

# The Black Jewel of Shingon Tradition: A Historical Examination of Its Emergence, Characteristics, and Associated Rituals

STEVEN TRENSON

IT IS WELL-KNOWN that the relic of the Buddha (Skt. *śarīra*, Jp. *shari* 舍利)<sup>1</sup> and symbols intimately related to it, such as the wish-fulfilling jewel (Skt. *cintāmaṇi*, Jp. *nyoihōshu* 如意宝珠)<sup>2</sup> and the dragon (Skt. *nāga*, Jp. *ryū* 龍),<sup>3</sup> occupy prominent positions in the Shingon 真言 school of Japanese Esoteric Buddhism (*mikkyō* 密教).<sup>4</sup>

THE PRESENT research was conducted with the support of a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (grant number: 18K00964).

<sup>1</sup> In this article, the word “relic” principally denotes the corporeal remains of the Buddha, which exist in many different shapes and colors, often resembling small crystalline beads or grains. For an exquisite catalogue on relic artwork, see Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 2001.

<sup>2</sup> For practical reasons, the reading of Esoteric Buddhist terms and rituals as well as priest names are based on the *Mikkyō daijiten* 密教大辞典 (MDJ), unless another pronunciation is more commonly used in scholarship. For the titles of medieval Japanese Buddhist texts, however, I have followed the readings given by the online Union Catalogue Database of Japanese Texts of the National Institute of Japanese Literature (<https://kokusho.nijl.ac.jp>).

<sup>3</sup> The relation between relic, jewel, and dragon is most aptly expressed in the *Da zhidu lun* 大智度論 (Treatise on the Great Perfection of Wisdom), which explains that the jewel is the transformation of a relic or that it emerges out of the brain of a dragon (T no. 1509, 25: 478a20–26, 134a21–22). The *Beihua jing* 悲華經 (Sutra of the Lotus of Compassion) also provides various magical benefits of the relic qua jewel, including healing and the subjugation of enemies (T no. 157, 3: 211c6–212a7). The amount of scholarship on Buddhist relic and jewel worship is tremendous, but noteworthy studies are, in English, Schopen 1997, 2005, Trainor 1997, Ruppert 2000, 2002, Faure 2003, 2004, 2016, Strong (2004) 2007, Rhi 2005, Skilling 2005, 2018, and Silk 2006; and in Japanese, Kageyama 1986, Abe 1989, Ishii 2001, and Naitō 2010.

<sup>4</sup> The question of which appellation—Tantric or Esoteric—to use to refer to the various ritualized forms of Buddhism that spread throughout Asia is not an easy matter. For relevant studies on this issue, see Lopez 1996, pp. 83–104; Sørensen 2011, 2017, and McBride 2004. In this article, I employ the term “Esoteric Buddhism,” with “Esoteric” capitalized, following the arguments put forth by Sørensen 2011, pp. 166–72, 174–75, and Sørensen 2017, pp. 42–43, in which he convincingly argues that Esoteric Buddhism was a major and distinct Indian Buddhist tradition on

Indeed, the medieval collections of ritual procedures, oral transmissions, and iconography—the so-called *shōgyō* 聖教, or “sacred teachings”—produced by that school often underscore the significance of these concepts to Shingon doctrine and practice. For example, some *shōgyō* indicate that a relic had to be placed on the altar (*dan* 壇) and visualized as a *cintāmaṇi* jewel, serving there as the alternate form of the primary deity (*honzon* 本尊) of the rite, to guarantee the realization of a variety of magical objectives. Other *shōgyō*, furthermore, explain that relics and jewels fulfill an important role in such doctrinal matters as the theory of bodily buddhahood (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏), human embryology, and rebirth in the Pure Land.<sup>5</sup> Going beyond Esoteric Buddhist doctrine and practice proper, the relic, jewel, and dragon are also occasionally mentioned in medieval Shingon interpretations of the sacredness of Japan, the divinity of the emperor, and the nature of the *kami* 神, the native Japanese gods.<sup>6</sup>

Although there is much overlap between Shingon and continental Buddhist relic and jewel beliefs, the extent to which relic or jewel symbolism has been elaborated in Shingon is striking. Moreover, although Tendai 天台, the other major Japanese Esoteric Buddhist school, valorized relics as well, it did not utilize these objects in ritual as extensively as Shingon, and it seemingly only began emphasizing their role in esoteric practices from a relatively later time in the medieval era.<sup>7</sup>

That Shingon had come to highly value relics and jewels was naturally the result not of chance but of a specific historical development. In this regard, it is already long known that the basis for the school’s emphasis on these symbols lies in the twenty-fourth article of the so-called *Nijūgo kajō goyūigō* 二十五ヶ条御遺告 (Last Testament [of

---

par with Mahayana from about the early sixth century CE onward. The term should therefore be capitalized.

<sup>5</sup> On the relevance of the relic to bodily buddhahood, see Trensou 2016, pp. 422–30; on its relation to embryology, see Dolce 2016 and Trensou 2018b; on the connection with rebirth in the Pure Land, see Tomabechi 2017.

<sup>6</sup> The relevance of the relic or jewel to these topics concerns what is referred to in scholarship as “medieval Shinto,” i.e., the Esoteric Buddhist reinterpretations of *kami* mythology and worship. There are numerous studies on this subject, but noteworthy references are Yamamoto 1998, Itō 2011, and Andreeva 2017.

<sup>7</sup> In the repertoire of Tendai ritual are included the Nyohō Butsugenhō 如法仏眼法 (Jewel Ritual of Butsugen [Skt. *Buddhalocanā*, “Buddha Eye”]) and the Shijōkōhō 熾盛光法 (Ritual of [the *Uṣṇīṣa* Crown Buddha] Shijōkō [Skt. *Prajvalošṇīṣa*, “Dazzling Light”]), which are both described as relic rituals (Naitō 2010, pp. 307–9; Tomabechi 2017). The definition of these rites as relic rites, however, is only mentioned in relatively late Tendai sources, such as the *Keiran shūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集 (Collected Leaves from Hazy Valleys; T no. 2410, 76: 578c10–25) by Kōshū 光宗 (1276–1350). The *Asabashō* 阿婆縛抄 (Notes on the Buddha, Lotus, and Vajra) of Shōchō 承澄 (1205–1282), moreover, while including a transmission of a relic ritual, admits that such a rite is of special concern to Shingon and not so much to Tendai (TZ 9: 102c10–12). Since there are no earlier sources mentioning Tendai Esoteric Buddhist relic rituals, we therefore agree with Naitō (2010, p. 309) when he surmises that such rites were likely established relatively late in Tendai history, perhaps under the influence of Shingon.

Kūkai] in Twenty-Five Articles; hereafter *Testament*).<sup>8</sup> In short, the article states that the founder of Shingon, Kūkai 空海 (774–835), received instructions in China from his master, Huiguo 惠果 (746–805), on how to fabricate a jewel sphere with crushed incense, black lacquer, and relics, and that upon his return to Japan he buried such a jewel at Mt. Murō 室生 in the ancient Yamato 大和 Province, a place renowned for its dragon cult. The article also explains that the fabricated jewel is consubstantial with the relic, and that Shingon masters ought to revere that object during visualizations. The *Testament* does not specify in what ritual exactly the visualization ought to be performed. However, the twenty-third and twenty-fifth articles respectively mention the Byakujahō 避蛇法 (Ritual for Repelling Serpents) and Ōsashihyōhō 奥砂子平法 rituals, which seem closely related to the jewel.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, the former ritual, practiced for three days and nights around the turn of each month by the head abbot (*chōja* 長者) of Tōji 東寺 temple, would according to later accounts involve a concentration on Mt. Murō and thus likely also on the jewel buried there.<sup>10</sup> The latter is a subjugation ritual (*jōbukuhō* 調伏法) whose secrets, the *Testament* informs, are stored in a box kept by one of Kūkai’s disciples residing at Mt. Murō.<sup>11</sup> Its association with Mt. Murō thus suggests that this subjugation ritual was likely also related to the jewel buried at that mountain.

If the facts mentioned in the twenty-fourth article (hereafter referred to also as “jewel account”) were historically true, they would easily explain the importance of relics and jewels in Shingon esotericism, because if the founder promoted their worship, it is only natural that his successors would have followed that instruction. However, it is generally agreed today that the twenty-five-article *Testament* was established well after the founder’s death. There is, on the other hand, no consensus about the period of its establishment. While most scholars argue that it was likely already circulating by the mid-tenth century, there are others who believe that it was produced much later, in the late eleventh or early twelfth century.

Both views will be explained in more detail below, but the divergence in opinion shows that the historical development of Shingon relic and jewel beliefs is a complex matter that is far from being fully elucidated. In this article, I would like to convey some results of my own investigation of this matter by focusing on the *Testament*’s

<sup>8</sup> T no. 2431, 77.

<sup>9</sup> For a discussion of the *Testament* and its contents, see Ruppert 2000, pp. 102–41; Fujimaki 2001; Faure 2016, pp. 215–18, 235–70; and Trensón 2016, pp. 311–25, 421–46. The term “Ōsashihyōhō” is difficult to translate. According to one explanation, the word *ōsashi* is derived from “Gōzanze” 降三世, one of the various *vidyārāja*, or “mantra kings” (Jp. *myōō* 明王), by omitting the letter “g” from the first syllable and “n” from the second and pronouncing *se/ze* as “shi.” See *Besson yōki* 別尊要記 (Essential Records of Individual Deities, KBA, *MS* 118.10), cited in Trensón 2016, p. 439.

<sup>10</sup> See *Goyuigō shakugishō* 御遺告釈疑抄 (Exegetical Notes on the *Testament*), ZSZ 26: 81ab.

<sup>11</sup> See T no. 2431, 77: 412c25–414a13.

black-lacquered jewel sphere and examining its emergence, characteristics, and associated rituals. The purpose of this investigation is to shed more light on the early medieval history of Shingon relic and jewel veneration and, in doing so, offer clues to better understand this intricate issue in Japanese *mikkyō* studies.

*The Black-Lacquered Jewel of the Testament*

Before proceeding, it is both practical and necessary to first have more detailed knowledge of the contents of the twenty-fourth article in the *Testament* of Kūkai, in which the equivalence between relics and jewels as well as the method for fashioning a black-lacquered jewel sphere are mentioned. Below follows a partial translation of that article.<sup>12</sup>

Article Twenty-Four. Concerning the origin of the [teaching] that the abbot and great *ajari* 阿闍梨 (master) of Tōji should protect the *cintāmaṇi* jewel. . . . Since beginningless time, it is not [true] that the *cintāmaṇi* jewel lies in the liver of dragons or in the brain of phoenixes; it is the “fragment” (*bunshin* 分身) of the earthly, manifested (*jinen dōri* 自然道理) [body] of the Tathāgata [Śākyamuni] [that is the real *cintāmaṇi* jewel]. [Yet] some continue saying that [the jewel] lies in dragon brains or phoenix livers. Their statement is mistaken. Why is that? It is because it is the fragment of the manifested [body] of the Tathāgata [Śākyamuni] that is the true *cintāmaṇi* jewel.<sup>13</sup> What is called “fragment of the manifested [body] of the Tathāgata” here [also] refers to a material sphere that is fashioned (*seisei* 成生) on the basis of oral transmissions handed down to me [Kūkai] by my master [Huiguo]. This is the secret of secrets, the most profound of all profundities. One should never write down [the details of this teaching] in a ritual manual; it is the [direct] transmission from the Buddha Dainichi 大日 (Skt. Mahāvairocana). By “fashioned sphere” (*seisei no tama* 成生玉) is meant a “fabricated (*nōsashō* 能作性)<sup>14</sup> sphere,” which is to be made using

<sup>12</sup> Some sentences in the jewel account have been omitted for reasons of brevity and clarity. The translation that follows is my own. In making this translation, I have consulted and benefited from an alternative partial translation of the account provided in Ruppert 2000, pp. 148–55.

<sup>13</sup> The link between relics, jewels, and dragons referred to here was probably founded on the *Da zhidu lun* (see n. 3), since medieval *shōgyō* often cite this scripture to support the interconnection. See for example *Kakuzenshō* 覺禪鈔 (Kakuzen’s Compendium, TZ 5: 615c4–5, c27–29) and *Datohō kuketsushō* 駄都法口決鈔 (Compendium of Oral Transmissions on the *Dhātu* Ritual[s], SZ 28: 130ab). The word “phoenix” here, according to the *Kakuzenshō* (TZ 5: 615b22–29), refers to the *garuḍa* (Jp. *karura* 迦楼羅), a mythological bird that is associated with jewels.

<sup>14</sup> The ambiguous meaning of this term will be discussed below.

nine different materials.<sup>15</sup> . . . Make a vessel (*tsubo* 壺) with the gold and silver<sup>16</sup> and place the thirty-two relics therein. Then close the opening of the vessel for a while and firmly seal it off with an incantation. Crush the six (seven?)<sup>17</sup> types of incense wood in an iron mortar that has not been used yet and wash the wood seven times inside a clean, unused, silken cloth. The sediment should be crushed and washed in the same way. Then, when there are no more impurities [in the sediment], the crushed incense is to be fashioned into a sphere with pitch-black lacquer (*shin no urushi* 真漆).<sup>18</sup> Make the sphere evenly round, insert the relic(s) inside it, and [place the sphere in the gold-silver] vessel.<sup>19</sup> The [jewel] should be fashioned into an evenly shaped round form. . . .<sup>20</sup>

When pondering the principle [of the fabricated jewel], [the following should be known]. In the treasury of the dragon palace at the bottom of the great sea are numerous treasures, but the *cintāmaṇi* jewel is the “emperor” (*kōtei* 皇帝) among them. When asking about its real nature, [it should be known that] it is a “fragment” (*bunshin*) of the manifested [body] of Śākyamuni. How do we know that? The jewel [miraculously] moves from the treasury [of the dragon palace] to the liver inside the neck [under the jaw] of the Sea Dragon King (Kairyūō 海龍王, a.k.a. Shagara 娑伽羅; Skt. Sāgara).<sup>21</sup> The [jewel in the] treasury and the [jewel in the] neck of

<sup>15</sup> The *Testament* specifies the nine materials to be thirty-two relics, fifty *ryō* 兩 (one *ryō* is about thirty-seven grams) of gold, ten *ryō* of rosewood, ten *ryō* of sandalwood, and five different types of agarwood, likewise ten *ryō* of each. Besides these items, fifty *ryō* of silver was also used, as the *Testament* makes clear later in the text.

<sup>16</sup> The *Testament* does not specify how the gold and silver are to be used. According to later sources, the silver served to fabricate the lower part of the vessel and the gold the upper part (*Zu* 図 [Drawing], KBA, *MS* 319.49).

<sup>17</sup> While the text mentions “six,” this conflicts with the fact that previously it is asserted that seven types of incense wood ought to be used (see n. 15). Hence, perhaps “six” might be an error for “seven.”

<sup>18</sup> On this term, see below.

<sup>19</sup> I have followed the punctuation provided by the TKDZ and a copy of the *Testament* kept at Shinpukuji 真福寺 (Ōsu Bunko 大須文庫 archives, 278-5-13), which records the sentence as follows: 等分合成シテ奉ツル入彼仏舎利ヲ壺トス。方円合丸高下等分セヨ。It is unclear from the text, however, exactly how many relics (all, several, or only one?) were inserted inside the sphere.

<sup>20</sup> Then follows an explanation of the various incantations that ought to be enacted to empower the material jewel.

<sup>21</sup> The logic of why the fragment of Śākyamuni’s body is equal to the jewel is still unclear here, despite the author’s intention to explain it, unless we assume that he believed that the Dragon King and the Buddha are fundamentally one and the same, as is explained in some *shōgyō*. See for example *Besson zakki* 別尊雜記 (Miscellaneous Records of Individual Deities, TZ 3: 178a22–23), which associates “Shaga/Shaka[ra]” with “Shaka[muni],” and *Byakuhōshō* 白宝抄 (The White Treasure Compendium, TZ 10: 716b29–c2), which identifies Śākyamuni with the dragon because this buddha presides over the north, the direction of the water element (and water is the domain of dragons).



the Dragon King are always as one. At a given moment, [the jewel] emits favorable winds and sends forth [rain] clouds to the four continents [around Mt. Sumeru], making everything grow and benefiting all sentient beings. Is there a thing or creature in the sea or on land that does not receive its blessings? Yet uninstructed people, unable to keep their ignorant mouths closed, [can only] say that the *cintāmaṇi* jewel spills treasures. The jewel at the bottom of the sea is [also] interconnected with the whereabouts of the fabricated (*nōsashō*) jewel [buried at Mt. Murō] and shares its virtues with it. Therefore, one should visualize [that jewel].<sup>22</sup> [When visualizing it,] the great *ajari* [of Tōji] should say, “Homage to the Bodhisattva (*daishi* 大士) and avatar (*gongen* 権現) of the *cintāmaṇi* jewel that lies in the treasury of the Sea Dragon King as well as in the liver [inside the dragon’s] neck.”<sup>23</sup> He must recite this three times while visualizing [the jewel of Mt. Murō] and [then] also recite the mantra of the primary deity (*honzon*). One should discard all evil and have [only] benevolent thoughts. This teaching is based on instructions in the *Mahāvairocana Sutra* (Jp. *Dainichikyō* 大日經). However, being the secret of all secrets and the most profound [teaching] of all, the arcane lore should be kept in the innermost recesses of the *ajari*’s heart and mind. One should never copy and spread [these secrets]. . . . However, one should transmit [them] to the one who is to become the [next] abbot (*zasu chōja* 座主長者) of Tōji. . . .

[About] the fabricated (*nōsashō*) *cintāmaṇi* jewel that I [Kūkai] received from the great *ajari* of the Great Tang 唐 [Huiguo], I took it with me on my voyage back to the great country of Japan and buried it at a marvelous place on a famous mountain. That place is the so-called Peak of Ascetic Practice (Shōjin no mine 精進峯) [at Mt. Murō], that is, the peak east of the cave where [my disciple], the Dharma master Kenne 堅惠 (d.u.), practiced austerities. One should never reveal to later generations where the place [of burial exactly] is. This way, the Esoteric Buddhist teaching will flourish for ages and my monastic followers will spread and thrive. ([Interlinear note:] About the relics of the Buddha kept at the great sutra repository of Tōji, the great *ajari* should protect [these] in the same way as he protects the secret mudra and mantra bestowed on him during the transmission-of-the-law [initiation rite] (*denbō kanjō* 伝法灌頂); he should not let one of these relics be lost. That is because [the relics] are the [true]

<sup>22</sup> I have followed the punctuation provided by the TKDZ edition of the *Goyuigō*, which reads 所以可觀 in the original text as one clause; hence, as *yuen ni [kano hōshu o] kanzu beshi*.

<sup>23</sup> As I have indicated elsewhere (Trenson 2013; Trenson 2016, pp. 322–23), there are a few medieval sources specifying that the “Bodhisattva” here refers to Śākyamuni and the “avatar” to the dragon.

*cintāmaṇi* jewel. They protect the [Esoteric Buddhist] Way. Why can we say this? It is because [the relics] constitute the “essence” (*shinpon* 心本) of the fabricated (*nōsa*[*shō*]) jewel sphere.<sup>24</sup>

It should be noted that translating the jewel account of the *Testament* is a complicated task due to the fact that many terms mentioned in it bear multiple meanings or connotations. This we can infer from the quite numerous medieval commentaries on this work, which provide various possible interpretations. Different translations can thus be produced depending on which exegetical explication one relies on. Although a detailed analysis of all the different terms is beyond the scope of this article, for the sake of this study it is nonetheless important to clarify a few among them.

The first term that requires some explanation is *bunshin*. Although the term could be more elegantly translated (e.g., as “manifestation”), it is important not to overlook its literal meaning, namely, “fragment of the [earthly, manifested] body [of the Buddha].” Hence, it is probable that the term here is used to denote the relic. A few medieval Shingon exegetical works do indeed specify that the word *bunshin* refers to the relic,<sup>25</sup> and since the *Testament* declares on two occasions that the relic is the “true” *cintāmaṇi* jewel, it seems appropriate not to disregard this interpretation when translating the text.<sup>26</sup>

Another term that is quite ambiguous is *nōsashō* [*hōshu*]. Basically, the term appears to be a different appellation for the material jewel, in the sense of “fabricated [jewel].” This meaning is confirmed by the *Goyuigō shakugishō* 御遺告釈疑抄 of Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226–1304), which states: “Since it is about a sphere (*tama*) that is fabricated on the basis of [Huiguo’s] instructions, it is called *nōsa* (fabricated) or *seisei* (fashioned). Since relics are inserted in this sphere, constituting its ‘essence’ (*shō* 性), it is called *nōsashō*.”<sup>27</sup> Following this explanation, *nōsashō* [*hōshu*] could thus be translated as “fabricated [jewel sphere] of which relics inserted in it are its essence.” However, medieval Shingon exegesis provides other doctrinal explanations for the word *nōsashō*. For example, the *Goyuigō chū* 御遺告註 of Genpō 賢宝 (1333–1398) interprets *shō* 性 as *tai* 体 (“body” or “basis”) and explains *nōsashō* to mean “basis from which arise all phenomena”

<sup>24</sup> *Goyuigō*, T no. 2431, 77: 413b22–c2.

<sup>25</sup> See for example *Hishō* 秘鈔 (Secret Compendium), T no. 2489, 78: 559b13, and *Goyuigō shakugishō* 御遺告釈疑抄, ZSZ 26: 83a.

<sup>26</sup> The *Goyuigō chū* 御遺告註 (Annotations on the *Testament*, ZSZ 26: 122b) mentions the word *nyorai bunshin* 如来分身 in relation to vol. 59 of the *Da zhidu lun*. This volume does not mention the term *nyorai bunshin*, however, but it introduces the notion of the Buddha “pulverizing his body” (*suishen* 碎身) into relics (as small as mustard seeds) to save sentient beings (T no. 1509, 25: 480a24). On *suishen*, see also Silk 2006, pp. 83–87. It may be that the author of the *Testament* was inspired by this same notion.

<sup>27</sup> *Goyuigō shakugishō*, ZSZ 26: 85a.

(*bantoku nōsa no tai* 万徳能作ノ体).<sup>28</sup> Following this interpretation, the term *nōsashō* could therefore be translated as “generative [jewel].”<sup>29</sup> It is difficult to determine which of the two interpretations—“fabricated” or “generative”—the author of the *Testament* originally intended, but, as would be only natural for a religion that values secrecy, it could be that both were implied at the same time. At least, it is logical to assume that the idea of “fabricated,” which is the primary significance of the word *nōsa*, had been part of the original meaning.

The final term that I would like to draw attention to is *shin no urushi*, literally “true lacquer.” The word can be found in a few Heian- and Kamakura-period documents, but since no explanation is given in them about its meaning, it is difficult to determine what kind of lacquer is concerned. However, in some early modern sources the word is explained to mean “black lacquer.” For example, the *Vocabulario da Lingoa de Iapam* (Vocabulary of the Language of Japan, Jp. *Nippo jisho* 日葡辞書), published by the Jesuits in 1603, provides the following definition: “Xin. l, Xinno vruxi (*shin*, or *shin no urushi*). Pitch black colored Japanese lacquer. Example: Xinni nuru (*shin ni nuru*). To paint something in deep black color with this kind of lacquer.”<sup>30</sup> The *Zōtei kōgei shiryō* 増訂工芸志料 (Historical Materials on Handcrafts, Enlarged and Revised Edition) compiled by Kurokawa Mayori 黒川真頼 (1829–1906) in 1888 also glosses the characters 真漆, which are read “*shin no urushi*,” as “black lacquer” (*kuro’urushi* 黒漆).<sup>31</sup> From these definitions it may be assumed that the word *shin no urushi* in the *Testament* likely refers to black lacquer as well.<sup>32</sup>

Moreover, a few medieval Shingon accounts confirm that the jewel sphere of the *Testament* is a black item. For example, in his *Kakuzenshō* 覚禅鈔, Kakuzen 覚禅 (1143–ca. 1213) records an instruction from Shōken 勝賢 (1138–1196), the abbot of Daigoji 醍醐寺, which says that the “jewel transmitted [from Kūkai]” (*sōden no hōshu* 相伝宝珠) is a black sphere of about nine to ten centimeters in diameter.<sup>33</sup> Then

<sup>28</sup> *Goyuigō chū*, ZSZ 26: 122b–123a.

<sup>29</sup> As pointed out in Murakami 2013, p. 186, some medieval sources refer to a vase containing only relics as a “*nōsashō*-jewel.” This concerns the so-called [*nōsashō*-related] oral transmission (*sōjō no kuketsu* 相承之口決), which does not involve a black sphere but only relics in a vase. However, as Matsumoto Ikuyo points out, this may be a theory that was created by Daigoji monks at the end of the twelfth century to counter different views espoused by their rivals from Kajūji 勤修寺 (Matsumoto 2005, pp. 242–44).

<sup>30</sup> I consulted the modern Japanese translation. See *Hōyaku Nippo jisho* 邦訳日葡辞書, s.v. “Xin,” p. 768.

<sup>31</sup> *Zōtei kōgei shiryō*, p. 327.

<sup>32</sup> A thought that occurred to me when I first encountered the term 真漆 was that it could perhaps refer to raw lacquer. I verified with Kobayashi Hiroyuki 小林広幸, a professional lacquer craftsman, who confirmed that if raw lacquer had been used, the result would still have been a dark orb, since raw lacquer turns a dark brownish or blackish color when it is exposed to air.

<sup>33</sup> *Kakuzenshō*, TZ 5: 612b5–10. See also *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 143b.





Figure 1. Black-lacquered jewel sphere (ca. 2.5 cm in diameter) and five-wheel stupa (*gorintō* 五輪塔) in which the sphere was inserted, kept at the temple Shōkaiji 性海寺, Aichi Prefecture. The jewel was fabricated in 1278 and the stupa around 1281–1282, in all probability to pray for the destruction of the Mongol invaders. Pictures provided by the Nara National Museum. Courtesy of Shōkaiji.

there is also an account by Jitsugen 実賢 (1176–1249), who confirms that according to his master Shōken the jewel of the *Testament* is a black sphere with a small cavity on top, in which the “essence” (*shinpon* 真本)—in all likelihood a relic—is inserted. Importantly, the account adds that “since the nine materials are made round with *shin no urushi*, the [resulting sphere] looks black.”<sup>34</sup> From this wording it may also be concluded that the term *shin no urushi* was understood at the time to mean black lacquer.

A final clue indicating that the word refers to black lacquer is the material sphere of Shōkaiji 性海寺 (see figure 1). This sphere, which was crafted in 1278 by the abbot Jōin 淨胤 (d.u.), most likely to pray for the destruction of the Mongol invaders, is set in the triangular part (fire element) of a five-wheel stupa (created in 1281–1282) together with a manual detailing how the jewel was fashioned. The manual reveals that the jewel had been made based on the *Testament*’s instructions. The round part (water element) of the stupa, moreover, includes a votive text that refers to the jewel with the epithet *nōsashō*.<sup>35</sup> Since there is no doubt that Shōkaiji’s black jewel was crafted based

<sup>34</sup> *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 143b, *Goyuigō shakugishō*, ZSZ 26: 85a.

<sup>35</sup> See Aikō 1992, pp. 110, 114.

on the *Testament*, we may assume here again that the term *shin no urushi* in the latter text was likely well understood to refer to black lacquer.

*Shingon Relic and Jewel Rituals: Terminology*

Before continuing our investigation, it is necessary to further clarify some additional terminological issues. Specifically, we must elucidate the meanings of, and differences between, the various terms—*nyoihōshuhō* 如意宝珠法 (or *hōshuhō*, *nyohō* 如法), *dadohō* 駄都法, and *sbarihō* 舍利法—adopted by medieval Shingon sources to refer to rituals related to relics and jewels.

According to the *Mikkyō daijiten* (hereafter MDJ), the term (*nyoi*) *hōshuhō* (“[*cintāmaṇi*] jewel ritual”) first of all indicates *any* ritual in which a relic installed on the altar (inside a miniature stupa, box, vase, material sphere, etc.) is visualized in the shape of a Buddhist *cintāmaṇi* jewel (or jewels), that is, round, with a conical tip, often surrounded by flames (see figure 2). The same dictionary gives as a principal example the annual Goshichinichi Mishiho 後七日御修法 (Latter Seven-Day Ritual; hereafter “Mishiho”), Shingon’s most important state-protecting ritual, which was established by Kūkai at the Shingon’in 真言院 chapel of the palace in 835. Indeed, medieval sources reveal that in this rite, relics brought back from China by Kūkai and kept at the Tōji repository were placed on the main altar (sometimes inside a stupa reliquary) and visualized as a *cintāmaṇi* jewel. This jewel is said to correspond to the symbolic implement of the primary deity (*honzon*)—the Buddha Hōshō 宝生 (Skt. Ratnasambhava) or the Bodhisattva Kongōhō 金剛宝 (Skt. Vajraratna)—and is also identified with the jewel buried at Mt. Murō.<sup>36</sup>

The MDJ further provides other examples of “jewel rituals,” such as the Tsugomori Minenju 晦御念誦 (Incantation Ritual of the Final Day of the Month; this is the same rite as the Byakujahō mentioned in the *Testament*), the Nyohō Aizen’ōhō 如法愛染王法 (Jewel Ritual of King Aizen), and the Nyohō Sonshōhō 如法尊勝法 (Jewel Ritual of [the Buddha Crown Called] “Supreme Glory”).<sup>37</sup> The word *nyohō* 如法 here stands for *nyohō* 如宝, the abbreviation of *nyoihōshu*, or *cintāmaṇi* jewel.<sup>38</sup> Thus, the term (*nyoi*)

<sup>36</sup> See *Eiji ninen Shingon’in mishuhō ki* 永治二年真言院御修法記 (Record of the Mishiho at the Shingon’in Chapel in the Second Year of Eiji, ZGR 25 (2): 131b–132b; *Atsuzōshi* 厚造紙 (The Thick Paper Leaf [Notes]), T no. 2483, 78: 274b29–c5; *Besson yōki*, pp. 20–21; and *Kakuzenshō*, TZ 5: 671c4–5. On the Mishiho, see Abé 1999, pp. 344–57; Ruppert 2000, pp. 102–4; and Rambelli 2002.

<sup>37</sup> This is a ritual based on the Esoteric Buddhist deity called Butchō Sonshō 仏頂尊勝 (Skt. Uṣṇīṣavijaya) or Sonshō Butchō 尊勝仏頂 (Skt. Vikīrṇoṣṇīṣa), the deification of the Buddha’s crown, which is associated with the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya-dhāraṇī* (*Sonshō darani* 尊勝陀羅尼), or “Superlative Spell.” On this spell, see Copp 2014.

<sup>38</sup> See *Hishō mondō* 秘鈔問答 (Questions and Answers on the Secret Compendium, T no. 2536, 79: 334c10–335a11. This is, however, just one meaning of the word. For the other meanings, see MDJ, s.v. “Nyohō.”



Figure 2. Triple *cintāmaṇi* jewel (*sanben hōshu* 三弁宝珠). *Byakuhō kushō* 白宝口抄 (The White Treasure Compendium of Oral Transmissions), TZ 6: 635a.

*hōshuhō* (or *nyohō*) principally denotes a collection of rituals in which a relic is visualized as a jewel. Another ritual that should be added to this collection, although not mentioned by the MDJ, is the *Shōugyōhō* 請雨經法 (Rain Prayer Sutra Ritual), which is likewise defined in a few medieval sources as a *nyohō*, or a *hōshuhō*, rite.<sup>39</sup>

However, as the MDJ also briefly adds, sometimes the term (*nyoi*)*hōshuhō* points to a specific ritual, “the” *Nyoihōshuhō* (Jewel Ritual). This ritual was occasionally performed from 1127 on behalf of retired emperors and was centered on the Buddha *Hōshō* or on the triad of *Hōshō*, *Kongōhō*, and *Hōkō Kokūzō* 宝光虚空藏, one of the five *Kokūzō* (Skt. *Ākāśagarbha*) *Bodhisattvas*.<sup>40</sup> It was a “jewel ritual,” that is, it incorporated the visualization of the relic as the *cintāmaṇi* jewel, but in this case, importantly, a material jewel sphere was apparently often installed on the altar as well. In fact, it is likely that a physical jewel sphere was also frequently implemented in the *Nyohō Aizen’ōhō* and *Nyohō Sonshōhō* (see below).

<sup>39</sup> See *Byakuhōshō*, TZ 10: 692c4, and *Hishō kuketsu* 秘鈔口決 (Oral Transmissions on the Secret Compendium, SZ 28: 172b). Interestingly, the latter source notes that the *Shōugyōhō* is the most prominent among the *nyohō* rituals.

<sup>40</sup> On this ritual, see *Hizō konpōshō* 秘藏金宝鈔 (The Secretly Stored Golden Treasure Compendium, T no. 2485, 78: 373a19–373b26); *Kakuzenshō*, vol. 129, “*Hōshu*” (TZ 5: 610a–619b); the sections entitled “*Dado*” (*Dhātu*) and “*Dado hiketsu*” 駄都秘決 (Secret Transmissions on the *Dhātu*) in the *Hishō* (T no. 2489, 78: 559a24–560c12, 562b16–563c20); and the *Hishō mondō* (T no. 2536, 79: 512a6–520b17).

Next, the word *dado* 駄都 (or *dato*) in *dadohō* is the Sino-Japanese transliteration of the Indic word *dhātu*, which has numerous meanings (layer, stratum, constituent, metal, relics, etc.) but in medieval Japanese texts is mostly used as an alternative for *shari* (relic).<sup>41</sup> The meaning of the term *dadohō*, however, differs from lineage to lineage. In the Sanbōin 三宝院 lineage of Daigoji and related lineages, the term served as a substitute for *hōshuhō*, both as a collective noun and as the title of a specific ritual. Thus, in these lineages “*dadohō*” may indicate any of the various jewel rituals or the specific Nyoihōshuhō.<sup>42</sup> In Kajūji 勧修寺 and related lineages, however, the same word *dadohō* referred to a distinct relic ritual in which the relic was specifically identified with the Siddham syllable *bhrūṃ* of the deity Ichiji Kinrin 一字金輪 (Skt. Ekākṣara-buddhoṣṇīṣacakra, “One-Syllable Golden Wheel Buddha Crown”). This ritual was based on the *Da tuoluoni mofa zhong yizi xinzhou jing* 大陀羅尼末法中一字心呪經 (Great *Dhāraṇī* Sutra of the One-Syllable Heart Spell for the Final Age of the Dharma), which describes *bhrūṃ* as the syllable that represents the relic.<sup>43</sup> In some sources, this particular *Dadohō* is alternatively called “*Sharihō*” (Relic Ritual).<sup>44</sup>

From the above it should be evident that when discussing Shingon relic or jewel rituals one must be aware of the different meanings of such terms as *hōshuhō* and *dadohō*. Moreover, it should also be acknowledged that the term “jewel” (*cintāmaṇi*) is also rather ambiguous, since it may refer to a relic (in whatever receptacle), the symbolic image of a *cintāmaṇi* jewel, or a physical sphere. The term “jewel ritual” does not have much differential value either. Indeed, if we were to follow the Shingon sources asserting that a relic was installed in *every* Shingon ritual,<sup>45</sup> nearly all medieval Shingon rites would have been “jewel rituals,” since the relic was usually visualized as a *cintāmaṇi* jewel.

For this reason, a clearer specification might be in order. One factor that one could focus on to make a practical distinction is the material jewel sphere. Indeed, it seems that while there were many relic rituals that functioned as *nyohō*, or “jewel rituals,” not all of them implemented a physical sphere. I therefore propose to refer to rituals in which the relic is (usually) visualized as a jewel, but without installing a material sphere, as simply “relic rituals” and reserve the term “(*cintāmaṇi*) jewel ritual” only for

<sup>41</sup> This view is usually sustained in the medieval *shōgyō* by a sentence cited from the *Dari jing shu* 大日經疏 (Commentary on the *Mahāvairocana Sutra*, T no. 1796, 39: 654a15–16) that says relics are called “*tuodu*” (*dado*).

<sup>42</sup> Indeed, most of the medieval sources related to the *dado* or *dadohō* provide instructions about either one of the various *nyohō/hōshuhō* rituals or the specific Nyoihōshuhō.

<sup>43</sup> *Da tuoluoni mofa zhong yizi xinzhou jing*, T no. 956, 316b19–20.

<sup>44</sup> On this ritual, see *Shoson yōshō* 諸尊要抄 (Essential Notes on Various Deities, T no. 2484, 78: 338a6–17); *Kakuzenshō*, vol. 128, “*Shari*,” TZ 5: 599b–609c.

<sup>45</sup> The sources are *Shikan* 四卷, T no. 2500, 78: 802a9; *Kakuzenshō*, TZ 5: 603c9–10, TZ 4: 619c9–11; *Hishō mondō*, T no. 2536, 79: 390a16; *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 130b.

those rituals that made use of a fabricated jewel sphere in addition to relics.<sup>46</sup> At any rate, henceforth in this article I will employ the term “jewel ritual” only in this sense.

*Relics and Jewels in Shingon Ritual: A Brief History*

Let me now give a brief overview of the history of relic and jewel worship in Shingon ritual. Judging from the extant sources, it seems that jewel rituals only emerged in the late eleventh century. By that time, however, a few significant relic rituals relying on jewel symbolism had already been established. One of the oldest among them is the Mishiho, which, as already noted above, was based on the visualization of the relics placed on the altar as the jewel (of Mt. Murō). While there are accounts asserting that this visualization goes back to the time of the Shingon prelate Kangen 観賢 (854–925),<sup>47</sup> there is no reliable evidence to sustain the veracity of this claim.<sup>48</sup> Nonetheless, as Abé Ryūichi has pointed out, since the *Golden Light Sutra* (*Konkōmyō saishōkyō* 金光明最勝王經), on which the Mishiho was based, underscores the importance of the jewel (in chapter 14) and relic veneration (in chapter 26), and since Kūkai himself in his *Saishōkyō kaidai* 最勝王經解題 (Introduction to the *Golden Light Sutra*) instructed that the essence of the sutra lies in the Buddha Hōshō and the *cintāmaṇi* jewel, it seems quite possible that relics and the (symbolic) jewel had been part of the ritual from the very beginning of its history.<sup>49</sup>

The Mishiho was a prestigious state ritual enacted annually by the head abbot of Tōji for seven days, from the eighth day of the first month, to protect realm and emperor and to secure the growth of the crops for the coming spring and summer. Another major early Shingon relic ritual that was enacted to make crops grow is the Shōugyōhō. This ritual, which was regularly enacted in times of drought at the Shinsen'en 神泉苑 garden from circa 875 until 1273,<sup>50</sup> was built on a complex concentration practice centered

<sup>46</sup> In Murakami 2013, pp. 185–86, we also find noted the necessity to distinguish between “relic as jewel” and “material jewel sphere,” but he refers to both items with the same word, viz. “*nōsashō*.” This, however, does not solve the ambiguity of relic and jewel terminology.

<sup>47</sup> For example, see *Goshichinichi mishuhō yuisho sabō* 後七日御修法由緒作法 (Origins and Procedures of the Mishiho), ZGR 25 (2) and *Besson yōki*, pp. 20–21. The latter source records that Kangen taught the visualization technique to his disciple Kangū 寬空 (884–972) in 920.

<sup>48</sup> The earliest solid clue suggesting the use of relics in the Mishiho is the *Busshari kankeiki* 仏舍利勘計記 (Record of Buddha Relic Inventories), which states that the Tōji relics were inventoried after the completion of the rite in 950. See Ruppert 2000, p. 147.

<sup>49</sup> Abé 1999, pp. 349–50. It has also been suggested that the use of relics in the Mishiho may have been inspired by the Tang court’s worship of the famous finger bone relic held at Famensi 法門寺, about which Kūkai must have heard when residing in the capital of Chang’an 長安. See Bogel 2009, p. 106; Naitō 2010, pp. 53–55.

<sup>50</sup> According to later accounts, the Shōugyōhō was established by Kūkai, but this is more than likely a fabricated legend. On the history of this ritual, see Trenson 2013 and Trenson 2016.



on a relic placed (inside a box or lapis lazuli vessel) in the middle of the altar. During concentrations, the relic was visualized as the jewel of the dragon and was specifically identified with the jewel of Mt. Murō.<sup>51</sup>

Relics were likely part of the Shōugyōhō liturgy from a very early stage in its history. According to historical records, Kūkai brought rain at the palace by pouring water on a relic in 827.<sup>52</sup> The memory of this miraculous feat was probably kept alive and valued by the Shingon monks who first began praying for rain at the Shinsen'en. The identification of the relic with the jewel in the ritual probably goes back to an early period as well. A citation from the diary of the renowned rainmaker Ningai 仁海 (951–1046) in the *Kiu nikki* 祈雨日記 (Diary of Rain Prayers, 1117) states that the rain master offered a relic to the dragon at the Shinsen'en pond in 1032.<sup>53</sup> There is no doubt, then, that jewel symbolism was part of the ritual from that time, since the link between relics, jewels, and dragons is too basic a Mahayana Buddhist feature to ignore.

Other Shingon rituals established before the end of the eleventh century that possibly integrated jewel beliefs are the Byakujahō (or Tsugomori Minenju) and the Ōsashiyōhō, both mentioned in the *Testament*,<sup>54</sup> and the offering rituals dedicated to Kannon 觀音 (Skt. Avalokiteśvara) at the Imperial Palace. Of the latter practice, there were two types. One type was performed monthly at the Jijūden 仁壽殿 hall of the inner palace on the eighteenth day, and the other was conducted every night at the Futama 二間 (two-bay) room situated adjacent to the imperial sleeping quarters. While later medieval sources affirm the connection between these rites and the jewel,<sup>55</sup> there is no early textual evidence to confirm this. Nonetheless, regarding Kannon, Brian Ruppert has shown that the interrelationship between this deity, the jewel, and

<sup>51</sup> See *Hishō*, T no. 2489, 78: 506b5–b12. On the ritual's liturgy, see Trensou 2013; Trensou 2016, pp. 241–98; and Trensou 2018a.

<sup>52</sup> Ruppert 2000, p. 127.

<sup>53</sup> *Kiu nikki*, ZGR 25 (2): 228b. According to the *Ugon zōhiki* 雨言雜秘記 (Record of Miscellaneous Secrets on the Shōugyōhō, ZGR 25 (2): 260a), the use of the relic in the rain ritual was supported by an instruction in the *Bukong juansuo shenbian zhenyan jing* 不空羼索神變真言經 (Sutra of Amoghapāśa's Mantra and Supernatural Transformations) saying that a prayer for rain ought to be performed before a stupa reliquary (*sharitō* 舍利塔; T no. 1092, 20: 388b2). For a discussion of relic worship in Esoteric Buddhism, see Orzech and Sørensen 2011.

<sup>54</sup> One could also add the Goya Nenju 後夜念誦 (Incantation Ritual of the Early Morning), which was apparently performed daily by the head abbots of Tōji. According to the *Dato hiketsushō* 駄都秘決鈔 (SZ 23: 205a), the Mishiho, Tsugomori Minenju, and Goya Nenju rites are fundamentally the same practice and only differ in scale.

<sup>55</sup> The *Goyūgō shichika hihō* 御遺告七箇秘法 (Seven Secret Rituals Associated with the *Testament*, copy dated 1246) cited in Fujimaki 2001, p. 72 provides an example. The seven rituals mentioned are the Mishiho, Byakujahō, Tsugomori Minenju, Goya Nenju, Ōsashiyōhō, Kannon offering at the Jijūden, and Nyoishōshuhō. The Shōugyōhō is conspicuously absent from the list, but this should not cloud the fact that it was a significant relic ritual related to the *Testament's* jewel, as evidenced by the *Hishō* (T no. 2489, 78: 506b5–b12).

imperial authority had grown quite important by the late eleventh century. A more recent study by Saiki Ryōko corroborates this view with a citation from the *Denjuki* 伝受記 (Notes on Received Transmissions, 1115) of the Daigoji abbot Shōkaku 勝覚 (1057–1129), which affirms that during the same period Kannon offerings at the palace were secretly dedicated to Nyoirin Kannon 如意輪觀音 (Cakravartī-cintāmaṇi), a deity that is by definition intimately related to the *cintāmaṇi* jewel.<sup>56</sup>

The history of relics and jewels in Shingon, however, took a new direction during the reign of Emperor Shirakawa 白河 (1053–1129; r. 1073–87; r. 1087–1129 as retired emperor) through the actions of Hanjun 範俊 (1038–1112). This monk conducted the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō in 1080 and the Nyohō Sonshōhō in 1109 to pray for the personal well-being of the sovereign.<sup>57</sup> What distinguishes these prayer services is that they represent the first appearances of a jewel ritual in documented history. While there is no conclusive evidence that a physical jewel sphere was indeed implemented,<sup>58</sup> a clue supporting the assumption that it was used is the fact that both cases are recorded in the *Nyohōshū mishuhō nikki* 如意宝珠御修法日記 (Diary of Imperial Rites Based on the *Cintāmaṇi* Jewel). This source enumerates examples of rituals (from 1080 until the early fourteenth century) centered on a jewel offered by Hanjun to Shirakawa and later stored at the Shōkōmyōin 勝光明院 hall of the Toba Palace (Toba Rikyū 鳥羽離宮), where retired emperors used to reside. According to later testimonies, this jewel had the shape of a black sphere.<sup>59</sup>

In fact, Hanjun is said to have given at least two jewels to Shirakawa. One was the so-called jewel transmitted [from Kūkai] (*sōden no hōshū*), which was apparently either inserted in the statue of Aizen'ō 愛染王 (Skt. Rāgarāja, “King of Lust”), the primary icon of the Endō 円堂 hall of Hosshōji 法勝寺 imperial temple, or buried

<sup>56</sup> Saiki 2008, p. 313. The *Denjuki* (p. 407) specifies that the identity of the Kannon at the inner palace was originally threefold—Eleven-Headed Kannon (Jūichimen Kannon 十一面觀音), Holy Kannon (Shō-Kannon 聖觀音), and Nyoirin Kannon—and that these three deities were unified in the single form of Nyoirin during visualizations.

<sup>57</sup> The rites were respectively enacted at the Rokujō Palace (Rokujō Dairi 六条内裏) and Hanjun's private quarters at Toba Palace, two places where Shirakawa was residing at the time. On Hanjun and the jewel, see Matsumoto 2005, pp. 226–45. On the Nyohō Sonshōhō, see Kamikawa 2008a.

<sup>58</sup> Regarding the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō of 1080, while there are sources stating that a miniature stupa containing relics was installed on the altar (see *Shosonbō* 諸尊法 [Rituals of Various Deities; KBA, *MS* 86.6; cited in Takahashi 1993, pp. 261–62]), there are none that mention a material sphere. Concerning the Nyohō Sonshōhō, the *Kakuzenshō* (TZ 4: 554c27–28) asserts that Hanjun inserted the “jewel transmitted [from Kūkai]” (*sōden no hōshū*) inside a miniature stupa, which suggests that at that occasion a jewel sphere like the one described in the *Testament* was installed. In the final analysis, however, there is no conclusive proof.

<sup>59</sup> A testimony by Jitsugen recorded in the *Datohō kuketsushō* (SZ 28: 143b) states that his master, Shōken, was able to view this jewel on two or three occasions at the court of Retired Emperor Goshirakawa 後白河 (1127–1192) and confirmed that it was a black sphere.

at the hall.<sup>60</sup> The other jewel was the one that was eventually stored at Shōkōmyōin hall. It is uncertain, however, who originally made that other jewel.<sup>61</sup> While some accounts assert that it was fashioned by Hanjun,<sup>62</sup> others claim it had been fabricated by Kūkai.<sup>63</sup> All in all, it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain whence Hanjun obtained the jewels, how many of these items he inherited or fabricated, or what physical properties they had, due to the secret nature of the objects and the lack of detailed and trustworthy contemporary sources.<sup>64</sup>

After Hanjun, the next recorded example of a jewel ritual is the Nyoihōshuhō, which was enacted by Shōkaku in 1127 at the Sanbōin monastery of Daigoji on behalf of Retired Emperor Shirakawa. As for the circumstances of this rite,<sup>65</sup> on the twenty-sixth day of the fifth month of that year, a “jewel” (ambergris?) was found in the belly of a dead whale that had washed onto the shore of the Kanzaki 神崎 imperial estate in Kyushu. It was offered to Shirakawa, who carried the object—described to be like a crystal the size of a small orange—around his neck as a protective amulet (*omamori* 御護) for two days. Becoming afraid of its power, however, he had it wrapped in a red silken cloth and stored in a silver box. The sovereign wondered whether the whale jewel ought to be added to his personal treasury (at the Toba Palace) or stored somewhere else and had his senior secretary (*daigeki* 大外記) Nakahara no Morotō 中原師遠 (1070–1130) carry out a divination. However, according to some sources, he also

<sup>60</sup> See *Gyokuyō* 玉葉 (Jeweled Leaves), Kenkyū 建久 3 (1192).4.8 (vol. 3, p. 806a) and *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 145ab. The *Ono ruibishō* 小野類秘鈔 (Compendium of Ono Lineage Secrets, SZ 36: 20b–21a) adds that Hanjun gave Kūkai’s jewel to Shirakawa together with a copy of the *Testament*.

<sup>61</sup> *Gyokuyō*, Kenkyū 3 (1192).4.8 (vol. 3, p. 806a).

<sup>62</sup> See *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 145ab; Itō 2011, pp. 571–73.

<sup>63</sup> See *Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 129a. Other Shingon monks who, besides Kūkai and Hanjun, are said to have fabricated a jewel are Shōken, Jichiun 実運 (1105–1160), and Jitsugen (see Takahashi 2015). It is known that a jewel jointly made by Shōken and Chōgen 重源 (1121–1206) was installed in the newly built Vairocana (Jp. Birushana 毘盧遮那) Buddha statue of Tōdaiji 東大寺 in 1185. There is no doubt that the jewel made then consisted of a gold-silver vessel, sphere, and relics (Itō 2011, pp. 576–77).

<sup>64</sup> According to Shōken, there are two types of fabricated jewels, one being a silver vase containing relics but no sphere and the other being an object involving a gold-silver vessel, relics, and a black sphere constructed according to the instructions of the *Testament* (*Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 129ab). He further asserted that the jewel Hanjun offered to Shirakawa was of the former type (*Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 129ab). However, this conflicts with Jitsugen’s account saying the jewel of Hanjun that Shōken saw at the court was a black sphere (*Datohō kuketsushō*, SZ 28: 143b; see n. 59 above). A possible solution to this contradiction is that Hanjun had given both types of jewels to Shirakawa. Also, as will be shown below, it is possible that the black Shōkōmyōin jewel sphere was obtained not directly from Hanjun but only shortly after the Shingon monk had passed away.

<sup>65</sup> The details of the event mentioned here are based on the *Nyoihōshu mishuhō nikki* (pp. 429–30) and the *Geishuki* 鯨珠記 (Record of the Whale Jewel). See also Kamikawa (2004) 2008b for a discussion of this event.

asked Shōkaku's opinion.<sup>66</sup> The latter, relying on the *Zabaozang jing* 雜寶藏經 (Sutra of the Storehouse of Sundry Valuables), noted that a *cintāmaṇi* jewel may be obtained from *mojieyu* 磨竭魚 (Skt. *makara*, Jp. *makatsugyo*), a mythological sea creature, which in some scriptures (e.g., *Fanfanyu* 翻梵語 [Translation of Sanskrit Words]) is identified with a whale.<sup>67</sup>

As a result, Shōkaku was commissioned to perform the Nyoihōshuhō on behalf of Shirakawa using the whale jewel. The sovereign also lent out the jewel already in his possession that he had obtained from Hanjun. These two jewels were the *honzon* (primary icons) of the rite; that is, they functioned as the physical representations of the primary deity, which was likely Hōshō or Kongōhō.<sup>68</sup>

Incidentally, a noteworthy detail about Shōkaku's performance of the Nyoihōshuhō is that he is said to have suspended a painting of a *cintāmaṇi* jewel with two dragon kings, Nanda (Jp. Nanda 難陀) and Upananda (Jp. Batsunanda 跋難陀), drawn underneath. This is mentioned in the *Himitsushū* 秘密集 (Collection of Secrets), an unpublished manuscript from the Kanazawa Bunko 金沢文庫 of Shōmyōji 称名寺.<sup>69</sup> If this account is true, Shōkaku's drawing may have been one of the first examples of the so-called *Mani hōshu mandara* 摩尼宝珠曼荼羅 (*Cintāmaṇi* Mandala), an icon quite well known in Japanese *mikkyō* studies, which typically shows two dragons beneath a triple *cintāmaṇi* jewel inside a jeweled pavilion.<sup>70</sup> Scholars have already pointed out that this mandala was probably used as an icon in the Nyoihōshuhō,<sup>71</sup> but there is still uncertainty about this due to a lack of written evidence. The *Himitsushū* is a rare textual piece of evidence supporting this hypothesis.

After 1127, the Shōkōmyōin jewel was often lent out to be used in rituals commissioned by the retired emperor. The rituals performed were usually the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō, the Nyohō Sonshōhō, and the Nyoihōshuhō.<sup>72</sup> The purpose of these practices was mostly a matter of significant import for the retired sovereign, such as healing

<sup>66</sup> *Gajushō* 鵝珠鈔 (The Goose Jewel Compendium), SZ 36: 290a.

<sup>67</sup> *Zabaozang jing*, T no. 203, 4: 481a1–2; *Fanfanyu*, T no. 2130: 1032c5.

<sup>68</sup> Hence, the Nyoihōshuhō performed by Shōkaku seems to have been quite similar to the Mishiho but of much smaller scale. However, the real *honzon* of the rite was said to be unknown (see Kamikawa [2004] 2008b, pp. 289–90).

<sup>69</sup> The original text is as follows: “As for the Nyoihōshuhō, it is [no different from the] Byakujahō. One intones the mantra of [Kongō]hō or Hōshō. There is no other *honzon*; simply, the *cintāmaṇi* is the *honzon*. The supernumerary archbishop [Shōkaku] is said to have drawn an image of a *cintāmaṇi* and to have suspended it [behind the altar of the rite]. They say it was an image [showing] the dragons Nanda and Batsunanda holding up the *cintāmaṇi*.” 如意宝珠法、避地法。宝菩薩真言、或宝生尊真言。無別本尊。只以宝珠为本尊。権僧正御房、宝珠書令懸給ケリト云々。宝珠難・跋難陀二龍捧持之像云々。 Unpaginated manuscript.

<sup>70</sup> For images of this mandala, see Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 2001, pp. 91–93.

<sup>71</sup> See Matsushita 1943 and Manabe 1979.

<sup>72</sup> See Matsumoto 2005, pp. 236–37, for a list of recorded examples.

an illness, prolonging life, or securing a safe childbirth. The subjugation of enemies was also a recurring motive.<sup>73</sup> Furthermore, sometimes the jewel was used in prayers for rain, such as in the Kujakukyōhō 孔雀經法 (Ritual of the Peacock) conducted by Shōken in 1191 and the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō led by the Tōji abbot Shingon 親巖 (1151–1236) in 1231 and 1233.<sup>74</sup>

Records show examples of rituals based on the imperial jewel until the early fourteenth century, but it is uncertain whether the primary icon had been a material sphere in every case. According to a conversation held in 1303 between Retired Emperor Gofukakusa 後深草 (1243–1304) and Saionji Kinhira 西園寺公衡 (1264–1315),<sup>75</sup> the jewel sphere would have been lost by 1246, and instead only a relic, or relics, would have been used in subsequent *nyohō* rituals. The retired sovereign believed the Shōkōmyōin jewel may have been taken by the prince-monk (*omuro* 御室) of Ninnaji 仁和寺 or by the Daigoji abbot Seigen 成賢 (1162–1232) but was uncertain. The eventual fate and whereabouts of the imperial jewel sphere are thus unknown.

*The Date of Establishment of the Jewel Account in the “Testament”*

One of the most crucial issues in the history of Shingon's relic and jewel beliefs is the uncertainty about the date of the jewel account in the *Testament*. Although said to contain the final instructions of Kūkai given six days before he died in 835, the text itself is without doubt of a later date. There are quite a few extant manuscripts of the twenty-five-article *Testament*.<sup>76</sup> To date, the oldest manuscript is the one that is currently kept at the Takahata Fudōson Kongōji 高幡不動尊金剛寺. According to the colophon, it is a copy of the *Testament* that was made in 969 by a monk named Ryakunō 曆能 (d.u.) and that later came into the hands of Ningai, who in 1025 passed it on to his disciple and Daigoji abbot Kakugen 覚源 (1000–1065). Eventually, the copy was inherited by Seigen, abbot of the same temple.

Scholars have pointed out that the *Testament*, since it emphasizes the prestige of Tōji while placing Mt. Kōya 高野 in a subordinate position, must date back to a time when Tōji acquired a superior position in Shingon. They believe that the early tenth century corresponds well to such a development. It was a period when the monks of Kongōbuji 金剛峰寺 on Mt. Kōya opposed Tōji by refusing to return the *Sanjūjō sasshi* 三十帖冊子 (Thirty Booklets of Scriptures Copied [by Kūkai]) but eventually lost the dispute

<sup>73</sup> On this aspect, see Takahashi 2015.

<sup>74</sup> See *Nyohōshū mishubō nikki*, pp. 434–35, and Trensou 2016, pp. 208–12.

<sup>75</sup> *Kinhira kōki* 公衡公記 (Diary of Minister Kinhira), vol. 3, p. 11, entry for Kengen 乾元 2 (1303).4.16.

<sup>76</sup> See Kobayashi 2004. In passing, the TKDZ version of the *Testament* is based on a manuscript dated to 1210, suggesting that this is the oldest copy currently kept at Mt. Kōya 高野.



in 919 when Kangen placed Kongōbuji under Tōji's administration. Some scholars have therefore argued that the twenty-five-article *Testament* could have been initially drafted by Kangen.<sup>77</sup>

There are also studies that tend to place the establishment of the *Testament* at a somewhat later date but still in the tenth century. One such study, by Nishida Nagao, focuses on an incident in which a Shingon faction led by Kansan 寛算 (fl. 940) was ousted in 943 from Butsuryūji 仏隆寺, which was built by Kenne in 850 near Mt. Murō. In this incident, Tōji clashed with Kōfukuji 興福寺 over the supervision of Butsuryūji. According to Nishida, the story interconnecting Kūkai, Kenne (who was likely originally not even a Shingon, but rather a Tendai, monk), Mt. Murō, jewels, and dragons—hence, the core of the *Testament's* jewel account—was formed during that period to legitimize Shingon's claim against Kōfukuji, which had the de facto legal administrative rights.<sup>78</sup> Recently, this theory has been reemphasized by Takeuchi Kōzen, who sets the date of establishment of the *Testament* around 960.<sup>79</sup>

Some scholars, however, remain skeptical about such an early date for the *Testament's* establishment. For example, noting that the *Honchō shinsenden* 本朝神仙伝 (Biographies of Japanese Immortals) of Ōe Masafusa 大江匡房 (1041–1111) refers to a “twenty-two-article” *Testament*, Kadoya Atsushi has opined that if the word “twenty-two” is not a copying error, the final three articles of that text were perhaps not yet committed to writing at that time and only orally transmitted.<sup>80</sup> However, it is difficult to draw any conclusions from the *Honchō shinsenden*, as indeed the word “twenty-two” could simply be a copyist error. Moreover, a “twenty-five-article” *Testament* is mentioned in the [*Kōbō*] *daishi gogyōjō shūki* [弘法]大師御行状集記 (Collected Records on the Life of Kōbō Daishi [Kūkai]) written by Keihan 経範 (1031–1104) in 1089,<sup>81</sup> suggesting that such a version was already circulating by that time.

Another scholar who expressed doubts about the theory of a tenth-century establishment of the twenty-five-article *Testament* is Kamikawa Michio. In his study on the Nyoihōshuhō, he intimates that Hanjun may have been the author of the

<sup>77</sup> See Moriyama 1966, pp. 33–34, and Shirai 1986, pp. 21–22. The *Goyuigō chū* (ZSZ 26: 99ab) states that Kangen copied the *Testament* to prevent it from getting lost (see also Matsumoto 2005, p. 230), and according to the *Ono kyōzō mokuroku* 小野経蔵目録 (Catalogue of Scriptures in the Ono Repository; copied in 1168; p. 14), there existed a work entitled “*Yuigō*” 遺告 (Testament) in Kangen's handwriting (Kobayashi 2004, p. 491). Although unverifiable, it could be that Kangen was indeed the author of the *Testament* as we have it today.

<sup>78</sup> See Nishida 1978, pp. 261–314, esp. pp. 313–14.

<sup>79</sup> Takeuchi 2011. In addition, Tomabeichi Seiichi hypothesizes that the *Testament* may have been authored by Kangū around 960 (Tomabeichi 2010). He bases this theory on the fact that Kangū is the first Shingon monk who can be confirmed to have studied both Sanron 三論 and Hossō 法相, two schools that in the *Testament* are recommended (allegedly by Kūkai) as necessary learning for Tōji abbots.

<sup>80</sup> Kadoya 1997.

<sup>81</sup> KDZ, opening volume, p. 49.

twenty-five-article *Testament* as we have it today. The principal argument for this hypothesis is that it seems that no jewel sphere had ever been made before Hanjun, or that no jewel ritual had ever been performed before him.<sup>82</sup>

Recently, this hypothesis has gained further traction. In a study of a relic crypt inside a Liao 遼 dynasty (907–1125) pagoda (the Chaoyang 朝陽 Northern Pagoda) dating from 1043 to 1044, Kim Youn-mi has demonstrated that the ritual space of the crypt bears a striking resemblance to the ritual setting on the great altar of the Nyohō Sonshōhō performed by Hanjun in 1109. Indeed, the Liao relic crypt includes a miniature stupa with a material jewel sphere made from agate set inside it.<sup>83</sup> This recalls the Nyohō Sonshōhō altar setting, which also comprises a stupa with, in all likelihood, a jewel sphere installed inside it. This similarity and other details show that Hanjun was more than likely directly inspired by Liao relic and jewel technology when he devised the Nyohō Sonshōhō. Relying on this observation, Kim then also further supports Kamikawa's hypothesis by arguing that Hanjun may have invented Shingon's jewel sphere tradition on the basis of the Liao Buddhist relic and jewel beliefs.<sup>84</sup>

That the Nyohō Sonshōhō is indebted to Liao Buddhism is an important discovery, but insofar as the theory of Hanjun inventing Shingon's jewel sphere tradition is concerned, there is room for questioning that hypothesis. This is because there are a few clues suggesting that the *Testament's* jewel account was likely established prior to Hanjun and that consequently the Shingon tradition of jewel spheres was possibly already in place before that monk's time as well. One clue is provided by the Takahata Fudōson Kongōji manuscript of the *Testament*. According to Kobayashi Yoshinori's paleographic analysis, there is little doubt that the red-ink notes and dry-point glosses (*kakuhitsuten* 角筆点) on the manuscript were added in 1025.<sup>85</sup> It thus seems reasonable to assume that the twenty-five-article version of the *Testament* was established before that time, presumably in the tenth century, or at the latest in 1025. Then, another important clue is the fact that the *Testament's* jewel account was partly cited in the *Shingon fuhō san'yōshō* 真言付法纂要抄 (Collected Essentials on Shingon Dharma Transmissions) written by Seizon 成尊 (1012–1074), Hanjun's master, in 1060.<sup>86</sup> The citation occurs in a section where Seizon explains ten superior characteristics of the Shingon school, one of which is the mastery of the power of the *cintāmaṇi* jewel.

The *Testament* of the Great Master [Kūkai] mentions the following: “When asking about the real nature of the *cintāmaṇi* jewel, [it should be known

<sup>82</sup> Kamikawa (2004) 2008b, p. 281.

<sup>83</sup> Kim 2013, pp. 141–42.

<sup>84</sup> Kim 2013, pp. 168–70.

<sup>85</sup> Kobayashi 2004, p. 499.

<sup>86</sup> This was first pointed out by Nakamura Honnen. See Nakamura 2005a and Nakamura 2005b.

that] it is the fragment (*bunshin*) of the manifested (*jinen dōri*) [body of] Śākyamuni. At a given moment, the jewel emits favorable winds and sends forth [rain] clouds to the four continents, making everything grow and benefiting all sentient beings. Is there any living creature in the sea or on land that does not receive its blessings? However, I [Kūkai] brought the fabricated (*nōsashō*) *cintāmaṇi* jewel that I had received from the great master and *ajari* of the Great Tang [Huiguō] back with me to the great country of Japan, and I buried it at a marvelous place on a famous mountain. This way, the Esoteric Buddhist teaching will flourish for ages, and my monastic followers will spread and thrive.”<sup>87</sup>

When comparing the citation with the *Testament*'s corresponding section in the twenty-fourth article, it becomes apparent that Seizon had cited a few sentences from that work. His citation clearly uses the same wording and terminology and mentions such key concepts as “fragment” (*bunshin*) and “*nōsashō*.” This makes it quite likely that the jewel account of the *Testament*, including the method for fabricating (the primary meaning of the word *nōsa* as argued above) a jewel sphere, was already part of that work before 1060.

Kamikawa's hypothesis is built on the assumption that there had never been a case of a Shingon monk fashioning a jewel sphere or performing a jewel ritual prior to Hanjun, but this is too bold a claim. The fact that later sources assert that Hanjun fashioned a jewel sphere does not preclude the possibility that he had inherited such jewels besides having fabricated some of these items himself. Shingon is after all based on secrecy, and to claim that no jewel sphere had been made before Hanjun is untenable or highly debatable.

Moreover, there is a historical account intimating the possibility that a jewel sphere already circulated in Shingon prior to Hanjun. The account concerns the contents of a conversation between Shirakawa and Nakahara no Morotō in 1127, which is recorded in the latter's diary in the following way:

This work (the *Testament*) is in the very handwriting of Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師 (Kūkai). In it, he wrote his final instructions [before passing away] and revealed them to his disciples. It mentions the *cintāmaṇi* jewel. During the time of the Minister of Uji (Fujiwara no Yorimichi 藤原頼通; 992–1072), the master of Bishop Seizon, [Ningai,]<sup>88</sup> had this jewel stored at the Uji repository (Byōdōin 平等院) together with other items that belonged

<sup>87</sup> *Shingon fuhō san'yōshō*, T no. 2433, 77: 420b16–25.

<sup>88</sup> The name of the master is unfortunately not visible, but it is most likely Ningai, who was Seizon's only master.

to the Great Master [Kūkai]. ([Interlinear note:] The *cintāmaṇi* jewel was inserted in a black box.) Since Seizon's master [Ningai] wished to pass it on to his disciple, he repeatedly asked for the box to be taken out, but [the Minister of] Uji did not open the repository. [Seizon's] master therefore went [secretly] under the repository, made a hole in its floor, and stole the black box and the [Great Master's] other items.<sup>89</sup> He passed on these items to Seizon, who gave them to Hanjun. When the latter felt that his final days were approaching, he said that the items should not be passed on to one of his disciples but to his Excellency (Shirakawa). However, Hanjun was not immediately summoned, neither did he hasten to offer [the items]. When he eventually passed away, a commotion broke out inside his private living quarters [at the Toba Palace], but two of his disciples were able to control the situation. Upon hearing that the items were scattered [inside his living quarters], the retired emperor had warrior guards of the Toba [Palace] placed there to keep these items safe. Thirty days later, the sovereign had the items examined and, as expected, the jewel was found among them. He had it retrieved and stored at his private repository.<sup>90</sup>

The jewel in question here, since it is said to have been eventually stored in Shirakawa's repository, the predecessor of the Shōkōmyōin hall, might be the very jewel that was on numerous occasions implemented as the primary icon in *nyohō* rituals sponsored by retired emperors and that, as witnessed by Shōken at the end of the twelfth century, had the shape of a black sphere. If that is true, the black Shōkōmyōin jewel would thus not have been directly "given" to Shirakawa by Hanjun but retrieved from the latter's living quarters right after he had passed away; and what is more, that jewel would not have been one that was made by Hanjun but one that previously had been in the possession of Ningai and his own master, Seizon.

Regarding Ningai, it is interesting to note that he is reported to have written a "Record of Jewel Fabrication" (*Zōhōshuki* 造宝珠記), which was later kept at the Shōkōmyōin hall.<sup>91</sup> It is also noteworthy that the tradition of the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō is said to go back to the same monk.<sup>92</sup> Moreover, Ningai's name is indirectly mentioned in relation to a "jewel inside a black box" in the *Byakuhōshō* (dated to ca. 1278–1284), in a section related to the Shōgyōhō rain ritual: "Originally, the black box of the

<sup>89</sup> The original text provides "yūigō" 遺告 (testament) here. If this is correct, Hanjun would not have been the first to give a jewel and a copy of the *Testament* to the court. It is more likely, however, that the word *yūigō* is a miscopy for *ibutsu* 遺物 (items [of Kūkai's]).

<sup>90</sup> *Geishuki*, p. 571.

<sup>91</sup> *Goyūigō chū*, ZSZ 26: 124b.

<sup>92</sup> *Kakuzenshō*, TZ 5: 266c14–15.

Ono 小野 [master Ningai] was installed [on the altar]. In it, there was the *cintāmaṇi* jewel [sphere] transmitted [from Kūkai] (*sōden no nyoihōshu*). This is a great secret. Nowadays [only] a relic is placed.”<sup>93</sup> Although these clues do not constitute conclusive evidence, they nonetheless point out the possibility that Ningai could already have possessed or fabricated a jewel sphere and even secretly implemented such an item in a relic ritual.

Following the abovementioned observations, it would appear appropriate to leave room for the assumption that the tradition of material jewel spheres could already have existed in Shingon prior to Hanjun and the introduction of Liao jewel technology. It also seems prudent to think that such a jewel could already have been secretly implemented in one of the older relic rituals such as the Mishiho or the Shōugyōhō, for example. In addition, it is to be noted that the jewel of the Chaoyang Northern Pagoda was a solid orb made from agate. Its materiality is quite different from that of the *Testament's* jewel, which is crafted with crushed incense and black lacquer. This suggests that the *Testament's* jewel fabrication method was likely derived from an alternative source. We will revisit this issue at the end of the article, where I will propose a theory of what this alternative source could have been.

#### *The Emergence of Jewel Rituals: An Alternative Hypothesis*

Regardless of whether jewel spheres were already circulating or not, the enactment of the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō in 1080 was an important event, signaling the rise of relics and jewels in imperially sponsored Shingon rituals. It is, however, unclear as to what led Hanjun to emphasize these symbolic items in this prayer service for Shirakawa. About this, Kamikawa argues that the emergence of jewel rituals during that period was part of Shirakawa's political design to promote Japanese Buddhism as a superior form of Buddhism in Asia to curb a growing sense of instability and fear caused by the increased military tensions between the Song 宋 and the Liao. Thus, according to Kamikawa, rituals relying on a material *cintāmaṇi* jewel, an object with roots in India, would have been invented (with the help of Hanjun) to place Japan at the center of the pan-Asian Buddhist world. Or, according to Matsumoto, the rise of relics and jewels during Shirakawa's reign might be related to the sovereign's strategy to create a new Buddhism-based ideology of kingship, surpassing the Shinto mythology traditionally supporting the rule of emperors, to legitimize his own authority as retired emperor.<sup>94</sup>

While it is certainly necessary to consider these theories, I believe that insofar as the case of 1080 is concerned, there might have been other, more immediate factors that led

<sup>93</sup> *Byakuhōshō*, TZ 10: 698c24–26.

<sup>94</sup> See Kamikawa (2004) 2008b, pp. 282–83; Kamikawa 2008a, p. 79; and Matsumoto 2005, pp. 250–52.



Hanjun to highlight the significance of relics and jewels besides supporting Shirakawa's religiopolitical designs. One factor that I think is quite relevant in this regard is Hanjun's prolonged conflict with Gihan 義範 (1023–1088), the senior disciple of Seizon, over the leading position in his master's lineage, the Ono lineage, established by Ningai.

In brief,<sup>95</sup> when Seizon died in 1074, Hanjun took over the supervision of Mandaraji 曼荼羅寺, which was built by Ningai in the Ono area close to Daigoji and which formed the center of his lineage. In 1076, however, when Hanjun was away for a one-thousand-day retreat at Mt. Nachi 那智 in the Kumano 熊野 region, Gihan usurped Hanjun's position. Apparently, Gihan justified his actions on the grounds that he was Seizon's senior disciple (*jōrō* 上臈). Hanjun vehemently protested, claiming that although he was the junior disciple, he was nonetheless the rightful successor. In one of the lengthy petitions sent to the court in 1078 (Jōryaku 承暦 2.7.10), he defended his claim by bringing up the following argument:

Not so long ago, my master, Seizon, received the imperial order, in the sixth lunar month of 1065, to conduct the Shōugyōhō at the Shinsen'en. On that occasion, my master had me, Hanjun, perform the offering to the dragon, which is an uttermost profound secret. Moreover, when my master proceeded to the whereabouts of the dragon at night [at the isle in the pond], I, Hanjun, was the only one who accompanied him. This is a [most important] secret of our school and a [most valuable] oral transmission of our branch. If Gihan would be a fit Dharma vessel [of our lineage], why did he not inherit the Shōugyōhō, and why did he not learn the offering to the dragon? Is that not proof enough of the fact that I, Hanjun, am sole legitimate successor and should be declared the [rightful] Dharma vessel [of our lineage]? What is more, Gihan received instructions from me about the secrets concerning the oral transmissions on the last words [i.e., the *Testament*] of Kōbō Daishi (Kūkai). . . . In a governmental order sent to Mandaraji and addressed to archbishop Ningai, the following is said: "Ningai, disciple of Kōbō Daishi in the sixth [eighth?]<sup>96</sup> generation, inherited [the founder's] writings, was entrusted with [his] ritual implements, preciously holds [his] One Mind (*isshin* 一心), and now abides on this rock [Mandaraji]. From among his school, capable and outstanding monks are to be chosen to have them protect [the Dharma?]." With "holding [Kūkai's]

<sup>95</sup> For a detailed discussion, see Tsuda 1990.

<sup>96</sup> The original text provides "sixth," but counting the different masters in the lineage, from Kūkai to Ningai, there ought to be more than six. The character for "six" (六) might be a copying error for the character 八 meaning "eight."

One Mind” is meant nothing but [keeping the secrets of] the Shōugyōhō. Although I am a monk of low capacities, I am fortunate enough to have inherited that ritual. Hence, I too hold [the founder’s] One Mind. How could I forget or lose it? Also, there are various oral instructions on the Goshichinichi Mishiho and Tsugomori Minenju rites of the Shingon’in chapel, but Gihan knows absolutely nothing about them. Should you have any doubts [about my statement], have me, Hanjun, and Gihan confront each other [in a ritual contest] and have us pray to the hidden and manifest gods and the Three Jewels [to find out the truth].”<sup>97</sup>

Hence, Hanjun asserted that he was Seizon’s rightful successor because he alone, and not Gihan, had inherited the secrets of the Shōugyōhō. The Ono lineage, since Ningai had successfully completed the rain ritual on multiple occasions,<sup>98</sup> was indeed one that had inherited its secrets. Hanjun, however, elevated the status of the ritual to the “One Mind” (*isshin*) of Kūkai and to the most important criterion for determining leadership within the Ono lineage. At the end of the quote, the boastful Hanjun even suggests to the court, led by Shirakawa, to let him and Gihan engage in a prayer contest to decide who is right. Since the petition was sent in the summer, perhaps he had a rain prayer in mind.

It is a well-known fact of Shingon history that although given the opportunity to prove his claims by conducting the Shōugyōhō in 1082, Hanjun failed to bring rain.<sup>99</sup> This must have been a major loss of face for the impetuous monk, who is reported to have fled to Mt. Nachi in shame. Somehow, however, the failure did not make Shirakawa lose confidence in this monk. According to later accounts, the sovereign called Hanjun back from Mt. Nachi to have him conduct a prayer on his behalf. Moreover, after 1092 Hanjun rose steadily in the monastic hierarchy, becoming head abbot of Tōji in 1104 and eventually even serving as the personal protector-monk of Retired Emperor Shirakawa at the Toba Palace until his death in 1112.<sup>100</sup>

Returning to the main issue, it should be clear that Hanjun’s dispute with Gihan and his claim about the Shōugyōhō in 1078 are quite relevant to the question of why this monk began emphasizing relics and jewels two years later in 1080. There is no doubt that Hanjun had been looking for support from Shirakawa since 1078 to defend his rights. The fact that the emperor allowed him to perform the Nyohō Aizen’ōhō in

<sup>97</sup> *Heian ibun* 平安遺文 (Records of the Heian Period), Komonjo-hen 古文書編, vol. 10, *ho* 補 17, p. 42.

<sup>98</sup> See Trensou 2016, pp. 121–28.

<sup>99</sup> *Kiu nikki*, ZGR 25 (2): 232b–233a.

<sup>100</sup> On Hanjun’s life, see *Tōji chōja bunin* 東寺長者補任 (Record of Appointments of Tōji Abbots), vol. 2; *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書 (Buddhist Records from the Genkō Era), vol. 10; and Trensou 2016, pp. 176–77.

1080, even though he had no monastic rank or title yet, shows that the sovereign was lending an obliging ear to the zealous monk. Although Hanjun's petition of 1078 does not clarify what the "profound secret" of the Shōugyōhō was about, it almost certainly concerned relics and jewels. Hence, it looks as if Hanjun, eager to prove to Shirakawa that he alone possessed the secrets of Kūkai's relic and jewel lore, had found a way to show it by being allowed to perform a different relic ritual, the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō.<sup>101</sup> At any rate, the performance of that ritual, which probably involved the use of a material jewel sphere as well, must have been the perfect opportunity for Hanjun to enlighten the sovereign about relics and jewels, or even about their relevance to the rain ritual, to further strengthen his claims vis-à-vis Gihan.

Hence, while various factors might have led to the performance of the Nyohō Aizen'ōhō rite in 1080, including religiopolitical ones, I believe that one of the more concrete factors urging Hanjun to emphasize relics and jewels at that time was his ambition to defeat his rival, Gihan, by turning his words into actions and proving to Shirakawa through an actual relic ritual that his claims of inheriting the "One Mind" of Kūkai were not idle. Once he had revealed this "secret," Hanjun naturally continued highlighting relics and jewels, making them among the most precious treasures of the retired emperor.

#### *The Jewel of the Iwashimizu Hachimangū Shrine*

Incidentally, the shrine Iwashimizu Hachimangū 石清水八幡宮 houses a medieval, black-lacquered box containing a jewel (figure 3). The jewel is a blackish sphere of about 4.7 centimeters in diameter and, as x-ray pictures reveal, contains a small mineral or metal object (probably a relic). It is wrapped in a red cloth and set inside an octagonal, black-lacquered wooden box that is nested in a matching lid. On each panel of the box, on the inside and on the outside, as well as on the eight panels inside the lid, a deity is painted in gold and silver strokes. While the figures on the inside of the box are all *nāga* dragons surrounded by ocean waves, those depicted on the outside of it, and on the inside of the lid, include besides dragons a variety of other Buddhist deities, such as Kichijōten 吉祥天 (Skt. Mahāśrī) and an eight-armed Benzaiten 弁財天 (Skt. Sarasvatī). As for the origin of the artifact, a notice (copied in 1759) stuck on the inner ceiling of the lid states that according to ancient records the jewel had been offered to the shrine by Hanjun. The notice further adds that the item swiftly produced rain in a prayer service conducted previously at the shrine (probably not long before 1759).

<sup>101</sup> As I have argued elsewhere (Trenson 2013; Trenson 2016, pp. 269–73), by the end of the twelfth century the Shōugyōhō had come to be perceived as a ritual centered on Aizen (as the dragon). Perhaps this view existed already in Hanjun's time.



Figure 3. Jewel and black-lacquered octagonal box with lid. Iwashimizu Hachimangū. Estimated to date from the early to mid-twelfth century. Reproduced from the frontispiece pages of Izumi 2010. Courtesy of Iwashimizu Hachimangū.



Figure 4. Black-and-white inverted images of the *nāga* dragons drawn on the inside panels of the box. Reproduced from Izumi 2010, pp. 24–25. Courtesy of Iwashimizu Hachimangū.





Figure 5. Mandala that was laid out on the great altar of the Shōugyōhō rain ritual. *Zuzōshō* 図像抄 (TZ 3, image no. 26). As indicated in Izumi 2010, p. 28, it is the *nāga* images in the *Zuzōshō* version of the mandala which resemble closest those drawn on the inside of the Iwashimizu Hachimangū jewel box.

According to Izumi Takeo's study, the images of the dragons amid ocean waves (figure 4) show a striking resemblance to those in the Shōugyōhō mandala (figure 5), while the figures of the deities on the outside of the box and on the inside of the lid, especially the eight-armed Benzaiten image, point to a close connection with the *Sutra of Golden Light*. Izumi thus argues that the Shōugyōhō and the *Sutra of Golden Light* (which constitutes, let us recall, the scriptural basis of the Mishiho) formed the two fundamental ideological underpinnings of the item. He doubts, however, that the artifact was made by Hanjun, even though he asserts, based on art historical analysis, that it was most likely fabricated in the period ranging from the early to the mid-twelfth century. He surmises that the item was perhaps first used in the Nyoihōshuhō ritual but adds that the possibility of its original use in rainmaking rituals cannot be ruled out either.<sup>102</sup>

While it seems indeed doubtful that Hanjun was the creator of the artifact, it must be noted that it is nonetheless one of the oldest surviving tokens of Shingon's jewel

<sup>102</sup> Izumi 2010, pp. 34, 38–40.



sphere tradition. As such, it is also noteworthy that the Esoteric Buddhist symbols associated with this artifact point to the Mishiho and the Shōugyōhō. From this it can further be hypothesized that the liturgies of the Mishiho and the Shōugyōhō formed the bedrock on which Shingon's relic and jewel cult, and possibly the tradition of the material jewel sphere as well, had originally been built.

*The Origin of Black-Lacquered Jewel Spheres: A Buddhist-Daoist Alchemical Perspective*

To end this article, let us turn again to the question of what could possibly have been the source of the peculiar jewel fabrication method provided by the *Testament*. As already noted above, this article argues that the method of fabricating a black-lacquered jewel sphere had probably already been established in Shingon prior to Hanjun. In this final section, I would like to add further weight to this theory by pointing out a possible concrete textual source for this method.

To come immediately to the point, according to Genpō's *Goyuigō chū*, the jewel fabrication method of the *Testament* is based on the *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing* 大仏頂広聚陀羅尼經 (Extensive *Dhāraṇī* Sutra of the Great Buddha Crown; hereafter *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra*),<sup>103</sup> which is said to have been brought to Japan by the Tendai priest Ennin 円仁 (794–864).<sup>104</sup> In this scripture, of which the translator is unknown, we find the description of an Esoteric Buddhist practice involving the fabrication of “precious treasures” (*zhenbao* 珍宝). One of those treasures is “pure gold” (*zimo jin* 紫磨金) that is “shining like the sun” and is produced by melting copper in a crucible, mixing in various medicinal herbs and plants, and dipping the result in turmeric. Another treasure is silver “shining like the moon,” which is made by combining tin, copper, and herbs, likewise in a crucible, and dipping the result in milk. Then there is also a *cintāmaṇi* jewel (*rubao zhu* 如宝珠), which is to be fabricated as explained here:

Prepare the following: three *liang* 兩 [one *liang* is about 41 grams] of the palash (*zikuang* 紫鋹; *Butea monosperma*) tree, ([Interlinear note:] use its resin), one hundred *liang* of clam powder ([Interlinear note:] take various bright and beautiful clams), one hundred *liang* of glass powder ([Interlinear

<sup>103</sup> *Goyuigō chū*, ZSZ 26: 125b. Genpō also points out the seventh volume of the *Shouhu jing* 守護經 (abbr. of *Shouhu guojiezhū tuoluoni jing* 守護国界主陀羅尼經 [*Dhāraṇī* Sutra for Protecting State, Realm, and Sovereign]) as an additional source for the idea of fashioning jewels. However, besides the mention of a “compounded jewel” (*wagōju* 和合珠) in the ninth volume (T no. 997, 19: 567b12, b19), I have not been able to find a jewel fabrication method in that sutra. Perhaps the word “compounded jewel” alone had been the source of inspiration. For the *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing*, see T no. 946.

<sup>104</sup> The text is indeed included in Ennin's catalogue of imported scriptures. See *Nittō shingu shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄 (Catalogue of Sacred Texts Newly Sought in the Tang), T no. 2167, 55: 1080a17.

note:] the glass should be bright and clean), one *liang* of life-prolonging herbs (*yanshou yao* 延寿藥), one *liang* of the “king of oils” (*gaoyou wang* 膏油王), and one *fen* 分 (about 0.4 grams) of *tāla* (*duoluo* 多羅) [palm] tree [leaves]. Crush [the leaves] into a powder with a thin pestle (*xi dao* 細槵/槵). Press the [other] materials into a harmonious whole and make it round. Add the one *feng* of *tāla* [powder] to it and fashion a jewel (*zhu* 珠). Adjust its size as desired. Set this jewel in a ceramic crucible and heat it up with a small fire. As the jewel becomes hot, it will emit a violet glow. Take it out and dip it in liquid jaggery (*shimi* 石密/蜜 [Skt. *śarkarā*]). This will produce a splendid *cintāmaṇi* jewel. One may use it as one sees fit.<sup>105</sup>

The “king of oils” mentioned in the above procedure is an oil of which the fabrication method is provided in a preceding section of the same sutra.<sup>106</sup> It is made by boiling cut or crushed turmeric, *keruing* (*Dipterocarpus*) wood, *jianxiang* 煎香 agarwood, perilla seeds, *shenxian* 沉香 agarwood, and bezoar (*niuhuang* 牛黃). This oil is explained to have many magical usages. For example, when rubbed on the eyelids, it enables one to see various deities, such as dragons, *garuḍa*, and *asura*; or when applied to white mustard seeds (*byakugaishi* 白芥子) and thrown in a sea or in a place where dragons live, it is sure to bring rain.<sup>107</sup>

Evidently, the fabrication methods of the treasures (gold, silver, and *cintāmaṇi* jewel) described here reflect alchemical procedures. Han Jishao believes that these procedures are thoroughly Daoist in nature. He argues that although some elements, such as clam powder, are also found in Indian Buddhist alchemical methods, the production of “pure gold”—which recalls the “golden elixir” (*jindan* 金丹) of immortality—in a crucible with medicinal herbs must be based on Daoist alchemy.<sup>108</sup> It is known that a few Chinese Esoteric Buddhist scriptures are not direct translations but hybrid texts mixing Indian Buddhist teachings with Daoist beliefs,<sup>109</sup> and the above procedures seem to illustrate that. On the other hand, it is also a fact that alchemical methods for creating silver or gold existed in medieval Indian Esoteric Buddhist tradition as well, even though they may have been originally introduced to India from China.<sup>110</sup> It is not easy to draw a distinct line here. Whatever the origin, however, there is no doubt that any religious specialist in China or Japan able to consult the Chinese translation would have recognized the alchemical procedures therein as akin to Daoist methods.

<sup>105</sup> *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing*, T no. 946, 19: 165c6–11.

<sup>106</sup> *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing*, T no. 946, 19: 164a20–28.

<sup>107</sup> *Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing*, T no. 946, 19: 164c8–c13.

<sup>108</sup> Han 2015.

<sup>109</sup> Strickmann 1996, pp. 118–26.

<sup>110</sup> See White 1996, pp. 46–57, esp. p. 53. I thank Iyanaga Nobumi for bringing this to my attention.

It can be safely argued that the procedures for crafting treasures provided by the *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra* had been a crucial source of inspiration for the *Testament's* jewel fabrication method. Not only do these procedures mention the factors of gold and silver, which in the case of the *Testament* are used to fashion the vessel to store the jewel sphere, but we also have the factor of the fabrication of a spherical object with various substances. In the case of the *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra*, the substances are *Butea monosperma* resin (which has a violet color), clam and glass powder, an oil (derived from boiling various ingredients, including agarwood), medicinal herbs, *tāla* tree leaves,<sup>111</sup> and liquid jaggery. Of course, these substances do not all appear in the *Testament's* jewel fabrication method and there are some noticeable differences. For example, the primary material of the *Testament's* jewel is agarwood instead of clam and glass powder, and its outer coating is black lacquer (made from the resin of the lacquer tree) and not liquid jaggery. But it looks very likely that these changes were adapted from the method of the *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra*—for example, the use of agarwood was probably inspired by the oil, and the use of lacquer by the *Butea monosperma* resin—and it is also not hard to imagine that the changes were made due to practical reasons, such as difficulty procuring some of the ingredients or to simplify the fabrication method.

Conversely, it could be that the changes were perhaps brought about under the influence of additional beliefs. If that is the case, it looks as if these beliefs might have been of Daoist origin. Indeed, the use of black lacquer, to begin with, aligns well with the Daoist notion of the “dark (or black) pearl” (*xuanzhu* 玄珠). This pearl stands for the mystery, or essence, of the Dao 道, which according to the *Zhuangzi* 莊子 was obtained by the immortal Yellow Emperor (Huangdi 黃帝). As Nomura Hideto has pointed out, in medieval Daoist alchemy the golden elixir was sometimes identified with both the *cintāmaṇi* jewel and the dark pearl.<sup>112</sup> Thus, perhaps the use of black lacquer was stimulated by the knowledge of such Daoist alchemical jewel beliefs.

Additionally, the reliance on agarwood as the main solid ingredient of the jewel was also perhaps inspired by Daoist perceptions. Agarwood (*jinkō* 沈香) is an aromatic substance obtained from various types of the *Aquilaria* tree and is called “sinking incense” due to the fact that the blackish, resin-infused heartwood parts submerge in water. Besides being highly prized in Buddhism, it was also widely used

<sup>111</sup> Note that the word *duoluo* 多羅, besides pointing to the *tāla* tree, may also easily have evoked the image of the goddess Tārā (Jp. Tara Bosatsu 多羅菩薩), who in Esoteric Buddhism was identified with the Bodhisattva of Love (Skt. Rāgavajra, Jp. Aikongō Bosatsu 愛金剛菩薩; see MDJ, s.v. “Tara Bosatsu.” The identification is based on the *Wumimi yigui* 五秘密儀軌 (Manual of the Five Mysteries, T no. 1125, 20: 538b6). That the jewel of Shingon was eventually strongly connected to Aizen’ō, that other Esoteric Buddhist deity of love, was perhaps influenced by this.

<sup>112</sup> Nomura 2002, pp. 71–73.

in Chinese folkloric and Daoist practices.<sup>113</sup> As Rolf Stein has illustrated, in China and Vietnam agarwood figured prominently in various Daoist-inspired customs and was closely connected to female divinities controlling rain and fertility.<sup>114</sup> Finally, the decision to use gold and silver to fabricate a vessel could also have been based on Daoist concepts. As argued again by Stein, the production of the elixir of immortality was connected to the idea of the fusion of two metals, one female (jade or mercury) and one male (lead or gold), inside a receptacle. This receptacle was perceived as a closed miniature realm of Daoist immortals and was often associated with a *hu* 瓠 calabash gourd or a *hu* 壺 vessel.<sup>115</sup>

The above are only speculations, however, and the exact reasons for which Shingon monks decided to use black lacquer—if there were any specific reasons at all other than practical convenience—will never be known. Regardless of the reasons, the result of the adaptation was the “black jewel” of Shingon, that beating dragon-heart of the sect, which exhibited Esoteric Buddhist as well as Daoist undertones.

### *Conclusion*

In this article, I have attempted to shed more light on the origin of the black-lacquered jewel sphere mentioned in the *Testament* of Kūkai and on related rituals and matters. The subject is very complex due to convoluted or ambiguous terminologies, the secret nature of the item, the lack of precise historical data, and diverging scholarly theories on the establishment of the *Testament's* jewel account.

According to the theory proposed by Kamikawa Michio, the jewel account and the fabrication method of the black jewel sphere recorded therein could have been created by Hanjun. This theory, however, does not consider a few crucial clues suggesting that the tradition of fashioning black-lacquered spheres could already have been in existence prior to that monk. These clues include the paleographic assessment of the Takahata Fudōson Kongōji manuscript of the twenty-five-article *Testament* indicating that the dry-point glosses (*kakuhitsuten*) on its folios go back, in all probability, to 1025, and the

<sup>113</sup> Schafer 1963, pp. 155–65.

<sup>114</sup> Stein 1942, pp. 72–80. Also, aromatics such as agarwood were frequently used in Daoist practices to increase sense faculties or receptiveness to the mysterious realm of immortal spirits (Stein 1942, p. 77; Schafer 1963, pp. 155–63). According to a note in the *Jūshū honzō kōmoku keimō* 重修本草綱目啓蒙 (Revised Dictated Compendium of Materia Medica, vol. 23), the “spirit-invoking incense” (*hangonkō* 返魂香) burned in the necromantic practice of bringing back the image of a beloved deceased person—based on the legend of Lady Li (Li Furen 李夫人), concubine of Emperor Wu 武 (157–87 BCE), whose dead spirit reappeared in the fumes created by a Daoist priest—would be nothing other than agarwood (called *kinankō* 奇南香 in the work).

<sup>115</sup> See Stein 1942, pp. 45–63, especially n. 3 on pages 50 and 51. The article is reproduced in Stein 1987. I cited the 1942 article since the 1987 reproduction is more difficult to read due to the fact that the Chinese characters are omitted from the main text and placed in a list at the end of the book.

fact that the *Testament's* jewel account was cited in Seizon's *Shingon fuhō san'yōshō* written in 1060. But the most important clue is provided by the fact that the jewel fabrication method described in the *Testament* was closely inspired by a hybrid Buddhist-Daoist procedure for fashioning a *cintāmaṇi* jewel recorded in the *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra*, which was brought to Japan by the Tendai monk Ennin in the ninth century. Although the circumstances of how the sutra passed from Tendai into Shingon circles are unclear, the possibility that prior to Hanjun a Shingon monk had obtained it and relied on it to devise a black-lacquered jewel sphere like the one described in the *Testament* is rather high. This also strengthens this article's assumption that the jewel account in the *Testament* was more than likely already well established before the time of Hanjun.

Consequently, this article argues that the origin of Shingon's jewel sphere is to be found in the Buddhist-Daoist jewel fabrication method recorded in the *Buddha Crown Dhāraṇī Sutra*. It further contends that material jewel spheres were probably already secretly used in such older relic rituals as the Mishihō and the Shōgyōhō prior to Hanjun. These relic rites thus deserve to be brought under the spotlight again when trying to clarify the reasons why jewel rituals and jewel spheres emerged in the late eleventh century. As proposed in this article, it is likely that Hanjun's emphasis on relics and jewels stemmed from his conflict with his rival Gihan and his eagerness to prove his superiority within Shingon's Ono lineage by revealing his mastery of the Shōgyōhō's relic and jewel secrets. Since it is likely that Shingon's jewel sphere tradition was already in place by that time, Hanjun's actions—the enactment of jewel rituals and the offering of jewel spheres to Shirakawa—would thus not represent the invention of a new tradition but the divulgence of an older secret.

Obviously, the issue is far from fully elucidated, as the matters discussed in this article represent only the proverbial “tip of the *cintāmaṇi*.” Many other factors need to be considered to complete the picture of Shingon relic and jewel veneration. Indeed, as was noted at the beginning of this article, the relic and the jewel played a significant role not only in ritual but also in doctrinal matters such as bodily buddhahood and embryology. Relics and jewels were moreover also integrated into ceremonies and narratives related to divine kingship and medieval Shinto. In order to bring all features of Shingon relic and jewel worship into relief, it is necessary to scrupulously reexamine these correlated matters as well. It is by doing such a broad-spectrum investigation that one can hope to one day have a better and more comprehensive grasp of this most defining, but also most complex, characteristic of medieval Shingon Buddhism.



## ABBREVIATIONS

- KBA Kanazawa Bunko archives (Shōmyōji archives).
- KDZ *Kōbō daishi zenshū* 弘法大師全集. Edited by Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo 密教文化研究所. 3rd rev. ed. Opening volume (*shukan* 首卷) + 8 vols. Kōyachō: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1965–68.
- MDJ *Mikkyō daijiten* 密教大辭典. Edited by Mikkyō Daijiten Saihan Iinkai 密教大辭典再版委員会. Rev. ed. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1970.
- SZ *Shingonshū zensho* 真言宗全書. Edited by Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai 真言宗全書刊行会. 44 vols. Kōyachō: Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai, 1933–39.
- SZKT *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai* 新訂増補国史大系. Edited by Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美 and Maruyama Jirō 丸山二郎. 60 vols. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1929–64.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡邊海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–35.
- TKDZ *Teihon Kōbō daishi zenshū* 定本弘法大師全集. Edited by Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kōbō Daishi Chosaku Kenkyūkai 密教文化研究所弘法大師著作研究会. Opening volume (*shukan*) + 12 vols. Kōyachō: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo, 1991–97.
- TZ *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō zuzō* 大正新脩大藏經図像. Edited by Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. 12 vols. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1932–34.
- ZGR *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 続群書類従. Edited by Hanawa Hokiichi 塙保己一 and Ōta Tōshirō 太田藤四郎. 86 vols. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1923–72.
- ZSZ *Zoku Shingonshū zensho* 続真言宗全書. Edited by Zoku Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai 続真言宗全書刊行会. 42 vols. Kōyachō: Zoku Shingonshū Zensho Kankōkai, 1975–88.
- ZZGR *Zokuzoku gunsho ruijū* 続々群書類従. Edited by Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会. 17 vols. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1969–78.

## REFERENCES

## Primary Sources

- Asabashō* 阿娑縛抄. By Shōchō 承澄 (1205–1282). 227 fascicles. TZ 8–9.
- Atsuzōshi* 厚造紙. By Genkai 元海 (1094–1157). T no. 2483.
- Beihua jing* 悲華經. Translated by Dharmakṣema (Tan Wuchen 曇無讖 [385–433]). T no. 157.
- Besson yōki* 別尊要記. By Shinkaku 心覚 (1117–1180). 4 vols. Vol. 4 reproduced in *Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 高野山大学密教文化研究所紀要 32 (2015), pp. 5–94.
- Besson zakki* 別尊雜記. By Shinkaku. TZ 3.
- Bukong juansuo shenbian zhenyan jing* 不空罽索神變真言經. Translated by Bodhiruci (Putiliuzhi 菩提流志 [fl. 6th c.]). T no. 1092.
- Busshari kankeiki* 仏舎利勘計記. Copy by Genpō 賢宝 (1333–1398). Reproduced in Hashimoto Hatsuko 橋本初子, “*Busshari kankeiki*” kaidai: Tōji denrai no busshari kankei shiryō” 「仏舎利勘計記」 解題：東寺伝来の仏舎利関係史料, in Kageyama 1986, pp. 201–58.

- Byakuhō kushō* 白宝口抄. By Ryōson 亮尊 (fl. early 14th c.). TZ 6.
- Byakuhōshō* 白宝抄. By Chōen 澄円 (1218–ca. 1287). TZ 10.
- Da foding guangju tuoluoni jing* 大仏頂広聚陀羅尼經. Translator unknown. T no. 946.
- Dari jing shu* 大日經疏. By Yixing 一行 (683–727). T no. 1796.
- Dato hiketsushō* 駄都秘決鈔. By Gahō 我宝 (d.u.–1317). SZ 23.
- Datohō kuketsushō* 駄都法口決鈔. By Kyōjun 教舜 (fl. mid-13th c.). In *Hishō kuketsu* 秘鈔口決 (SZ 28: 9–10).
- Da tuoluoni mofa zhong yizi xinzhou jing* 大陀羅尼末法中一字心呪經. Translated by Mañicintana (Bao Siwei 宝思惟 [d.u.–721]). T no. 956.
- Da zhidu lun* 大智度論. Translated by Kumārajīva 鳩摩羅什 (344–413). T no. 1509.
- Denjuki* 伝受記. By Shōkaku 勝覚 (1057–1129). In *Zuishin'in shōgyōrui no kenkyū* 随心院聖教類の研究, edited by Zuishin'in Shōgyōrui Sōgō Chōsadan 随心院聖教類綜合調査団, pp. 404–9. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1995.
- Eiji ninen Shingon'in mishubō ki* 永治二年真言院御修法記 (1142). By Kanjin 寛信 (1084–1153). ZGR 25 (2).
- Fanfanyu* 翻梵語. Edited by Baochang 宝唱 (fl. late 5th–early 6th c.). T no. 2130.
- Gajushō* 鵝珠鈔. By Shinkaku. SZ 36.
- Geishuki* 鯨珠記. Excerpt from the *Daigeki Morotōki* 大外記師遠記 (Diary of Nakahara no Morotō, 中原師遠 [1070–1130]). In *Shisen kokushi no bianteki kenkyū* 私撰国史の批判的研究, Hirata Toshiharu 平田俊春, pp. 568–74. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1982.
- Genkō shakusho* 元亨釈書. By Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬 (1278–1346). 30 vols. SZKT 31.
- Goshichinichi mishubō yuisho sabō* 後七日御修法由緒作法. Anonymous. ZGR 25 (2).
- Goyuigō* 御遺告. Attributed to Kūkai 空海 (774–853). T no. 2431.
- Goyuigō*. Attributed to Kūkai. Copy dated 1484. Ōsu Bunko 大須文庫 archives, 278-5-13. Union Catalogue of Japanese Texts, <https://kokusho.nijl.ac.jp/biblio/100109403>.
- Goyuigō*. Attributed to Kūkai. KDZ, vol. 2, pp. 781–813.
- Goyuigō*. Attributed to Kūkai. TKDZ, vol. 7, pp. 350–76.
- Goyuigō chū* 御遺告註. By Genpō 賢宝 (1333–1398). ZSZ 26.
- Goyuigō shakugishō* 御遺告釈疑抄. By Raiyu 頼瑜 (1226–1304). ZSZ 26.
- Goyuigō shichika hihō* 御遺告七箇秘法. Copy dated 1246. Cited in Fujimaki 2001, p. 72.
- Gyokuyō* 玉葉. By Kujō Kanazane 九条兼実 (1149–1207). Edited by Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会. 3 vols. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1906–07.
- Heian ibun* 平安遺文. Edited by Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三. 15 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan, 1947–80.
- Himitsushū* 秘密集. Author unknown. KBA, MS 84.13.
- Hishō* 秘鈔. By Shukaku 守覚 (1150–1202). T no. 2489.
- Hishō kuketsu* 秘鈔口決. By Kyōjun 教舜 (d.u.). SZ 28.
- Hishō mondō* 秘鈔問答. By Raiyu. T no. 2536.
- Hizō konpōshō* 秘藏金宝鈔. By Jichiun 実運 (1105–1160). T no. 2485.
- Honchō shinsenden* 本朝神仙伝. By Ōe Masafusa 大江匡房 (1041–1111). ZGR 8 (1).
- Hōyaku Nippo jisho* 邦訳日葡辞書. Translated and edited by Doi Tadao 土井忠生, Morita Takeshi 森田武, and Chōnan Minoru 長南実. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980.
- Jūshū honzō kōmoku keimō* 重修本草綱目啓蒙. 3rd rev. ed. by Kakehashi Nan'yō 梯南洋 (d.u.) of the *Honzō kōmoku keimō* 本草綱目啓蒙 written by Ono Ranzan 小野蘭山 (1729–1810). 32 vols. Heian: Gakkokan, 1844.
- Kakuzenshō* 覺禪鈔. By Kakuzen 覺禪 (1143–ca. 1213). 136 vols. TZ 4–5.

- Keiran shūyōshū* 溪嵐拾葉集. By Kōshū 光宗 (1276–1350). T no. 2410.
- Kinhira kōki* 公衡公記. By Saionji Kinhira 西園寺公衡 (1264–1315). 4 vols. In *Shiryō sanshū* 史料纂集, vols. 3, 7, 41, 58, edited by Hashimoto Yoshihiko 橋本義彦 and Imae Hiromichi 今江広道. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1968–79.
- Kiu nikki* 祈雨日記 (1117). By Shōken 聖賢 (1083–1147). ZGR 25 (2).
- [*Kōbō*] *daishi gogyōjō shūki* [弘法]大師御行狀集記. By Keihan 經範 (1031–1104). KDZ, opening volume (*shukan*), pp. 17–57.
- Nijūgo kajō goyūigō* 二十五ヶ条御遺告. See *Goyūigō*.
- Nittō shingū shōgyō mokuroku* 入唐新求聖教目錄. By Ennin 円仁 (794–864). T no. 2167.
- Nyoihōshu mishuhō nikki* 如意宝珠御修法日記. In “Shitennōji shozō ‘Nyoihōshu mishuhō nikki,’ ‘dō’ shihai ‘Togashishi kankei’ monjo ni tsuite” 四天王寺所藏「如意宝珠御修法日記」・「同」紙背（富樫氏関係）文書について, Sugihashi Takao 杉橋隆夫, *Shirin* 史林 53, no. 3 (1970), pp. 413–38.
- Ono kyōzō mokuroku* 小野経蔵目錄. Copy dated 1168. In *Ryūmon bunko zenpon sōkan* 龍門文庫善本叢刊, vol. 12, edited by Kawase Kazuma 川瀬一馬, pp. 3–106. Yoshinochō: Sakamoto Ryūmon Bunko, 1988.
- Ono ruishō* 小野類秘鈔. By Kanjin 寛信 (1084–1153). SZ 36.
- Shikan* 四卷. By Kōzen 興然 (1121–1204). T no. 2500.
- Shingon fuhō san'yōshō* 真言付法纂要抄. By Seizon 成尊 (1012–1074). T no. 2433.
- Shosonbō* 諸尊法. Author unknown. KBA, MS 86.6.
- Shoson yōshō* 諸尊要抄. By Jichiun 実運 (1105–1160). T no. 2484.
- Shouhu guojiezhū tuoluoni jing* 守護国界主陀羅尼經. Translated by Prajñā (Bore 般若 [734–d.u.]) and Muniśrī (Mounishili 牟尼室利 [d.u.–806]). T no. 997.
- Tōji chōja bunin* 東寺長者補任. First three volumes by Gōhō 杲宝 (1306–1362). 5 vols. ZZGR 2.
- Ugon zōhiki* 兩言雜秘記. By Shōken 勝賢 (1138–1196). ZGR 25 (2).
- Wumimi yigui* 五秘密儀軌. Abbrev. of *Jingangding yujia Jingangsaduo wumimi xiuxing niansong yigui* 金剛頂瑜伽金剛薩埵五秘密修行念誦儀軌. Attributed to Amoghavajra (Bukong 不空 [705–774]). T no. 1125.
- Zabaozang jing* 雜寶藏經. Translated by Kiñkara/Kekaya (Ch. Jijiaye 吉迦夜; fl. ca. 472) and Tanyao 曇曜 (fl. ca. mid-5th c.) in 472. T no. 203.
- Zōtei kōgei shiryō* 增訂工藝志料. By Kurokawa Mayori 黒川真頼 (1829–1906). Annotated by Maeda Yasuji 前田泰次. *Tōyō Bunko* 東洋文庫 254. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1974.
- Zu* 囗 [*Shi* 私] (*Nōsazu* 能作囗). Copy by Kenna 釵阿 (1261–1338). KBA, MS 319.49.
- Zuzōshō* 囗像抄. By Yōgen 永嚴 (1075–1151) or Ejū 恵什 (fl. 1135). TZ 3.

#### Secondary Sources

- Abé, Ryūichi. 1999. *The Weaving of Mantra: Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Abe Yasurō 阿部泰郎. 1989. “Hōju to ōken: Chūsei ōken to mikkyō girei” 宝珠と王権：中世王権と密教儀礼. In *Iwanami kōza tōyō shisō* 岩波講座東洋思想, vol. 16, edited by Nagao Gajin 長尾雅人 et al., pp. 115–69. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Aikō Shōkan 愛甲昇寛. 1992. “Inazawa-shi Shōkaiji no gorintō nōnyū shiryō” 稲沢市性海寺の五輪塔納入資料. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 佛教藝術 204, pp. 106–23.

- Andreeva, Anna. 2017. *Assembling Shinto: Buddhist Approaches to Kami Worship in Medieval Japan*. Harvard East Asian Monographs 396. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Bogel, Cynthia J. 2009. *With a Single Glance: Buddhist Icon and Early Mikkyō Vision*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Copp, Paul. 2014. *The Body Incantatory: Spells and the Ritual Imagination in Medieval Chinese Buddhism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dolce, Lucia. 2016. “The Embryonic Generation of the Perfect Body: Ritual Embryology from Japanese Tantric Sources.” In *Transforming the Void: Embryological Discourse and Reproductive Imagery in East Asian Religions*, edited by Anna Andreeva and Dominic Steavu, pp. 253–310. Leiden: Brill.
- Faure, Bernard. 2003. “Dato.” In *Hōbōgirin 法宝義林: Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, vol. 8, edited by Hubert Durt, pp. 1127–58. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.
- . 2004. “Buddhist Relics and Japanese Regalia.” In *Embodying the Dharma: Buddhist Relic Veneration in Asia*, edited by David Germano and Kevin Trainor, pp. 93–116. Albany: SUNY Press.
- . 2016. *Gods of Medieval Japan. Volume 1: The Fluid Pantheon*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Fujimaki Kazuhiro 藤巻和宏. 2001. “Hasedera engimon’ Kannon daiza kengentan seiritsu no haikai: Kūkai Shinsen’en shōutan, nyoihōju ryūō denjūsetsu to no kakawari kara” 『長谷寺縁起文』 観音台座顕現譚成立の背景：空海神泉苑請雨譚・如意宝珠龍王伝授説との関わりから. *Kokubungaku kenkyū* 国文学研究 133, pp. 65–75.
- Han Jishao 韩吉绍. 2015. “Daojiao liandanshu chuanru Yindu kaolun” 道教炼丹术传入印度考论. *Zongjiaoxue yanjiu* 宗教学研究, Autumn, pp. 28–37.
- Ishii Kōsei 石井公成. 2001. “Shoki Zenshū ni okeru mani hōju (1)” 初期禅宗における摩尼宝珠(一). *Komazawa Tanki Daigaku bukkyō ronshū* 駒沢短期大学仏教論集 7, pp. 115–29.
- Itō Satoshi 伊藤聡. 2011. *Chūsei Tenshō daijin shinkō no kenkyū* 中世天照大神信仰の研究. Kyōto: Hōzōkan.
- Izumi Takeo 泉武夫. 2010. “Kokushitsu hakkaku hōjubako no kingindei ezō to sono imi” 黒漆八角宝珠箱の金銀泥絵像とその意味. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 312, pp. 13–45.
- Kadoya Atsushi 門屋温. 1997. “Ben’ichisan doshin suishi’ o megutte” 「一山土心水師」をめぐって. *Setsuwa bungaku kenkyū* 説話文学研究 32, pp. 96–105.
- Kageyama Haruki 景山春樹. 1986. *Shari shinkō: Sono kenkyū to shiryō* 舍利信仰: その研究と史料. Tokyo: Tōkyō Bijutsu.
- Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫. 2008a. “Nyohō Sonshōhō shōgyō no seisei” 如法尊勝法聖教の生成. In *The Global Stature of Japanese Religious Texts: Aspects of Textuality and Syntactic Methodology*, edited by Abe Yasurō, pp. 74–80. Nagoya: Nagoya University Graduate School of Letters.
- . (2004) 2008b. “Nyoihōshuhō no seiritsu” 如意宝珠法の成立. In *Nihon Chūsei bukkyō shiryō ron* 日本中世仏教史料論, pp. 269–96. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- Kim, Youn-mi. 2013. “The Hidden Link: Tracing Liao Buddhism in Shingon Ritual.” *Journal of Song-Yuan Studies* 43, pp. 117–70.
- Kobayashi Yoshinori 小林芳規. 2004. “Goyuigō manju ninen kakuhitsuten” 御遺告万寿二年角筆点. In *Kakuhitsu bunken kenkyū dōron* 角筆文献研究導論, vol. 2, pp. 491–504. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.



- Lopez, Donald S. 1996. *Elaborations on Emptiness: Uses of the Heart Sūtra*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Manabe Shunshō 真鍋俊照. 1979. “Kūkai shōrai bonji hosshinge to mani hōshu mandara” 空海請来梵字法身偈と摩尼宝珠曼荼羅. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 122, pp. 71–81.
- Matsumoto Ikuyo 松本郁代. 2005. *Chūsei ōken to sokui kanjō: Shōgyō no naka no rekishi jojutsu* 中世王権と即位灌頂：聖教のなかの歴史叙述. Tokyo: Shinwasha.
- Matsushita Takaaki 松下隆章. 1943. “Mani hōju mandara ni tsuite” 摩尼宝珠曼荼羅に就いて. *Bijutsu kenkyū* 美術研究 131, pp. 32–40.
- McBride, Richard D. 2004. “Is There Really ‘Esoteric’ Buddhism?” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 27, no. 2, pp. 329–56.
- Moriyama Shōshin 守山聖真. 1966. *Shingon mikkyōshi no kenkyū* 真言密教史の研究. Tokyo: Rokuyaon.
- Murakami Taikyō 村上泰教. 2013. “Nōsashō ni tsuite: ‘Sono mondai to sōjō/zōsa hō’” 能作性について「その問題と相承・造作法」. *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 密教学研究 45, pp. 185–205.
- Naitō Sakae 内藤栄. 2010. *Shari shōgon bijutsu no kenkyū* 舍利莊嚴美術の研究. Tokyo: Seishi Shuppan.
- Nakamura Honnen 中村本然. 2005a. “Shingon mikkyō ni okeru nyoihōju ‘shinkō’” 真言密教における如意宝珠「信仰」. In *Chūsei no bukkyō: Raiyu sōjō o chūshin toshite* 中世の仏教：頼瑠僧正を中心として, edited by Chizan Kangakukai 智山勸学会, pp. 41–79. Tokyo: Seishi Shuppan.
- . 2005b. “Shingon mikkyō no shuhō to nyoihōju” 真言密教の修法と如意宝珠. *Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 18, pp. 1–29.
- Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 奈良国立博物館, ed. 2001. *Busshari to hōju: Shaka o shitau kokoro* 仏舎利と宝珠：釈迦を慕う心. Nara: Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan.
- Nishida Nagao 西田長男. 1978. “Murō ryūketsu jinja oyobi Murōji no sōsō: Tōji Kanchi’in bon ‘Ben’ichisan nenbun dosha sōjō’ no shōkai ni yosete” 室生龍穴神社および室生寺の草創：東寺観智院本『一山年分度者奏状』の紹介によせて. In *Nihon Shintōshi kenkyū* 日本神道史研究, vol. 4, pp. 195–318. Tokyo: Kōdansha.
- Nomura Hideto 野村英登. 2002. “Genshu kisō: Dōkyō renkinjutsu to hōju shinkō” 玄珠綺想：道教鍊金術と宝珠信仰. *Tōyō Daigaku Chūgoku gakkai kaihō* 東洋大学中国学会会報 9, pp. 71–81.
- Orzech, Charles D., and Henrik H. Sørensen. 2011. “Stūpas and Relics in Esoteric Buddhism.” In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 24, section four, China, edited by Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard Payne, pp. 146–52. Leiden: Brill.
- Rambelli, Fabio. 2002. “The Emperor’s New Robes: Processes of Resignification in Shingon Imperial Rituals.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 13, pp. 427–53.
- Rhi, Juhyung. 2005. “Images, Relics, and Jewels: The Assimilation of Images in the Buddhist Relic Cult of Gandhāra—Or Vice Versa.” In *Artibus Asiae* 65, no. 2, pp. 169–211.
- Ruppert, Brian. 2000. *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- . 2002. “Pearl in the Shrine: A Genealogy of the Buddhist Jewel of the Japanese Sovereign.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 29, nos. 1–2, pp. 1–33.
- Saiki Ryōko 斎木涼子. 2008. “Jijūden Kannon-ku to futama gohonzon: Tennō no shiteki butsuji no henbō” 仁寿殿観音供と二間御本尊：天皇の私的仏事の変貌. *Shirin* 史林 91, no. 2, pp. 287–319.



- Schafer, Edward H. 1963. *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T'ang Exotics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schopen, Gregory. 1997. *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 2005. *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India: More Collected Papers*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Shirai Yūko 白井優子. 1986. *Kūkai densetsu no keisei to Kōyasan: Nyūjo densetsu no keisei to Kōyasan nōkotsu no hassei* 空海伝説の形成と高野山：入定伝説の形成と高野山納骨の発生. Tokyo: Dōseisha.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2006. *Body Language. Indic śarīra and Chinese sheli in the "Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra" and "Saddharmapuṇḍarīka."* *Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XIX*. Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the ICPBS.
- Skilling, Peter. 2005. "Cutting Across Categories: The Ideology of Relics in Buddhism." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 8, pp. 269–322.
- . 2018. "Relics: The Heart of Buddhist Veneration." In *Relics and Relic Worship in Early Buddhism: India, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Burma*, edited by Janice Stargardt and Michael Willis, pp. 4–17. London: The British Museum.
- Sørensen, Henrik H. 2011. "On Esoteric Buddhism in China: A Working Definition." In *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*. *Handbook of Oriental Studies* 24, section four, China, edited by Charles D. Orzech, Henrik H. Sørensen, and Richard Payne, pp. 155–75. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2017. "Spells and Magical Practices as Reflected in the Early Chinese Buddhist Sources (c. 300–600 CE) and Their Implications for the Rise and Development of Esoteric Buddhism." In *Chinese and Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism*, edited by Yael Bentor and Meir Shahrar, pp. 41–71. Leiden: Brill.
- Stein, Rolf A. 1942. "Jardins en miniature d'Extrême-Orient." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 42, pp. 1–104.
- . 1987. *Le monde en petit: Jardins en miniature et habitations dans la pensée religieuse d'Extrême-Orient*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Strickmann, Michel. 1996. *Mantras et mandarins: Le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*. Paris: Galimard.
- Strong, John S. (2004) 2007. *Relics of the Buddha*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Takahashi Shūei 高橋秀栄. 1993. "Heian, Kamakura bukkyō yōbunshū (2)" 平安・鎌倉仏教要文集 (中). *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō Gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究紀要 51, pp. 248–67.
- Takahashi Yūsuke 高橋悠介. 2015. "Kenji sannen no hōju seisaku" 建治三年の宝珠制作. *Nihon bukkyō sōgō kenkyū* 日本仏教総合研究 13, pp. 67–86.
- Takeuchi Kōzen 武内孝善. 2011. "'Goyuigō' no seiritsu nendai: Kenne kanren no shiryō o chūshin toshite" 『御遺告』の成立年代：堅恵関連の史料を中心として. *Mikkyōgaku kenkyū* 43, pp. 59–82.
- Tomabechi Seiichi 苦米地誠一. 2010. "Kūkai senjutsu no 'soten' ka o megutte: Kūkai daisanji bosatsu setsu to 'Goyuigō' no seiritsu" 空海撰述の「祖典」化をめぐる：空海第三地菩薩説と『御遺告』の成立. In *Chūsei bungaku to jūin shiryō, shōgyō* 中世文学と寺院資料・聖教, *Chūsei bungaku to rinsetsu shogaku* 中世文学と隣接諸学 2, edited by Abe Yasurō, pp. 40–66. Tokyo: Chikurinsha.

- . 2017. “Nihon mikkyō ni okeru shari to hōju” 日本密教における舍利と宝珠. *Kōyasan Daigaku Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo kiyō* 30, pp. 95–114.
- Trainor, Kevin. 1997. *Relics, Ritual, and Representation in Buddhism: Rematerializing the Sri Lankan Theravāda Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trenson, Steven. 2013. “Shingon Divination Board Rituals and Rainmaking.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 21, pp. 107–34.
- . 2016. *Kiu, hōju, ryū: Chūsei Shingon mikkyō no shinsō* 祈雨・宝珠・龍：中世真言密教の深層. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppankai.
- . 2018a. “A Study on the Combination of the Deities Fudō and Aizen in Medieval Shingon Esoteric Buddhism.” In *Buddhist Encounters and Identities across East Asia*, edited by Ann Heirman, Carmen Meinert, and Christoph Anderl, pp. 108–36. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2018b. “Rice, Relics, and Jewels: The Network and Agency of Rice Grains in Medieval Japanese Esoteric Buddhism.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 45, no. 2, pp. 269–307.
- Tsuda Tetsuei 津田徹英. 1990. “Daigoji ni okeru Seiryō gongen no seiritsu to sono haikai ni tsuite: Daigoji Nyoirin Kannon-zō kō josetsu” 醍醐寺における清滝権現の成立とその背景について：醍醐寺如意輪観音像考序説. *Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Mita tetsugakkai daigakuinsei ronbunshū* 慶応義塾大学三田哲学会大学院生論文集 1, pp. 59–80.
- White, David Gordon. 1996. *The Alchemical Body: Siddha Traditions in Medieval India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yamamoto Hiroko 山本ひろ子. 1998. *Chūsei shinwa* 中世神話. *Iwanami Shinsho* 岩波新書 593. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.