, p. 135.

a so-called Dangi-sho 談義所 seminary within Jikonji 慈根寺 in Musashi province. In this early period, Gikai traveled typically between Jikonji in Musashi and Daibutsu-dani in Kamakura to copy a whole series of works, including *Usuzōshi kuketsu* in 1308. Several months later, he was initiated at Jikonji into the ritual sacred works (*jisō shōgyō*) of the Sanbō'in lineage by a monk named Bankai 鑾海 of Yakushiji in Shimotsuke province.<sup>7</sup> Between 1311 and 1319, Gikai traveled around Kantō to copy a series of Raiyu's works.<sup>8</sup> It was, however, over a half-year period between 1319 and 1320 that Gikai, at Chūshō'in in Negoroji, copied a whole series of other works that he attributed to Raiyu's hand.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, as with Raiyu himself, Gikai would produce the vast majority of his copies of the master's hand in a short period of time.

Unlike Raiyu's case, however, most of Gikai's copied works in the so-called master's hand in this short period were *not* ritual works on the order of the *Usuzōshi* but rather *commentarial* or doctrinal works originally written to support the establishment of a scholarly tradition in the form of the *Denbō'e Dangi* 伝法会談義—that is, originally, Raiyu's own *Dangi* at Negoroji. The following are the extant works that Gikai copied in this short period and attributed to the master's hand:

*Shakuron hiketsu* 釈論秘決, *Hōyaku gusō* 宝鑰愚草, *Shugokyō gusō* 守護經愚草, *Jūjūshinron inmon* 十住心論引文, *Jūjūshinron gusō* 十住心論愚草, *Kyōōgyō kaidai gusō* 教王經解題愚草 (*chū* 中), *Rishukyō monku gusō* 理趣經文句愚草; *Hokke kaidai gusō* 法華解題愚草, *Go-yuigō shakugi shō* 御遺告積疑抄, *Go-yuigō shichi-ka hihō* 御遺告七箇秘法 (anon.; in Kongōzanmai'in, Kōyasan), *Kongōchōkyō kaidai gusō* 金剛頂經解題愚草, *Daranigi gusō* 陀羅尼義愚草, and *Meigetsu shō* 明月抄 (anon.) (Shinpukuji, Kongōji archives)<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See Abe 2002, pp. 488-489. Gikai, however, did *not* make claims regarding the master's hand in the case of these ritual works. Moreover, it would be over the course of a *brief* period of time that he would eventually copy works based on the reputed "master's hand."

<sup>8</sup> On one occasion he went to Mount Kōya, where he copied two works by Kūkai. In Kantō, he became a disciple of the great debater and early disciple of Raiyu, Raien (b. 1254), who was in residence in Kamakura, and he began to copy Raiyu's works.

<sup>9</sup> He also copied a small number of such works at Kawamata in Ōshū province and at Koyama Kongōfukuji several months earlier, and later in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year on Mount Kōya.

<sup>10</sup> The citations are as follows: *Shakuron hiketsu* (1.11.26; S 19: 36a, 428a, four versions), *Hōyaku gusō* (1.12.2; 1.12.8; 1.12.12; 1.12.17; 1.12.12; 1.12.20; 1.12.16; S 21: 39b-40b; S 21: 400a-401a; two versions), *Shugokyō gusō* (2.2.12, 2.2.16; S 22: 46a), *Jūjūshinron inmon* (2.1.tsugomori; 2.1.18 [+ Gen'ō 1.8.4, 1.7intercalary-month.14]; S 23: 49a-51b), *Jūjūshinron gusō* (2.1.26; 2.9.7; 2.9.16; 2.9.12; 2.8.24; 2.1.22; 2.1.25; S 24: 52a-54a; 2.9.7; 2.9.16; 2.9.12; 2.8.24; 2.1.25; S 24: 351a, 352a-353a), *Kyōōkyō kaidai gusō* (*chū*) (1.11.23; S 26: 56b-57a),

In other words, Gikai's appeal to the master's hand was undertaken specifically in a context marked by an association of Raiyu with *kyōsō* study. Although Gikai had copied Raiyu's own appeals to the master's hand for *Usuzōshi kuketsu* and so on earlier, he had made no claims for *his* part to the master's hand; of course, the monks in the lineage presumably already had confidence in the veracity of the claims at the conclusion of works like *Usuzōshi kuketsu*, but Gikai's emphasis on the jihitsu character of these commentarial works by Raiyu, and the circumstances surrounding his actions, suggests the following.

First, for Gikai and presumably those close to him, the establishment of a scholarly tradition, in the form of a *dangi-sho* seminary, was a primary concern. Second, in order to do so, he and the projected audience of his copied works believed that their inscription in the master's hand would legitimize and perfect their efforts. Third, while Raiyu was undoubtedly also seen in part as the transmitter of *jisō* ritual traditions, Gikai's lineage saw him *especially* as the initiator of *kyōsō* writings and study; in other words, Gikai's emphasis on the master's hand—whether limited to a rhetorical effort or considered also in terms of his travel to Negoroji—suggests that he was particularly interested in copying *scholarly* works directly written by the master himself, a concern that Gikai did not similarly have with regard to ritual works. Fourth, we can see that the vast majority of these works were commentaries on works by Kūkai; the scholarly tradition was especially related to interest in Kūkai's works, and Raiyu can be seen, in the form of Gikai's colophons, as contributing vibrantly to the newly evolving emphasis on Kukai's oeuvre; Gikai even concludes one fascicle of *Hōyaku gusō* with “*Namu Daishi Kongō 南無大師金剛*”.<sup>11</sup> Finally, we can see that though Gikai copied most of the works at Negoroji, his actions were taken in connection with his activities as a Kantō monk; the works and related scholarly traditions of Raiyu, enshrined in the

---

*Rishukyō monku gusō* (2.2.4 [implicit, explicit versions]; S 26: 57a-b, 376a); *Hokke kaidai gusō* (2.2.25; S 26: 57b, 376b, two versions); *Go-yuigō shakugi shō* (2.1.5; S 30: 58b; 2.1.5, 2.1.3, S 30: 118b-119a, 381b, two more versions), *Go-yuigō shichi-ka hihō* (2.7.5; S 30: 68a, 383b, two versions), *Kongōchōkyō kaidai gusō* (1.11.25; 1.11.23; S 26: 374a), *Daranigi gusō* (2.2.8; S 26: 376a), and *Meigetsu shō* (Bunpō 3.4.12 [1319], Gen'un's *Kanjōbon gyōgi shi ki*, in *Kongōfukujū*; S 58: 499b, 546b, two versions). We should also note minor temporal exceptions. For example, among these works Gikai claimed were jihitsu, we can mention *Dato kanmon* (Enkyō 3.7.29 [1310], in *Jigenji*; S 67jō: 509b), as well as *Jigyō ryaku shidai dato* (Shōkyō 3.7.23 [1334], in *Jigenji*; S 46: 183b) and *Shakuron kai ge shō* (Genkō 2.10.2 [1322]; S 15: 417a; Genkō 2.9.21, Genkō 2.10.2); S 15: 529a-b; two versions);

<sup>11</sup> S 21: 401a.

Kantō temple treasuries, thus found a position in temple life in Eastern Japan within less than two decades of his passing.

### Nōshin

Nōshin was born the Ise area, and so he started his studies in that region. He studied under a pair of masters at temples there, lived as a recluse, and made a hundred-day pilgrimage to Ise Shrine before traveling to study under Gikai at Takahatayama in Musashi Province. His first teacher in the Ise area was Jitsuzai 実濟 (also called Jitsu'in 実印) of Kanjionji 關慈恩寺, who was a master of precepts study and of Igyō shōnin Raiken's 意教上人頼賢 particular Sanbō'in lineage of the Ono Branch, which had special connections with Kamakura; in particular, Jitsuzai's position within the Ono was as disciple of the monk Kenyo 賢譽, a figure of Kuwana Ōfukudenji 桑名大福田寺 who had been trained in the precepts at Saidaiji temple but who also was initiated into Raiken's Ono lineage from Raiken's disciple Jōsen 定仙, resident in Kamakura. Thus Nōshin was initiated into, and copied, a number of ritual works from this tradition.<sup>12</sup>

Nōshin also studied under the monk Jaku'un 寂雲 in Ise. Jaku'un had been a disciple of the Ise Zen-mitsu master Chikotsu Dai'e 痴兀大慧 (1229-1312; Buttsū Zenji 仏通禪師), the latter a disciple of Tōfukuji founding abbot Enni Bennen 円爾弁円 (1202-80) who would later himself become abbot there in Kyōto.<sup>13</sup> In this case, Nōshin was initiated into *kyōsō* scholarly works, especially the work *Dainichi kyō sho kenmon* 大日經疏見聞, as well as some ritual works.

Nōshin would later go to Gikai's Takahatayama Fudōdō 高幡山不動堂 in Kantō, and in 1328 made a large set of copies of Gikai's collection there. Nōshin would take these to the temple he founded, Shinpukuji (Hōshō'in) in present-day Nagoya, and then only return again twice later.<sup>14</sup> Under Gikai, Nōshin was initiated into Raiyu's lineage and into the Sanbō'in lineage of the monk Bankai 鑿海 of Shimotsuke Yakushiji 下野薬師寺 (present-day Tochigi prefecture). So for which works did Nōshin make claims to the master's hand? In fact though Nōshin made extensive copies of Raiyu's works, at the conclusion of many of which Gikai had invoked the master's hand, he did *not* himself reinforce such claims in these or other of Raiyu's works. Rather, Nōshin was the copier of a series of works claiming to be written in Ise master Buttsū Zenji's hand, that is, the monk Chikotsu Dai'e, originally a Tendai esoteric monk of Hiei who had become a disciple of Enni at the

<sup>12</sup> Abe 2002, pp. 475-78.

<sup>13</sup> Jaku'un likewise initiated Nōshin into the Sanbō'in lineage.

<sup>14</sup> He went to Takahatayama Fudōdō for purposes of copying works some 21 years and then 25 years later.

Zen temple Tōfukuji in Kyoto. It was, in particular, under Jaku'un's direction that Nōshin undertook the copying of these materials; moreover, as Itō Satoshi has noted, this was a corporate enterprise that seemed to have been dominated by Nōshin but which included other disciples as well.<sup>15</sup>

Among these works, the claim to Buttsū Zenji's hand is most common in the work noted earlier, *Dainichi kyō sho kenmon*, which Nōshin copied in Ise in 1325.<sup>16</sup> This work, according to the colophons of its ten fascicles, was based on Buttsū Zenji's reportage of the "on-dangi" 御談義 of the master Enni Bennen at Tōfukuji. Other of the works where Nōshin signed and invoked the master Buttsū Zenji's hand included *Jūshinbon sho kenmon* 十心品疏見聞, another work based on the *dangi* of Enni; *Sanbō'in kanjō kuketsu* 三寶院灌頂口訣, described as a secret transmission Nōshin copied in Chifukuji 智福寺 temple in Ise; an unidentified fragment of a *kenmon* 見聞 from Enni's *dangi*; *Kanjō hikuketsu* 灌頂秘口訣, a secret transmission of the Dharma consecration rite copied at Chifukuji.<sup>17</sup> Nōshin also copied *Sanbō'in kanjōshaku* 三寶院灌頂積, which purported to be written in the original hand of the masters at Anyōji 安養寺 in Ise to whom Buttsū Zenji had entrusted the temple at the time of his death. Although absent from the colophons, the cover of each of the three fascicles of Nōshin's copy of *Shakumakaenron kenmon* 釈摩訶衍論見聞 describes the "three fascicles" as being in the hand of Buttsū Zenji.<sup>18</sup>

How might we interpret Nōshin's elaborate copying of works written in *Zenmitsu* master Buttsū Zenji's presumed hand? Initially, we can note that Abe Yasurō has called attention to Nōshin's copying of a large quantity of works by Raiyu over a short period of time in late 1328.<sup>19</sup> Yet we also see that most of Nōshin's extensive copying of works reputedly in Buttsū Zenji's hand took place over a five-month period in 1325, and that Nōshin made specific reference to Raiyu's hand in

<sup>15</sup> Itō 2003, p. 194.

<sup>16</sup> Shōchū 2.6.2 [1325], 2.6.27, 2.8.18, 2.5.5., 2.9.9, 2.7.3, 2.8.28; S 10: 16b-17b; Shōchū 2.6.2, 2.6.27, 2.8.18, 2.5.5, 2.9.9, 2.8.21, 2.7.3, 2.8.28; S 10: 19b-20b; Shōchū 2.6.2, 2.6.27, 2.8.18, 2.5.5, 2.9.4, 2.8.28, 2.7.3, 2.8.28; S 10: 520a-521a; Shōchū 2.6.2, 2.6.27, 2.8.18, 2.5.5, 2.9.4, 2.7.3, 2.8.28; S 8: 664a-665a; Shōchū 2.6.2, 2.6.27, 2.8.18, 2.5.5, 2.9.4, 2.8.28, 2.7.3, 2.8.28; S 10: 665a-666a. Note that there are five manuscripts in Shinpukuji archives of this work.

<sup>17</sup> *Jūshinbon so kenmon* (Shōchū 2.4.15, 2.4.25; S 10: 18a, 521b; Shōchū 2.6.13, contained within *Dainichikyō kenmon*, S 10: 19b, 520a; 2 versions and separately dispersed fascicle); *Sanbō'in kanjō kuketsu* (Karyaku 4.3.18 [1329]; S 80: 442b); Unidentified fragment of a *kenmon* from Enni's *dangi* (Shōchū 2.6.13; S 1: 503b); *Kanjō hikuketsu* (Karyaku 4.3.20, 4.3.21; 4.3.20; S 7: 504b-505b, three versions).

<sup>18</sup> *Sanbō'in kanjōshaku* (Gentoku 2.1.23 [1330]; S 74: 455b-56a; S 82: 564b; two versions); *Shakumakaenron kenmon* (S 18: 394a-b).

<sup>19</sup> Abe 2002, pp. 476-77, 491.

none of the texts he copied of Raiyu's, simply including Gikai's and other's earlier invocations to that effect in a number of them. These Buttsū Zenji works, similar to Raiyu's copied by Gikai, were particularly of the so-called *kyōsō* scholastic variety—but they hearkened back to Enni Bennen at Tōfukuji rather than to Raiyu.

Moreover, we should take note of the fact that Nōshin copied these works a few years prior to traveling to Gikai's temple to copy Raiyu's works: Nōshin's possession of the works, from his own vantage-point, undoubtedly helped him establish his lineage and, perhaps, a *dangi-sho* seminary, at Shinpukuji—an effort toward which Raiyu's works would have dramatically contributed. Meanwhile, although Gikai's presence is basically absent from the extant treasury of Takahatayama Fudōdō and none of the works ostensibly in Buttsū Zenji's hand seem to still be held there, Nōshin may have thought Gikai would have interest in the works and we can similarly imagine such a possibility.

### Zenne

Zenne, moreover, is a very different figure who also became a Dharma descendant in Raiyu's lineage—and who in this case, similar to Gikai, often deployed the discourse of the master's hand. He seems to have been born in the southern Ōsaka region, not far from Negoroji. Zenne would enter both Negoroji and Tōdaiji Tōnan'in, where he studied under the monks Ryōden 良殿 (1264-1336), a direct disciple of Raiyu, and Raishin 頼心 (1281-1336) respectively, and became abbot of the rural southeastern Ōsaka temple of Kongōji, in the area that would be the gateway to the Kōya kaidō 高野街道 pilgrimage route directly in between Mount Kōya and the Ōsaka/Kyoto areas. Zenne copied a large number of works, including ritual works as well as scholastic texts.<sup>20</sup>

Which among these texts that Zenne stressed were based on originals in the master's hand? Zenne often copied works that had previously been copies invoking the hand of the master; for example, several works were previously copied by Ryōden, who had emphasized their basis in the master's hand. And Zenne, like Nōshin, especially copied works that Raiyu had originally claimed to include words written in his master Kenjin's hand, prominently for the *Usuzōshi kuketsu* fascicle-copies.

However, Zenne also often directly made claims that the works he copied were in the master's hand. The works which he claimed were copied based on the master's hand included the following largely fragmentary works:

<sup>20</sup> With regard to Raishin, see Sakamoto 2004; concerning Zenne, see Akatsuka 2007.

Fragment 斷簡 (in Kongōji); Fragment (Daily-record initiation/copy, in Tōdaiji Tōnan'in); Daily-record Fragment 日記斷簡 (“sahō 作法”, in Tōdaiji ), *Shichi kango* 四智漢語 Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* Seigen's “shidai 次第”; in Tōdaiji Hachimangū Dangi-bō); Fragment (in Sesshū Yunoyama Yakushidō Sōbō 撰州湯山藥師堂僧坊); *Genpi shō* “Hokuto hō” 玄秘鈔北斗法 (In Kongōji); *Genpi[shō]* 3 玄秘三 (In Kongōji), Fragment (In Kongōji); *Hishō* Fragment 秘鈔斷簡 (In Kongōji); Fragment (*Hishō?* In Kongōji); Fragment (In Kongōji?); Fragment (Seigen's “Shō 抄,” in Kongōji); and Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* In Kongōji); Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* “Shidai”; in Tōdaiji Hachimangū Dangi-bō). (Shinpukuji, Kongōji archives)<sup>21</sup>

Akatsuka Yūdō has drawn attention to Zenne's scholarly interests or *kyōgaku*, in connection with his copying of all manner of Raiyu's scholarly works.<sup>22</sup> But when we consider the works which Zenne claimed were based on the master's hand, we see that these so-called fragments are almost *all* directly related to ritual practice rather than so-called *kyōsō* study. Even the fragments that Zenne copied in Tōdaiji Hachimangū Dangi-bō 東大寺八幡宮談義坊 seminary were respectively a ritual “shidai” 次第 attributed by the initial colophon to the monk Seigen, author of *Usuzōshi*, and a “shidai” described as for a royal birth ritual that Seigen or Kenjin performed.

Thus Zenne undoubtedly, as Akatsuka notes, was involved in scholarship, yet the works that he was most compelled to claim the master's hand—or, if actually so, went to the trouble to gain access to—were mostly ritual texts. Moreover, when we consider the extremely numerous manuscripts previously claiming the master's hand, we recognize all the more the extent to which Zenne was concerned with

<sup>21</sup> Fragment (Gen'ō 1.2.12 [1319] + Genkō 2.7.3 [1322], in Kongōji; KK 58: 32); Fragment (Genkō 4.6.21, Daily-record initiation/copy, in Tōdaiji Tōnan'in; KK 82: 42); Daily-record Fragment (Genkō 4.6.21; KK 83: 43); *Shichi kango* (in Tōdaiji Tōnan'in; Shōchū 2.1.6 [1325]; KK 92: 48); Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* Seigen's “shidai”; in Tōdaiji Hachimangū Dangi-bō; Shōchū 2.6.23; KK 94: 49); Fragment (in Sesshū Yuzan Yakushidō Sōbō; Shōchū 3.3.22; KK 101: 52); *Genpi shō* “Hokuto hō” (Shōwa 5.10.17 [1316], in Kongōji; KK 109: 56-57); *Genpi[shō]* 3 (Shōwa 5.10.15; KK 110: 58); Fragment (*Hishō?* In Kongōji; Shōkyō 1.10.29 [1332]; KK 129: 69); *Hishō* Fragment (In Kongōji; Shōkyō 2.2.1; KK 130: 69); Fragment (*Hishō?* In Kongōji; Shōkyō 2.2.1; KK 131: 70); Fragment ([Gen'ō 2.1.25 +] Genkō 2.6.28 [1324]); Fragment (“Shōsaku,” in Kongōji; Gen'ō 2.2.13; KS: 382a); and Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* In Kongōji; Gen'ō 2.3.21; KS: 382b); Fragment (*Usuzōshi?* In Tōdaiji Hachimangū Dangi-bō; Shōchū 2.6.23; KS 423b).

<sup>22</sup> Akatsuka 2007, pp. 473-74. This is not to criticize Akatsuka's study, which is an important contribution that also includes some discussion of the ritual aspects of Zenne's copying.

ritual texts, especially Raiyu's copy of *Usuzōshi kuketsu* from 1262 with reference to the master Kenjin's hand.

Zenne, as we can see, copied these works in the master's hand in a *series* of temples, and on *multiple* occasions. In other words, *unlike* Raiyu, Gikai, and Nōshin, he invoked the master's hand in connection with multiple temples over longer spans. He not only copied such works in three areas at Tōdaiji and in Kongōji, but also similarly authoritative works such as a so-called "*shōhon*" 証本の *Sanmaya shiki sahō* 三昧耶式作法 in Ryūkō'in 龍光院 on Mount Kōya; and his copying was undertaken *intermittently*, between 1316 and 1332. It may be that it was spatially easier for Zenne, when compared to Gikai, to follow such an intermittent pattern of occasionally doing so at temples in the Kansai region; however, while Gikai did his copying of so-called jihitsu works far away from his Kantō home, Nōshin, himself from Ise, was still living there when he copied the works attributed to Buttsū Zenji, suggesting that the context for Zenne's production of these discourses cannot be attributed simply to propinquity.

Indeed, upon closer analysis of Zenne's discourse of the master's hand, we find that the *master* was also multiple. The master's hand here most prominently refers to Raishin in the case of the works copied at Tōdaiji, and it typically refers to Ryōden for works copied in Kongōji. However, there are other cases where it refers specifically to Raiyu, such as a fragment, apparently from *Usuzōshi*, that Zenne produced in 1320 in Kongōji.<sup>23</sup> There is at least one case where the master's hand is that of the monk Kanshō 寛昭 (fl. 1317-19) of Higashi-muro'in 東室院 in Tōdaiji, who seems to have been teacher in the Dangi-bō at Tōdaiji Hachimangū; there is another, copied in Sesshū Yuyama Yakushidō Sōbō, that refers explicitly to the jihitsu as that of Enmyōbō, that is, Shūkan 宗観 (fl. 1144), a disciple of Jitsuhan 実範 (d. 1144) and an influential early *shōmyō* 声明 chanting practitioner. The master's hand, for Zenne, was that of Raiyu, Raishin, Ryōden, Kanshō, and Shūkan; most of these, for Zenne, were undoubtedly *kyōgaku* 教学 scholastic forbears, but they were all also and especially ritual masters.

## Conclusion

What do we make of the late 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries in the monasteries of the Japanese isles? It was clearly an era in which trust was emphatically *not* self-evident. The last of the great aristocrats to dominate the court and, arguably, even the shogunate, had been brought down with the fall of Kujiō Michi'ie 九条道家 in the late 1240s. Civil wars were, indeed, common in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, including not

<sup>23</sup> Gen'ō 2.3.21 (KS: 382b).

just the Jōkyū war, which led to the first public exile of a cloistered sovereign (Go-Toba), but also wars of the 1240s and the 1280s. Meanwhile, the Mongols had come knocking, and the royal house was disintegrating into rival lineages with their respective allies. Perceived keys to establishing both legal and more general interpersonal trust were documents, records, or other writings that provided some kind of legitimacy.<sup>24</sup>

In Buddhist temples, claims to authentic oral transmissions had long been held in high regard, but written proof in the form of the master's instructions—and especially his approving signature (*kaō* 花押)—seem to have been especially prized in this tumultuous period. Given this context, Raiyu's innovation in *Usuzōshi kuketsu* in introducing more than 500 claims to the master's hand, buttressed by many claims in colophons, can be seen as a bold yet understandable move by a man who lay claim thereby to the transmission of one of the most influential monks of 13<sup>th</sup> century Japan, Daigoji's Kenjin, whose direct disciples numbered more than 60 and spanned both the Kansai and Kantō areas.<sup>25</sup>

The fact that Gikai and Zenne, in particular, made more references to the jihitsu status of works they copied than apparently any other monks in medieval Japanese Shingon is all the more remarkable, when we realize that these figures were responsible for the movement of Raiyu's lineage into other parts of the Japanese isles. Rather than monks of elite *kenmitsu* 顯密 monasteries like Ninnaji or Daigoji in Kyoto, Gikai, Nōshin, and Zenne transported Raiyu's ritual lineage to rural regions. Zenne established the temple Kongōji in the Osaka area. Gikai became the first abbot of Takahatayama Fudōdō temple in Kantō. Meanwhile, Nōshin became the first abbot of Shinpukuji Hōshō'in, Nagoya; although he did not make claims concerning Raiyu's hand on the level of Gikai, Nōshin, originally from Ise, made multiple claims to the "master's hand" in manuscript copies he made of texts written by networking monks, especially the now-obscure monk Buttsū Zenji of Ise.

With the exception of the works attributed to the hand of Buttsū Zenji, copied in Ise, the vast majority of the works were copied at Tōdaiji, at Raiyu's Negoroji, Kongōji in southeastern Osaka, or Takahatayama Fudōdō in Kantō. Copying at

<sup>24</sup> The term "document-ism" (*monjo-shugi* 文書主義) is sometimes ascribed to the emphasis on providing documents to legitimize legal claims in the period. Oikawa Wataru uses the phrase *monjo-chūshin-shugi* 文書中心主義 to refer to this concept. See Oikawa 2004. I surmise that there is a connection—perhaps direct—between practices such as Raiyu's here, but elaboration of such a claim awaits further research.

<sup>25</sup> I plan to undertake a separate study of Raiyu's use of such references in his ritual descriptions in *Usuzōshi kuketsu*, exploring their connection with his ritual and discursive systems as well as with his context.

these sites suggests the extent to which these were vibrant centers of Shingon study, and undoubtedly represents a changing situation in which the traditional structure of Shingon Buddhist temples in Kyoto was giving way to new ranges of mobility along with novel lineages.

Thus at the same time that Tōji and Mount Kōya featured active *kyōsō*-focused study traditions, and major centers like Ninnaji and Daigoji featured vibrant ritual traditions, the lineages spawned by Raiyu variously focused on both ritual and doctrinal aspects of Shingon traditions and seem to have also freely incorporated diverse elements like *Zen-mitsu* and precept teachings. It seems to have been these lineages, as much or even more than those in the leading temples related to *kenmon* power-blocs, that promoted the discourse of the master's hand; and while Koyama Yasunori has noted the development of Negoroji's position as a branch temple of Daigoji and its support of the Ashikagas in the Nanbokuchō era, he grants that its position as a prominent regional player would not occur until the late 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>26</sup> Meanwhile, given that estimates indicate that the vast majority of the Shingon temples in the Kantō region in the 18<sup>th</sup> century were of Raiyu's Shingi Shingon branch, it is apparent that the lineages tracing themselves to his innovations skillfully deployed the discourse of authenticity, and undoubtedly their connections with regional powers, to disseminate beliefs and practices throughout Honshū and into other areas of the Japanese isles.<sup>27</sup>

Raiyu's lineages brought together networks of monks who moved seemingly freely between the Tōdaiji, Negoroji, Kongōji, Kyōto temples, and the newly evolving temples of Shinpukuji, Takahatayama Fudōdō, Kamakura's Daibutsudani area, Shōmyōji, and even Yakushiji in Shimotsuke. It was these monks who constructed the high medieval Japanese Buddhist lineages of Shingon as much as it was figures like Ryūshō 隆勝 (1264-1314), Ryūgen 隆源 (1342-1426), Mansai 満濟 (1378-1435), and Gien 義演 (1558-1626) who simultaneously organized the cloisters and their sacred works at centers like Daigoji. To a degree, they too used the discourse of authenticity, but final conclusions about the differences in their appeals to the master's hand must await a fuller reading. Suffice it to say that their contexts differed from the monks we have addressed today, and that it was these seemingly historically "marginal" figures who played central roles in the dissemination of sacred writings throughout the Japanese isles.

History, when carefully addressed, may remind us that those who seem minor figures to us were not necessarily so in their own times. Indeed, the colophons

<sup>26</sup> Koyama 1998, pp. 126-134.

<sup>27</sup> See Sakamoto 1979.

bearing their traces beckon us to look past the post-Edo standard readings of Japanese Buddhist history to the manuscripts themselves; indeed, they may ultimately require us to rethink other notions we have even derived from Kuroda Toshio, whose theory of the *Kenmitsu* system (*kenmitsu taisei* 顯密体制) applied almost exclusively to the situation in the royal capital Kyōto and Kamakura<sup>28</sup>—while substantial groups of non-elite monks who were, meanwhile, *not* of the New Kamakura Buddhist lineages, were active in a broad range of areas over the course of the late 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries. These seem to have been almost all ostensibly *Kenmitsu* monks, and yet they disseminated the teachings of lineages as varied as esoteric Zen (originally from Tōfukuji), Yogacara (Hossō), Madhyamika (Sanron), and presumably Kegon (Huayen) as well. Their activity in areas like Ise, Nagoya (Shinpukeji), and outlying areas of the Kantō region beckon our attention beyond Kyoto and Kamakura—and, ultimately, it would seem, even Nara. Once we actually attend to the sacred writings and Buddhist communities scattered throughout Japan, we may be able to speak, through our interpretive prism, with a fluency we have never previously enjoyed.

## REFERENCES

Abe 2002

Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎. “Shinpukeji shōgyō no keisei to Raiyu no chosaku.” In *Raiyu sōjō nanahyaku go-onki kinen ronshū: Shingi Shingon kyōgaku no kenkyū* 頼瑜僧正七百御遠忌記念論集 新義真言教学の研究, ed., Sanpa Gōdō Kinen Ronshū Henshū Iinkai 三派合同記念論集編集委員会, pp. 471-500. Daizō shuppan, 2002.

Akatsuka 2007

Akatsuka Yūdō 赤塚祐道. “Kongōji shōgyō: Jōjōbō Zenne no shosha katsudō” 金剛寺聖教一上乘房禪恵の書写活動. In *Kongōji issaikyō no sōgōteki kenkyū to Kongōji shōgyō no kisoteki kenkyū* 金剛寺一切經の総合的研究と金剛寺聖教の基礎的研究. (Heisei 16~18 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū (A) kenkyū seika hōkokusho 平成 16~18 年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) 研究成果報告書, ed. Ochiai Toshinori 落合俊典, vol. 1. Pp. 468-89. Kokusai Bukkyōgaku Daigakuin Daigaku, 2007.

Itō 2003

Itō Satoshi 伊藤聡. “Sanage jinja shozō Mujū senjutsusho o megutte: Mikawa/Owari no chūsei jiin” 猿投神社所蔵無住撰述書をめぐって—三河・尾張の中世寺院. *Aichiken shi kenkyū* 愛知県史研究 7 (2003), pp. 192-99.

---

<sup>28</sup> Kuroda 1975.

## KK

*Kongōji koki* 金剛寺古記. Full title: *Amano angū Kongōji koki* 天野行宮金剛寺古記. Ōsakafu shiseki meisshō tennen kinenbutsu chōsa hōkokusho dai 6 shū 大阪府史跡名勝天然記念物調査報告書第六輯. Ed., Ōsaka-fu, 1935.

## Koyama 1998

Koyama Yasunori 小山靖憲. *Chūsei jisha to shōensei* 中世寺社と荘園制. Hanawa Shobō, 1998.

## Kuroda 1975

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄. *Nihon chūsei no kokka to shūkyō* 日本中世の国家と宗教.

Iwanami Shoten, 1975.

## KS

*Kawachi Nagano shi shi dai 5 kan, shiryōhen 2.* 河内長野市史 第五巻史料編二.

Ed. Kawachi Naganoshi Shi Shippitsu Iinkai 河内長野市史執筆委員会. Kawachi Nagano Shiyakusho, 1975.

## Nagamura 2005

Nagamura Makoto 永村眞. “Raiyu Hōin to Daigoji 頼瑜法印と醍醐寺.” In *Chūsei no Bukkyō: Raiyu Sōjō o chūshin to shite* 中世の仏教—頼瑜僧正を中心として—, ed. Chisan Kangakukai. pp. 13-39. Seishi Shuppan, 2005.

## Oikawa 2004

Oikawa Wataru 及川亘. “Gimonjo to chūseishi kenkyū” 偽文書と中世史研究. In *Gimonjogaku nyūmon* 偽文書学入門, eds. Hisano Toshihiko 久野俊彦 and Tokieda Tsutomu 時枝務. Kashiwa Shobō, 2004.

## Ruppert 2004.

Ruppert, Brian O. 2004. “Ejū, Kanjin, Shingon Ruijū and the Early Medieval Japanese Aristocracy.” In *Matrices and Weavings: Expressions of Shingon Buddhism in Japanese Culture and Society* (Bulletin of the Research Institute of Esoteric

Buddhist Culture, Kōyasan University, Special Issue II), pp. 165-178. Kōyasan University.

## S

*Shinpukuji bunko satsuei mokuroku jō ge.* 真福寺文庫撮影目録上・下. Two volumes. Ed. Chisan Denpō'in 智山伝法院. Chizanha Shūmuchō, 1997.

## Sakamoto 1979

Sakamoto Masahito 坂本正仁. “Honmatsuchō ni mieru kinsei no Kogi Shingonshū”

本末帳に見える近世の古義真言宗. *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 密教学研究 11 (1979), pp. 20-44.

Sakamoto 2004

Sakamoto Masahito 坂本正仁. “Raiyu jikimon no shosha katsudō: Raien, Ryōden, Raijun etc.” 頼瑜直門の書写活動—頼縁・良殿・頼淳ら.” In *Chūsei jūin no chiteki taikai no kenkyū: Shinpukuji shōgyō no fukugenteki kenkyū* 中世寺院の知的体系の研究 真福寺聖教の復原的研究 (Heisei 12-Heisei 15 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojoki [kibankenyū B (1)] kenkyū seika hōkokusho 平成 12 年度～平成 15 年度科学研究費補助金 (基盤研究 B) 研究成果報告書.), ed. Abe Yasurō. 阿部泰郎. pp. 91-110. Nagoya Daigaku Bungaku Kenkyūka, 2004.

Shibata 2002

Shibata Kenryū 柴田賢龍 ed. *Yakuchū Usuzōshi kuketsu zennijikkan* 訳注 薄草紙口決 全二十卷. Two volumes. Bunseidō, 2002.

T

*Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* (T.) 大正新修大藏經. 100 vols. Ed. Takukusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭. *Taishō issaikyō kankōkai*, 1924-1935.

Tanaka 2003

Tanaka Yūbun 田中悠文 comp. “Hōon’in kengyō zengonsōjō Kenjin kōnenpu” 報恩院 檢校前権僧正憲深広年譜. *Gyōei Bunko kenkyū kiyō* 堯榮文庫研究紀要 4 (2003), pp. 41-177.