On Bonshakuji as the Penultimate Buddhist Temple to Protect the State in Early Japanese History
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Abstract: During the 740s in Japan, the emperor established Buddhist temples in nearly all the provinces, in which three Buddhist scriptures were chanted to avert natural disasters. Tōdaiji, in the recently constructed capital, was the head temple of a network of Temples of Bright Golden Light and Four Heavenly Kings to Protect the State. The principal Buddhist scripture followed in these temples was the Golden Light Sūtra, translated from Sanskrit into Chinese in Tang China at the beginning of the 8th century. This article investigates the history of an understudied example of one of these temples, called Bonshakuji. Emperor Kannu (r. 781–806) repurposed it in 786 after the introduction from China of novel rituals to protect the state. It had among the most important Buddhist temple libraries, which came to rival perhaps only that of Tōdaiji through the 12th century. I also examine how and why scholar officials and powerful monastics, particularly those associated with the so-called esoteric Tendai and Shingon temples of Enryakuji and Miidera, and Tōji and Daigoji, respectively, utilized the library of Bonshakuji and older and novel state protection texts kept there to preserve early Japanese state-supported Buddhist worldmaking efforts long after that state had become virtually bankrupt.
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1. Bonshakuji and the Golden Light Sūtra

There is an edict found in the third of the Six National Histories (Rikkokushi 六國史, comp. ca. 720–901), Nihon kōki 日本後紀 (Late Chronicles of Japan, comp. 840), from the fifteenth day of the ninth lunar month of 795 (Enryaku 14), which Abé Ryūichī translates as follows in his groundbreaking book The Weaving of Mantra: Kōkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse:

Among the followers of the true teaching [of Buddhism], the king is responsible for bringing it to prosperity. Although the teachings of the Dharma are countless, their essentials are transmitted by priests and nuns. As emperor, I extend my rule to the four realms [of Tao, heaven, the earth, and the kingly domain] and nurture millions of lives. Following the example of the [Confucian] sage-kings in guiding my subjects with virtue and ordering the world through rites, I am desirous of spreading the [Buddhist] way of subtle, unsurpassed enlightenment (Abé 1999).

I have therefore cleared a site in a scenic forest in the mountains, donated land, trees, and other property to erect a monastery, which is named Bonshakuji. I have appointed as the resident priests ten meditation masters renowned for their untainted discipline and selected three administrators from among them to head the monastery. As for the sustenance of the monastery, I have donated one hundred chō of paddy fields in Omi, two fiefs respectively of fifty farming households in Shimotsuke and Echizen provinces. My wish is to propagate the Dharma in our land as swiftly as breakaway horses and to make it a time to transform hills into shrines and temples for worship so that this auspicious work and merit of founding the monastery will be shared by all beings.
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Abé (1999) further explains that emperor “Kanmu’s 桓武, 735–806, r. 781–806 [promulgation] plainly indicates that the late Nara [710–794] and early Heian (794–1185) ritsuryō [律令] state legitimized Buddhist worship only insofar as it did not contradict Confucian cosmology, at the heart of which was the emperor’s rule by virtue.” (Kuroita 1914–1918; Sakamoto 1991; Demiéville et al. 1978; Borgen 1986) How the early Japanese state employed Buddhist rituals and effective control of institutions and monastics under the auspices of the Sōgō 僧綱 (Office of Monastic Affairs) is richly discussed in this classic study designed to “move studies of Kūkai [空海] to Protect the State (Konkomyō shitennō gokoku no tera 眞言密教十王護国之寺) and the sovereign as the Kokubunji 保安寺 and three other Mahāyāna scriptures were to be ritually chanted—usually on behalf of the local kami (鎮護國家) and the sovereign as the ‘wheel turning king’ (cakravartin, tenrinō, zhuansun wang 乾輪王) (de Visser 1935, pp. 226, 605–15; Emmerick 1970; Sagai 2013; Gummer 2015; Radich 2015).” The narrative threads of Abé’s book seem to link “such issues as the struggles of the ritsuryō state to consolidate power at the turn of the ninth century … and Kūkai’s analysis of the power of mantra when used in a liturgical setting by practitioners who were trained in the esoteric Buddhist theories of the relationships among the material qualities of voice, the creative force of language, and the interdependent nature of all phenomena.” (Abé 1999; Gardiner 2001) This article investigates the history of the monastery erected from a “cleared site in a scenic forest in the mountains” called Bonshakuji 梵ancial 寺 (Monastery [devoted to] Brahmā and Śakra [Indra]), where “ten meditation masters renowned for their untainted discipline” (jīzenji) were installed with financial support from farmers working 100 chō of paddy fields in Ōmi province and 50 households each in Shimotsuke (modern day Tochigi 宇都宮) and Echizen (the northern part of present day Fukui 福井郡) provinces.

Bonshakuji is an understudied Buddhist monastery in the history of early and medieval Japanese religious history, where rites were performed to specifically venerate one key Mahāyāna scripture, the Golden Light sūtra (Suvarṇabhūtasottama-sūtra, Konkōmyōkyō, jin guangming jing 金光明經, T nos. 663–665). This sūtra includes a detailed account of why the Japanese state and Buddhist monks at this monastery should recite, study, and perform rituals to ensure the protection of the state (chingo kokka 鎮護国家) and the sovereign as the “wheel turning king” (cakravartin, tenrinō, zhuansun wang 乾輪王) (de Visser 1935, pp. 226, 605–15; Emmerick 1970; Sagai 2013; Gummer 2015; Radich 2015). Bonshakuji was not among the monasteries established after the 741 and 749 edicts by emperor Shōmu 聖武 (701–756, r. 724–749), which decreed that the state would pay for the construction and maintenance of a temple of Buddhist Light and Four Heavenly Kings to Protect the State (Konkōmyō shiten no kokoku no tera 金光明四天護國之寺), also known as the Kokubunji 國分寺, in each province, and in which the Golden light sūtra and three other Mahāyāna scriptures were to be ritually chanted—usually on behalf of the local kami (shinen dokkyō 神前唱経)—to avert natural disasters and calamities (shōjō saigai 消災経) and protect the state; powerful clans (annei kokka 俳寧国家) were also to be singled out.4 The other three sūtras include the Great Perfection of Wisdom (*Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra, Dainihonkyō, Da bore jing 大般若經, T no. 220) and Lotus (Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra, Myōhārungkyō, Miaofa lianhua jing 妙法蓮華經, T no. 262) sūtras, and the Senmonkyō 神門経 (Renwang jing, Book of Benevolent Kings, T nos. 245 and 246: Shinyaku ninnonkyō (Xinyi renwang jing, 新訳仁王経) (de Visser 1935; Orzech 1998; Moerman 2005, 2007; Komine et al. 2015, pp. 372–82; Keyworth 2020). Although Bonshakuji cannot be compared either in terms of size or fame to any of the other ten state-sanctioned Great Monasteries (daijī 大寺)
of the 8th or 9th centuries in Japan, because of the following edict from the fourteenth day of the first lunar month in 835 (Jōwa 康和 2) from Shoku Nihon koki 紙日本後紀 (Continued Later Chronicles of Japan, comp. 869, covers 833–850), we know that its library appears to have been second only perhaps to Tōdaiji 東大寺 (Great Eastern Temple) in Nara or Enryakuji 延暦寺 near Kyoto (Lévi et al. 1929).6

Emending the edict from last year (Jōwa 1 [834].5.15) (Morita 2010),7 today it is ordered that when a set of the manuscript [Buddhist] copy is printed each of the [six] provinces of Saigamii (central and western Kanagawa 神奈川県 today), Kazusa (Chiba 千葉県), Shimōsa (part of Chiba and Ibaraki 茨城県), Hitachi (northern Ibaraki), Kamitsu (alt. Kōzuke, Gunma 群馬県), and Shimotsuke, the copying of the monastic codes (vinaya), commentaries [translated into Sinitic from Indic languages] (Mair 1994; Kornicki 2018),8 commentaries and sub-commentaries (composed by Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese), hagiographical records, and collected digests or selections must follow the order of the Zhenyuan-era 8 and the Catalog of Bonshakuji (Tokuno 1990; Morita 2010; Funayama 2014; Storch 2014).9

The Zhenyuan-era catalog is the Tang (618–907) Chinese Zhenyuan xinding shijiao lu 貞元新定釋教錄 (Miyabayashi and Ochiai 1998; Jōgen shinjō shackkyō mokuroku, Newly Revised Catalog of Buddhist Scriptures, Compiled During the Zhenyuan Era [785–805], T no. 2157, comp. 800), with which scholars believe Kūkai, among others, returned to Japan when he came back from studying in Tang Chang’an (Abé 1999; Akatsuka 2014; Akatsuka 2016).10 This edict suggests that it very well may not have been Kūkai or even Saichō 最澄 (Dengyō daishi 傳教大師, 767–822, in China 804–805) who first or most notably introduced this catalog to Japan. Instead, it was probably one of the abbots of Bonshakuji named Echū 永忠 (alt. Yōchū, 743–816), who studied in Tang Chang’an and resided at the famous Ximing monastery 西明寺 between 770–782 or 806; Echū may have returned from China on the same ship as Kūkai or Saichō or perhaps much earlier (Washio 1996; Groner 1984).11 Echū probably returned with Saichō because Nihon koki records, on the twenty-third day of the fourth lunar month of 806 (Daitō 大同 1), that Saichō was awarded three ordinands (tokuudonin 得度人) following his proposal to revise the ordination system, and Echū was awarded two (Groner 1984).12 Echū became the abbot of Bonshakuji by early 806.

In this article I use several premodern sources, including the Six National Histories (Rikkokuishi 六國史, comp. ca. 720–901), Engishiki 延喜式 (Procedures of the Engi-era ([901–923], comp. 927, utilized after 967), the first comprehensive history of Buddhism in Japan, Kokan Shiren’s 虎源師鎌 (1278–1347) Genkō shakusho 元亨抄書 (Genkō-era [1321–1324] Buddhist History, comp. 1322), and later sources including Shikō’s 志賀 (1662–1720) Jimon denki horoku 寺門伝記補録 (Supplemental Record of the Transmission Record of the Temple Gate Branch, NBZ 86, no. 787), to reveal how Bonshakuji and an older monastery one ridge over on the southeastern slope of Mount Hiei 比叡山 called Sōfukuji 祇福寺 (Monastery [devoted to] Posthumous Happiness) represent an aspect of premodern Japanese religious history in which continuity may be more relevant than change, and an example of the Japanese state-supported network of monasteries where state protection rituals were performed and, particularly, where the study of the Golden Light Sūtra was a key component of the curriculum for high-ranking members of the Sōgō and their disciples. First, I briefly address the history of state-sanctioned support for the Golden Light Sūtra. I also examine why this scripture, and specifically the translation from Sanskrit into Chinese by Yi jing 義浄 (635–713) and his translation team in Tang (618–907) China at the beginning of the 8th century, and the chapter(s) about how the Four Heavenly Kings protect monarchs, played an expanded role within these monasteries and through at least the 12th century. In addition to learning about the curious history of Sōfukuji, Bonshakuji and its lost library, I also examine how and why scholar officials and powerful monastics, particularly those associated with the so-called esoteric (mikkyō 密教) Tendai 天台宗 and Shingon 真言宗...
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2. Provincial Temples, State Protection Buddhism, Chinese “Sounds”, and the Golden Light Sūtra

Every coin has two sides. The coin I have in mind represents the history of Japan and religion in Japan in particular, spanning the era between the late 7th century through the 12th centuries. Over many decades, scholars within and outside Japan have written groundbreaking studies of often significant changes over time that are connected to certain pivotal figures and the establishment of novel religious institutions. For example, Paul Groner and Abé Ryūichi, to name just two, introduced a much wider audience to Saichō and Kūkai, respectively, the “founders” of the Tendai and Shingon schools (Groner 1984; Abé 1999). If modern historical analysis is broadly conceived as investigating change and/or continuity over time, then the history of these two figures and their schools of Japanese Buddhism represent the history of change over time. Writing about the transition from the “court-centered society” of the Heian period (794–1221) to the “more tumultuous warrior temples of Enryakuji 延暦寺 and Miidera 三井寺 (alt. Onjōji 圓城寺), and Tōji 東寺 and Daigoji 醍醐寺, respectively, utilized the library of Bonshakuji and old and newly translated state protection (chingō kokka 鎮護国家) texts kept there to preserve the early Japanese state-supported Buddhist worldmaking efforts long after that state had become virtually bankrupt (Lévi et al. 1929). A key comparative question raised in this article concerns how medieval East Asian states—Tang China, Silla Korea (668–935), and Nara- and Heian-era (ca. 710–1185) Japan—used the cosmology specifically outlined in Yijing’s translation of the Golden Light Sūtra to construct and maintain both Buddhism and so-called Confucian-styled political, economic, and religious stability during seemingly unmanageable circumstances.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that this article is designed to correct an egregious mistake I made in an article published in 2017 in the Japanese Journal of Religious Studies, where I erroneously named the library where hundreds of rolls of the manuscript Buddhist canon copied in the 12th century for Matsuo (alt. Matsuno’ō) shrine (Matsuo issai kyō 松尾社一切經) were checked at an “an Ōbaku-shū 黄檗宗 [Zen] temple today in Higashi-Omi, located southeast of Ōtsu, in Shiga Prefecture.” (Keyworth 2017, p. 166). The correct location where scribes working for father and son chief shrine priests (kannushi 祭主) Hata no Chikatō 奏親任 (kannushi on 1076.2.20) and Hata no Yorichika 奏輝義 (kannushi on 1128.8.12) between 1115–1138, and later Tendai monastics from Enryakuji and Miidera ca. 1139–1165, went to find exemplars to systematically check many of the rolls of the manuscript canon copied for Matsuo shrine is on the southeastern slope of Mount Hiei (Matsuno’ō taisha shiryoushū henshu iinkai 1977, pp. 230–31). This is the Bonshakuji under investigation here.

The library at Bonshakuji is not only unambiguously mentioned as an exemplary archive in Shoku Nihon koki, but references to it by Saichō, Annen 安年 (ca. 841–889) in his Shō araj shingon mikkyō burui sōroku 諸阿闍梨真言密教部略録 (Comprehensive Catalog of the Shingon esoteric teachings of the [eight] acāryas, T no. 2176, hereafter Shingon mikkyō sōroku), and Eichō 永超 (1014–?) in his Tōki dentō mokuroku (Catalog of the Transmission of the Torch to the East, comp. ca. 1094, T no. 2183) demonstrate that well before the monastics who copied rolls from it for Matsuo shrine or checked roll 29 of the Tang-era Chinese Zhényuán lu against it for Nanatsudera 七寺 (in Nagoya) in 1176, Bonshakuji was arguably the second-most famous Buddhist library in Japan (Bushelle 2018, pp. 21, 22n.14; Dolce 2011b; Wang 2012, pp. 277–78; Wang 2018, p. 113; Ono 1975). Although it would be historically inaccurate to argue that abbots of Bonshakuji mentioned in the Six National Histories had as profound an impact upon the religious landscape of Japan as either Saichō or Kūkai, there is good reason to argue that Segyō 施迦 (alt. Sekyō, d. 804), Jōtō 常騰 (740–815), and Eichō were not only high-ranking monks in the Sōgō, each of whom earned the rank of Vinaya master (Risshi 律師), Junior Supervisor (shō sōzu 少僧都), or Grand Master who Transmits the Torch (dentō hōshī 傳燈法師位, alt. dentō hoshī-i), but they also exerted a lasting impression on the scope of Buddhist learning in Japan (Abé 1999; Adolphson 2000, p. 136; Iwao et al. 1978).
administrations” of the Kamakura period (ca. 1185–1333) in Japan, William Bodiford argues for a “middle way between (and thereby avoids some of the pitfalls of) the ‘Kamakura New Buddhism’ and the ‘Exoteric-Esoteric Establishment’ models of medieval Japanese Buddhism.” He goes on to say that “[t]hese two historiographical models each have their unique strengths, but they share a common weakness. They ignore important aspects of monastic Buddhism in medieval Japan.” His chapter in *Buddhist Monasticism in East Asia: Places of Practice* addresses the matter of “monastic institutions as settings for religious life, learning, and ceremony” (Kuroda 1996; Payne 1998; Bodiford 2010, pp. 125–26). This aspect of the history of religion in Japan represents the other side of the proverbial coin: the history of continuity over time.

There can be no doubt that the approach to investigating how certain Buddhist monasteries, including Saichō, Kūkai, and others across time and space, transformed the religious landscape of Japan has many merits. But we are certainly missing a great deal if we do not do our best to recover an equally nuanced understanding of the role of continuity in ancient and medieval Japan, spanning the 7th–12th centuries. Looking first at the tail end of this era, Halle O’Neal demonstrates how magnificent examples of the *Great Perfection of Wisdom, Lotus*, and *Golden Light sūtras* were written on indigo paper with characters in gold-ink—in the shape of “jeweled pagoda mandalas” from Tanzan shrine 諫山社 (in southern Nara prefecture) and Chūsonji 中尊寺 (Hiraizumi 平泉 in northern Honshū), for the latter two *sūtras*—and these represent something remarkable about Japanese material culture (O’Neal 2018, pp. 68–69, 72–77, 104–17; Blair 2015). There is a long and important history of specific veneration of these three Mahāyāna *sūtras* in Chinese translation from as early as the 7th and 8th centuries in Japan, which represents an aspect of Japanese history often excluded from studies that focus on change, rather than continuity over time.

English language readers have been aware of the history of what Bodiford calls “monastic institutions as settings for religious life, learning, and ceremony” or we might simply refer to as mainstream Buddhism since the posthumous publication of Marinus Willem de Visser’s (1875–1930) *Ancient Buddhism in Japan: Sūtras and Ceremonies in Use in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries A.D. and Their History in Later Times* in two volumes in 1935. There, he explains in some detail how the *Great Perfection of Wisdom, Lotus*, and *Golden Light sūtras*, as well as the Buddhist canon (*issaikyō 一切経*) as a set, were part and parcel of the Buddhist institution set up and paid for by the nascent Japanese government in the 7th–9th centuries. De Visser presents lists of state-sanctioned Great Temples (daiji) where these scriptures were explicitly recited, studied, and rituals with them were performed on behalf of the government. The Six National Histories, *Genkō shakusho*, and *Jimon denki horoku*, corroborate how the Japanese state supported Buddhist monasteries, including the seven or ten Great Temples (Lévi et al. 1929, pp. 704–11). *Shoku Nihongi 続日本紀* (Continued Chronicles of Japan, comp. 797: roll 31) and *Jimon denki horoku* mention that in 749, empress Kōken 孝謙天皇 (r. 749–758, later as Shotoku 称徳, r. 764–770), and emperor Kōnin 光仁 (r. 770–781) in 771, included these temples among the ten: Daianji 大安寺, Yakushiji 薬師寺, Tōdaiji, Kōfukuji 興福寺 (the so-called great four in Nara), Shin-Yakushiji 新薬師寺, Gangōji 元興寺, Hōryūji 法隆寺 (to make the great seven temples in Nara), Gufukujī 弘福寺 (another name for Kawaradera 川原寺), Shitennoji 四天王寺 (Osaka), and Shōfukujī, which is located near the city of Ōtsu 大津 in modern Shiga prefecture (Sueki et al. 2014; Buswell and Lopez 2014; Miyake 2015).

The Six National Histories contain multiple edicts pertaining to which of the four Mahāyāna scriptures—and the entire set of the manuscript Buddhist canon (*issaikyō*)—were ritually read (tendoku 転読) at these Great Temples and at Buddhist temples constructed on behalf of the state in each province (kokubunji), also known as Temples of Bright Golden Light and Four Heavenly Kings to Protect the State (*Konkomyō shitennō gokoku no tera*) 金光明四天王護国之寺. Based on the assistance of a digital edition of the Six National Histories, we know, for example, that the *Golden Light Sūtra* and the *Ninnōkyō* were to be “read in all four corners of the kingdom” as early as 676.11.20; during the fifth lunar month of 680, the *Golden Light Sūtra* was recited in the imperial palace and in each of the provinces.
Buddhist monks who staffed imperial residences gave lectures on this *sūtra*. The last of six entries in *Nihon shoki* (Chronicles of Japan, comp. 720, covers up to 697 CE) that concerns imperial patronage of this scripture is from the twelfth lunar month of 696, when it was announced that this *sūtra* was to be read at the end of each year. Noticeably, the *Lotus Sūtra*, which also enjoys a special place in early Japanese Buddhist history, is not mentioned in the *Nihon shoki*. In the *Shoku Nihon shoki* (covers 697–791), however, the *Lotus Sūtra* shows up 23 times; the *Golden Light Sūtra* appears 28 times. There are twelve edicts between 741 and 783 that expound orders concerning the Provincial Temples. However, in roll 29 of the *Nihon kōki* (covers 792–833) for the date 820 (Kōnin 11).11.22, we find the official reference to when the name for these Provincial Temples was elaborated to include explicit reference to the *Golden Light Sūtra* (Morita 2006–2007). The name is reiterated in another edict from the *Shoku Nihon kōki* for the date 839 (Jōwa 6).6.28, in which we also learn explicitly that the *Golden Light Sūtra* is read in the so-called Provincial Temples for monks; special lectures on this scripture are also given. Temple(s)—Hokkeji in Nara—where nuns resided were called Kokubunniji, with the official title of Temples for the Expiation of Sins by means of the *Lotus Sūtra* (Hokke metsuzai no tera) (Morita 2010; Meeks 2010).

Furthermore, in *Nihon Montoku tennō jitsuroku* (Veritable Record of Emperor Montoku [827–858], r. 850–858) of Japan, comp. 897) we find further stipulations about reciting these scriptures in Provincial Temples, and the entry for 859.4.15 in *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* (Veritable Record of Three Generations of Emperors) of Japan, comp. 901, covers 858–887) governs lectures on the *Golden Light* and *Lotus sūtras* at these temples. This brief discussion of some of the edicts about the *Golden Light* and *Lotus sūtras* ritually read within Provincial Temples should demonstrate that the world of state protection rites supported by the state did not diminish throughout the 9th century. Of course these are official histories—although certainly not the same as Chinese official histories (zhengshi 正史) in scope or reporting of events related to Buddhism—and were compiled on behalf of the imperial court, presumably to be read by future historians, and probably not for consumption by literate members of the Buddhist sangha.

“In 860 an edict stipulated that all candidates for ordination should be able to read the *Lotus sūtra* and the *Sūtra of golden light* in ‘Chinese sounds’, but another issued in 869 noted that the Chinese sounds were being neglected.” (Kornicki 2018; Morita 2006–2007, pp. 384–85). The decision by the Japanese court in the capital of Heiankyō 平安京 (modern day Kyōto) to compel candidates for Buddhist ordination to learn to read out loud—or more properly chant (dōkiju 誦誦)—these two scriptures in “Chinese sounds” (Kan'on 漢音) followed an earlier decree in 792 that required “Han sounds” to be used for the pronunciation of Chinese characters, thereby covering the activities of literate scholars and members of the Buddhist clergy a year later. By “Han sounds,” the decree meant the pronunciation of Chinese in the Tang capital of Chang’an at the time, as opposed to “Wu sounds” (Go'on 具音), which referred to earlier pronunciation guides for reading texts in Sinitic, following pronunciation in China—via Koreans who learned these sounds first and taught them to Japanese during the 5th–6th centuries—primarily from the south, when various capitals were located in the city of Jiankang 建康 (modern day Nanjing 南京; Wu refers to the kingdom during the Spring and Autumn Period in Chinese history 春秋, 771–476 BCE) (Kornicki 2018, p. 76). Edicts preserved in *Nihon kōki* and *Shoku Nihon kōki*, which cover the reigns of emperors Kanmu (r. 781–806; here from 792), Heizei 平城 (773–824, r. 806–809), Saga 紗娥 (786–842, r. 809–823), Junna 津奈 (ca. 786–840, r. 823–833) and Ninmyōo 仁明 (808–850, r. 833–850), respectively, reveal that a pronounced desire on the part of the state to mandate “Chinese learning,” defined by Mirian Bloom Ury as “reading and writing of Chinese and those kinds of knowledge most directly dependent on learned traditions which boasted Chinese roots,” continued through the 9th century, and Buddhism was a prime medium through which “Chinese learning” was promoted (Shively and McCullough 1999, p. 341). On the 20th day of leap month (urā 尋) eleven in 792, for example, would-be scholars training in the state Academy (Daigaku-ryō 大學寮) were first instructed to read the Classics out loud using “Chinese sounds” as spoken in the
Tang capital of Chang’an (Morita 2006–2007, vol. 1, p. 41). On the 28th day of the fourth lunar month of 793, emperor Kanmu mandated that candidates for Buddhist ordination must have learned these pronunciations in order to receive tonsure (ibid., p. 50). His orders must not have been followed to the letter because on the 15th day of the fourth lunar month of 801 (Enryaku 12), we find an edict ordering official monastics to redouble their efforts to pronounce the scriptures read in “Chinese sounds” (ibid., pp. 258–59).

Efforts on behalf of the court to coerce the use of contemporary pronunciation of court Chinese for Sinitic texts—both secular and Buddhist—appears not to have receded into the 9th century, after the return of the eight [esoteric Buddhist] monks from Japan who visited Tang China (Nittó hakke 入唐八家). For example, for the date 802.1.7 in Nihon kōki, monks representing the Sanron 三論宗 (Madhyamaka) and Hossō 法相宗 (East Asian Yogācāra) schools are encouraged not to limit their practice with “Chinese sounds” (ibid., pp. 304–5). The entry for 843.6.11 in Shoku Nihon kōki encourages students studying at the state Academy to redouble their efforts (Morita 2010, vol. 2, pp. 111–12), and the entry for 845.2.20 laments a time in the past when students could not distinguish between the four tones (ibid., pp. 171–72); there is a final entry for 850.3.25 which specifies how scholars who cannot correctly pronounce the Classics using “Chinese sounds” need to practice, and often (ibid., pp. 375–76).

Learned scholars and members of the Sogō were urged to “properly” pronounce the Chinese texts they read following Tang pronunciations—including the four tones (Mair and Mei 1991)—in a quest to emulate the court life and political, social, and religious influence Japanese envoys and monk-pilgrims wrote about when they returned from abroad. Yet most literate Japanese—following Koreans—read these texts using vernacular reading glosses (kanbun kundoku 漢文訓読) (Whitman et al. 2010; Whitman 2011, 2015, pp. 162–75). Court-supported Buddhist monastics at the Great Temples, which we will see included both Sūfukuji and Bonshakuji, paid special attention to certain texts, and particularly specific sections of the Golden Light Sūtra. This scripture exerted an influence upon medieval East Asian governments and the Buddhists they supported to an extent that was surprisingly misunderstood among English-speaking Western scholars who first studied Buddhist literature in Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese.

In his monumental history of Indian Buddhism, first published in 1844 as Introduction à l’histoire du Bouddhisme indien, Eugène Burnouf (1801–1852), chair of Sanskrit at the Collège de France, expressed a striking dislike for one of the Mahāyāna Buddhist scriptures he read and translated sections of, which had been dispatched to Paris in 1837 by the British Resident in India and Nepal, Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800–1894). Burnouf writes:

… I commence by design with that which appears the most celebrated of all, at least according to the report of Csoma de Körös, that is to say, the Svāyamprabhāṣa. The importance that the Buddhists of the North attach to this work is proved, moreover, by this fact alone: that it is included among the nine dharmas or sacred books of Nepal.

… Such is the content of this book, mediocre and indeed vapid, like the things of which it speaks, despite the great esteem it enjoys among the Buddhists of the North. Certainly, if one compares it to some of the tantras we have in Paris, it will appear superior to them on several points. The magical formulas and superstitious practices occupy much less of a place than in other tantras almost as esteemed. The worship of Śākyamuni and the observation of moral virtues that his teaching aimed to spread are still recommended; Śākyamuni is still not replaced … But despite these advantages, how little value this book has for us compared with the legends where the real like of Śākyamuni is recounted, and with so profound parables of the Lotus of the Good Law!

… [T]his book is so filled with praises of itself made by the Buddha or his listeners, and with the account of the advantages promised to one who studies and reads it, that one searches for it in vain beneath the mass of praise, and one
arrives at the last page, almost without knowing what the Suvarṇaprabhāsā is.

(Burnouf et al. 2010, pp. 484, 490)

Although Burnouf primarily restricted his remarks to the Sanskrit Buddhist texts he received from Nepal in the early 19th century, by “Buddhists of the North,” Burnouf described what today we call Mahāyāna Buddhism. Csoma de Körös (1784–1842) was a Hungarian scholar known today as the founder of Tibetology. Curiously, along with the scripture Burnouf translated into French nearly a decade later (Burnouf et al. 1852), to which he thought the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama-sūtra, or more accurately the Sūtra of Golden Light or “Golden Radiance” (Burnouf et al. 2010, p. 485), was incomparable—namely, the Lotus sūtra—the early Japanese government singled out the Suvarṇaprabhāsottama as the one of two most important Buddhist scriptures to be recited in specific temples to protect the state and in “proper” pronunciation of Chinese in the Tang capital of Chang’an.

The chapter (parivarta) from the Golden Light Sūtra, alternatively translated into Chinese as the Four Heavenly Kings (Si tianwáng pin 四天王品, Shiitenō-bin, nos. 6 or 10) or Four Heavenly Kings Who Protect the Kingdom (Si tianwáng hùguó pin 四天王護國品, Shiitenō gokoku-bin, no. 13) in the three extant translations of this remarkable scripture, contains what very well may be one of the most important teachings in any Buddhist scripture. The translations ascribed to Dharmaks.ema 曇無懺 (ca. 385–433) and his translation team (ca. 414–426: Jin guāngmíng jīng 金光明經, T no. 663), as well as the slightly expanded, but very close edition attributed to Baogui 宝貴 (n.d.) and perhaps Paramatha 真諦 (499–569) (Nobel 1944–1950, 1958; Emmerick 1970; Radich 2014, 2015)36 and their translation teams (Hebu Jin guāngmíng jīng 合部金光明經, T no. 664), differ slightly from the later translation completed by Yijing and his group in 703 (Jin guāngmíng zuishēng wáng jīng, T no. 665) (J. Chen 2004; M. Chen 2015).37 The passage in question is translated by R.E. Emmerick from the Sanskrit as follows:

“Whenver, dear Lord, in future times this excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, will go forth in villages, cities, settlements, districts, lands, royal palaces, and whichever king of men’s region it may reach, whichever king of men, dear Lord, there may be who will exercise sovereignty in accordance with the treatise on kingship (called) ‘Instruction concerning Divine Kings’, who will hear, reverence, honour this excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, and will respect, venerate, reverence, honour those monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen who hold the chief sūtras and will continually listen to the excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, by this flowing water of the hearing of the Law and by the nectar juice of the Law, he will magnify with great might these divine bodies of s four great kings with our armies and retinues and those of the numerous hundreds of thousands of Yaksas. And he will magnify our brilliance, glory, and splendor. Therefore, we, dear Lord, the four great kings, with our armies and retinues and with numerous hundreds of thousands of Yaksas, with invisible bodies, now and in the future, wherever we come upon villages, cities, settlements, districts, lands and royal palaces, there is excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, will go forth, and we will give protection, we will give salvation, assistance, defense, escape from punishment, escape from the sword, peace, welfare to their royal palaces, their lands, and their regions. And we will deliver those regions from all fears, oppressions, (and) troubles. And we will turn back foreign enemies.”

“If there should be another hostile king neighbouring upon that king of men who hears, reverences, honours this excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, and if, dear Lord, this neighbouring hostile king should produce such a thought: ‘I will enter that region with a fourfold army and destroy it,’ then indeed, dear Lord, at that time, at that moment, by the power of the brilliance of that excellent Suvarṇaprabhāsa, king of sūtras, there will arise a conflict between that neighbouring hostile king and other kings. And there will be regional disturbances in his own
regions. There will be fierce troubles with kings, and diseases caused by planets will become manifest in his area . . . We will turn back that foreign army from the very path it has taken. We will bring upon it hundreds of difference distractions, and we will make obstacles so that the foreign army will not be able to enter this region, much less cause destruction to the region.” (Emmerick 1970, pp. 27–28)

Although I have provided this English translation, it should be clear that this scripture unambiguously explains how the this-worldly fruits of Indic conceptions of governance could be reaped by those who supported the recitation and study of specifically this sūtra, the “king of sūtras,” and visitors to Tang China learned how the Tang state supported a new translation of it in 703 by Yijing and his team. The Sanron master Doji 道慈 (ca. 675–744) returned with this new translation in 718, and the 740.5.1 canon copied for empress Komyo 光明皇后 (701–760) was copied from the manuscript set of the Chinese Buddhist canon with Yijing’s translation of the Golden Light Sūtra, which had been brought to Japan recently from Tang China in 736 by Genbō 玄昉 (d. 746) (Abé 1999, p. 239; Lowe 2014, pp. 222–31; Abe 2013, pp. 155–56; Nara National Museum 2017). As I have discussed elsewhere, Japanese Buddhists quickly adopted Yijing’s translation—with special glosses at the end of many rolls—as the undisputed version to be esteemed at Provincial Temples and at the ten Great Temples. Our discussion of how “Chinese sounds” were specified for the recitation of this and several other Buddhist scriptures indicates how the worldview presented in this scripture was second to none. Why else would Kūkai—and many other esoteric Buddhist teachers—have developed specific commentaries explaining how to understand this key Mahāyāna sūtra as an esoteric ritual text? (Abé 1999, pp. 239–46)

3. Sūfukuji and Bonshakuji

There is surprising confusion about the history of Sūfukuji, one of the earliest of the ten Great Temples, in some recent English language scholarship. In her otherwise fascinating study of Shinra Myōjin 新羅明神, the tutelary deity of the powerful medieval Jimon 寺門 (Temple Gate) Tendai monastic complex of Onjōji (Temple Gate) tied to Enchin 円珍 (814–891, in China 853–858), Kim Sujung writes, “Onjōji was founded in 668 as Sufukuji (also known as Shigaji 志賀寺 and Shigazanji 志賀山寺) and has remained at its current site ever since.” She correctly states that “Sūfukuji was built by Emperor Tenji 天智 (626–672, r. 661–672) when he relocated the capital to Ômi Ôtsu palace 近江大津宮 briefly from 667–672 in response to the threat of an invasion by the Tang-Silla alliance” ca. 670. (Kim 2019, p. 15) Her book is primarily about Onjōji, which may explain why she seems to have been unaware of the archaeological excavations of three ridges on the southeastern slope of Mount Hiei in 1928, and again in 1938–1940, of the former site of Sūfukuji and Bonshakuji. These temples were located approximately 4.5 km to the north and slightly west of the present site of Onjōji (Ôtsu City Museum of History 2017, pp. 28–29). Following these archaeologists’ findings and many other sources, Donald McCallum writes:

When Tenji moved the court to the new capital in 667, he would have required appropriate temples there, and four temples are particularly important: Anō haiji (穴太廃寺), Minami Shiga haiji (南滋賀廃寺), Sufukuji, and a predecessor to Onjōji. At Anō haiji, remains from the first half of the seventh century were located, so it was evidently founded at an early stage of Buddhism in Japan; Minami Shiga haiji and the Onjōji predecessor have some tiles dating directly before the establishment of the Ôtsu capital; only Sufukuji was built at the same time as the capital . . . Finally, the new Sufukuji was constructed to the northwest of the palace, on the lower slopes of Mt. Hiei . . . Of the four, Sufukuji is undoubtedly the best known, primarily because of the magnificent reliquary set excavated from the pagoda remains in the late 1920s (McCallum 2009, pp. 190–91).

The reliquary from the pagoda (item no. 202) at Sufukuji that McCallum mentioned was also highlighted for special consideration in the 2017 exhibition of “National Treasures: Masterpieces of Japan” for the 120th anniversary of Kyoto National Museum (Kyoto National Museum and Mainichi Newspaper 2017, pp. 340, 388). The archaeologists who excavated what experts believe to have been the site of Sufukuji found the foundation of the
stupa building (tō 塔) on the second ridge of what was once Sūfukuji (Ōtsu City Museum of History 2017, p. 28). In addition to the aforementioned reliquary set (shari yoki 合利容器) from the 7th century—measuring 10.6 by 7.9 by 7.6cm and consisting of a bronze outer box, a gold inner box, and a luminous forest green glass jar with a gold lid—roof tiles and coins dating to 708 were found on the three ridges of what was formerly Sūfukuji at the turn of the 8th century (ibid., pp. 30–34).

Sūfukuji first seems to have consisted of a Maitreya Hall (Mirokudō 弥勒堂) on a northern ridge, a small Golden Hall (Shōkōdō 小金堂) and stupa on the middle ridge, and a larger Golden Hall (Kōdō 講堂) and Lecture Hall (Kōdō 講堂) on the southern ridge—less than a hundred meters from where archaeologists believe they found the separate remains of another temple called Shigadera (not pronounced Shigaji). Not surprisingly, McCallum must have read his sources carefully when he made the remarks quoted above about the history of Buddhist temples on Tenji’s Ōtsu capital. In a much later composition than any of the Six National Histories or Genkō shakusho, Jimon denki horoku records that the first Buddhist temple that emperor Tenji had constructed after he moved the capital to Ômi province was Sūfukuji. Genkō shakusho, however, says that another temple, Kawaradera, was constructed in 655, following orders from empress Saimei 齋明 (alt. Kōgyoku 皇極, r. 642–645 and 655–661; see Iwano 1936–1945, p. 342; Kokan and Takuki 2011; Ōtsu City Museum of History 2017, pp. 81–93). The following origin tale in Jimon denki horoku is almost certainly embellished, but it nonetheless connects the historical and archaeological records.

During the first spring after emperor Tenji had moved the capital of ancient Japan from Asuka palace to a new palace in the town of Shigatsu in the province of Ômi, in the third lunar month of 667, he was apparently visited by a golden man in a dream, who told him about a sacred spot where he could have a Buddhist temple built nearby, just to the northwest of the palace. Startled from the dream, he awoke, glanced toward the northwest, and saw a sliver of light coming from the western sky. The next morning, the emperor summoned two Buddhist priests to explain the dream and the auspicious sign. He climbed up into the mountains for approximately 1.2 km (two ri 里) before he encountered an upasaka (ubasoku 優婆塞) who was reciting scriptures in a small hut at a secluded place. When the emperor inquired where he was, the upasaka told him that this place was where the ancient “immortal” of Mount Sasanamo no Nagara 佐佐名長等山 had buried treasure, but it has never been found. Emperor Tenji had a Buddhist temple called Sūfukuji constructed at this place, with an image of Maitreya Tathāgata installed [in the Maitreya Hall].

Jimon denki horoku and Genkō shakusho also differ slightly about the date of the construction of Sūfukuji: either 667 or during the spring of 668 (Nakamura 2004). The next significant historical reference we have for Sūfukuji is from Shoku Nihongi 13, and concerns the date 756.8.22. Here, we learn that 100 rolls of “Ômi court legal documents” 近江朝書法 were given to Sūfukuji. Here, I think we find an important clue about how this library must have been viewed as a vital resource for storing important documents, and probably not merely the Ômi Code ( Ômiryō 近江令, comp. 668 in 22 rolls).

For the date 803.10.29 in the Nihon koki, we learn that “It was ordered that at Sūfukuji, which was established by former sovereign [Tenji]. Great Teacher (Daihōshi 大法師) Joto will temporarily become [chief] administrator of the [part of the temple now known as] Bonshakuji” 丙午。制。崇福寺者、先帝之所建也。宜今梵釋寺別當大法師常務、兼加檢校 (Morita 2006–2007, vol. 1, p. 296). Therefore, we now know that Sūfukuji and Bonshakuji are intimately connected. But Sūfukuji continued to be an important monastery because, on 806.4.15 also in Nihon koki, we learn that, “On the 28th day (shinonoka) [after emperor Kanmu] died, memorial services were held at Sai (river tributary, where it meets the Katsura river 桂川), Toribe (near Kyomizudera 清水寺), and Sūfukuji, Sæki Ō (d. 833), Secretary of the Right (Ubyōgo no kami), Lower Fifth Rank, and Kudara no Konishiki Kyōshun (d.u.), Left Guardian Office, Lower Fifth Rank went to meet Itsuki no Himeko (a shrine maiden) in Ise province [at the Saigū 斎宮] (ibid., p. 406). Memorial services were held again later
the same month at Sūfukuji for the 42nd day (munanoka) after [emperor Kenmu’s] death on 806.4.29 (ibid., p. 409).46

If we return briefly to the edict I began this article with from 795.9.15, and specifically Abé Ryūichi’s translation, then he explains in greater detail about how emperor Kanmu established Bonshakuji as follows:

Kanmu presented the erection of Bonshakuji as an establishment in the wilds of a new ritual center where his virtue in patronizing the monastery was to be converted by the priests through their ritual acts into a display of loyalty to the emperor and to the state. In this manner, the nameless mountains and forests in the wilderness were transformed into the landscape of a religiocultural (sic) showcase for the rectification of names. In other words, the ritual at Bonshakuji was expected to make visible the benevolent reign of the emperor over land and people as the idea relationship formed between ruler, subjects, and the nation’s natural resources (Abé 1999, p. 316).47

Yet premodern sources attest to the facts that, sometime between 783 and 792, emperor Kanmu renamed the southern ridge Bonshakuji of what had been called Sūfukuji, when he had images of BrahmA and Śakra (Indra) installed there, presumably in the Golden Hall, and decreed that ten meditation masters would be supported on site.48 Therefore, it seems highly likely that the edict Abé considers to be evidence of “an establishment in the wilds of a new ritual center” where the emperor saw that “nameless mountains and forests in the wilderness were transformed into the landscape of a religiocultural (sic) showcase for the rectification of names” was probably posturing on behalf of the imperial scribe who wrote this decree for him. Genkō shakusho records that Bonshakuji was established [in 786] as a separate temple to promote veneration of the Golden Light Sūtra by Segyō, a monk devoted to mountain asceticism and rituals to the Indian gods who protect Buddhism in this seminal Mahāyāna Buddhist scripture (Sango 2015b, pp. 80–95), and he happened to also have been a disciple of Genbō, who we recall returned from a voyage to China with nearly an entire set of the 5048 rolls of the Kaiyuan 开元-era (713–741) Chinese Buddhist canon in 736 (Iwano 1936–1945, pp. 376–77; Kobayashi 2008, pp. 7, 9; Kokan and Fujita 2011). It appears that Eichū, who had studied in China for nearly 30 years at Ximing temple in the Tang capital of Chang’an, met Kūkai there, and returned to Japan on the same ship as Saichō, was made abbot of Bonshakuji by emperor Kanmu sometime around 806 (Iwano 1936–1945, pp. 376–77; Kobayashi 2008, p. 260).51

Perhaps the most interesting and historically relevant event that transpired at Bonshakuji and Sūfukuji happened on the twenty-second day of the fourth lunar month of 815, when emperor Saga is credited with having been the first person in Japan to enjoy what reads like a tea ceremony (Morita 2006–2007, vol. 2, p. 368).52

The emperor set out toward Karasaki in Shiga, Ômi province, and [his retinue] stopped at Sūfukuji. Greater Supervisor Eichū and [Hossō] Master Gomyō 護命 (750–834), among others, went to meet the emperor’s caravan outside the gate. The emperor descended from his palanquin (kosshi) and ascended the Hall to make offerings to the Buddha [images]. Next, his retinue went to Bonshakuji, where the emperor descended from his palanquin again. The imperial heir (kotaieti) and ministers offered poems and exchanged them with one another and the monks. Grand Supervisor Eichū offered the emperor some tea decocted with his own hand. Then the retinue went to Lake [Biwa 琵琶] where they embarked on an imperial boat …

This episode is repeated rather frequently in books about the history of tea in Japan. For our purposes, what is most remarkable is that emperor Saga’s entourage went to Sūfukuji and Bonshakuji, probably to express official gratitude for the role these temples played in memorializing his father’s death.
Other edicts in the National Histories, from 819.9.10 (Morita 2006–2007, vol. 3, p. 76), 837.4.25 (Morita 2010, vol. 1, pp. 227–28), 849.10.23 (ibid., vol. 2, p. 347), and 850.2.5 (ibid., vol. 2, p. 366), demonstrate how both Sūfukuji and Bonshakujī continued to receive commensurate support and attention from the state. These monasteries were included in the following edict dated 856.6.14 in Nihon Montoku tennō jitsuroku, which confirms continued support from the state.

On the day when Junior Fifth Rank, Upper Grade, Ason Yoshibuchi was made [head] imperial attendant (ōtoneri-tō), 265 monks from the 14 monasteries of Tōji and Saiji (in the capital) and Enryakuji, Sūfukuji, Bonshakujī, [Shi]tennōji, Todaïji, Kōfukuji, Gangōji, Daianji, Yakushiji, Saidaiji, Horyūji, Shin-Yakushiji were “invited” to revolve-read the [whole manuscript Buddhist] canon three times over seven days. Different messengers of Fifth Rank were dispatched to each monastery [to issue this proclamation]. From the five monasteries which enshrined the head imperial attendant (ōtoneri-tō) and received the iron bars for similar items. [Similarly,] Todaïji, Kofukuji, Gangôji, Daianji, Yakushiji, Golden Light Sūtra with the rituals taught in the arrival and distribution in Japan of esoteric Buddhist practices (Dolce 2011a, 2014; equally possible that the “secret rituals to the Four Heavenly Kings” may have more to do with the rituals taught in the Golden Light Sūtra and Ninnōkyō, which certainly antedate the Four Heavenly Kings. On the second day of the third leap month in 866, we see evidence of how these two monasteries continued to receive specific support as follows:

It was decreed that 1000 iron bars for repairs of various items (e.g., ritual implements). The empress consort (Chūgū) received 1000 iron bars for similar items. [Similary,] Todaïji, Kofukuji, Gangôji, Daianji, Yakushiji, and Saidaiji each received 100 kan (in coins), and 100 iron bars. Enryakuji and Shin-Yakushiji each received 30 kan (of coins). Touradera, Hongangôji, [Tô]shôdaiji (all in Nara), and [Shi]tennōji (in Osaka), Sūfukuji, and Chishikiji (also in Osaka) each received 20 kan (of coins). Bonshakujī and Saiji each received 15 kan (of coins) and 15 iron bars. In the third day of the third leap month in 866, we see evidence of how these two temples played key roles in rituals to support continued state protection rites. A great fire had erupted in the capital on leap month (uruziki or jungetsu 閏月) 3.10 in 866 that spread to both the Shôran and the Seihô towers, which lay to the southwest and southeast of the Otô gate and lasted 22 days. Monastics from these two temples were called in to assuage this calamity as follows:

On the day when one hundred officials met in front of the Kaishô gate to address the fire that had burned the Otô gate 20 monks were summoned to Sūfukuji to revolve-read the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra for seven days; ten monks were summoned to Bonshakujī to perform the Secret ritual of the Four Kings (Shiten hihô) for seven days. The purpose was to ward off catastrophes... 会百官。大於會昌門前，以應天門火也。』是日，於崇福寺。於十僧。限以七日。轉讀大般若經。於於梵顯寺，請十僧修四王秘法。限七日訖。以消災變也。』以河守從五位下菅野朝臣豊持，為修理知識寺佛像別當。

This entry from Sandai jitsuroku may even suggest that, during the first century after the disciples of Kukai and Saichô, among others, began to teach how to utilize so-called esoteric Buddhist ritual practices, monks at Bonshakujī may have been well aware of these rituals, and perhaps they were even renowned for their ritual knowledge. It is equally possible that the “secret rituals to the Four Heavenly Kings” may have more to do with the rituals taught in the Golden Light Sūtra and Ninnōkyō, which certainly antedate the arrival and distribution in Japan of esoteric Buddhist practices (Dolce 2011a, 2014; Groner 2002). The final entry under consideration here is from 866.4.5, when in sixteen monasteries near the capital and at Bonshakujī and Sūfukuji temples in Ōmi province, the
4. The Library and Scholar Monks at Bonshakuji

There are several entries about Bonshakuji in *Nihon kōki* that reveal how prominent Bonshakuji must have been during the 9th century. The most famous one discussed above concerns how Eichū evidently not only personally prepared tea for emperor Saga in 815, which signs in the area today suggest he had grown in fields near the temple, and another for 803 provides an alternative figure than Segyō as an abbot before Eichū: a Hossō expert on monastic codes named Jōtō, who studied at Daianji and Kōfukuji before teaching at Saidaiji in Nara, was made temporary abbot of Bonshakuji and perhaps Sūfukuji as well on 803.10.29 (*Morita 2006–2007*, vol. 1, p. 296). It is difficult to determine if either Bonshakuji or Sūfukuji had any official sectarian affiliation at this time; our sources tell us that both Eichū and Jōtō were officially appointed monks (sōzu). In *Shoku nihon kōki* for the date 835.1.14 we already found evidence of widespread adoption of the catalogs from Bonshakuji and *Zhenyuan lu*. Eichū’s shipmate on the return from China, the Tendai patriarch Saichō, mentions the catalog of Bonshakuji in his *Shugo kokkai sho* 守護國界章 (ca. 818) (*Kobayashi 2008*, pp. 24–25). It seems that because neither *Genkō shakussho* nor *Jimon denki horoku* mention an imperial edict to establish the *Zhenyuan lu* and Bonshakuji catalog to inventory the canon, rather than the slightly earlier *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* 開元釋教錄 (Catalog of Sakyamuni’s Teachings), Compiled During the Kaiyuan Era [713–741], T no. 2154, comp. 730, and specifically the catalog from Bonshakuji, either this information was too well-known to Kokan Shiren and Shikō for them to have thought to bring it up, or this is a case of embellishment on the part of an eminent Fujiwara regent-cum-historiographer who supervised the compilation of the *Shoku Nihon kōki* (*Storch 2014; Wu 2016*).

Even if Fujiwara no Yoshifusa’s 近藤良房 (804–872) *Shoku Nihon kōki* might contain more legend than fact, there is another entry from 850.2.5 that connects Bonshakuji specifically with Matsuo and Kamo 鴨 shrines in the capital. When emperor Ninmyō 仁明天皇 (808–850, r. 833–850) was extremely ill and on his deathbed at the age of 41, the crown prince and influential ministers were summoned to his bedside. After offerings of cloth and robes were prepared for monastics at all the temples, scriptures were recited on his behalf. Six horses were presented from the imperial stables of the Left and Right to the *kami* of Upper and Lower Kamo and Matsuo shrines. Excluding only a single parrot (*oumu* 鵪), all imperial horses, hounds, and caged birds were set free. A proclamation was announced not to slaughter any animals in Ōmi, which caused the monks at Bonshakuji to perform rituals on behalf of the emperor’s longevity; ten monks were summoned from Bonshakuji to perform *kaji* 加持 (*adhis.t.hāna*, rituals for blessings or empowerment, probably not esoteric at this early stage) just outside the emperor’s *misu* 帳 or *sudare*. Therefore, it would appear that by the mid-9th century, the canon of Bonshakuji and monks from this temple were comparatively well-known. Coupled with *Engishiki* that records how copying and distributing the Buddhist canon in Chinese was widespread only half a century later, we may assume that the fame of Bonshakuji, in particular, must have spread to the monastics who were supported by aristocrats at shrine-temple multiplaxes including, but not limited to, Ise 伊勢, Iwashimizu 張山, Kamo 賀茂, Matsuo 松尾, Hirano 平野, Fushimi伏見, Inari 橿荷, and Kasuga 春 (the only one in Nara, and not Kyoto). This list is by no means extensive: archaeological and material cultural evidence from the Heian period confirms that wealthy shrine-temple multiplaxes such as Atsuta 熱田 in Owari 尾張 (Nagoya), the shrine-temple multiplex the Nanatsudera canon was copied for, for example, may have enjoyed even greater patronage than the sites in either Kyoto or Nara (*Keyworth 2016*).

Beyond the edict of 835.1.14 regarding the use of the *Zhenyuan lu* and Bonshakuji catalog for ordering the manuscript Buddhist canons copied for several eastern provinces, we also find evidence of later scholars using this library as an important archive. For exam-
ple, in his *Shingon mikkyō sōroku*, Annen cross checked numerous texts with copies in the libraries of Shōhei’s temple (809–884; China 862–865) temple of Engakuji (Mizuyama-dera 水尾山寺, not to be confused with the Zen temple in Kamakura) and Bonshakuji (von Verschuer 1985; Kornicki 2001, pp. 285–87, 367–416; Yoritomi 2009). In his *Tōki dentō mokuroku*, compiled by 1094, Eichō mentions not only the Bonshakuji catalog (*Bonshakuji roku*), but also eleven commentaries by Jōtō of Bonshakuji, including several prepared as lecture notes (*kōron* 講論) used for debate (*rongi* 論義) preparation. Yet this may not be the last time we learn of the distinction awarded to the library of Bonshakuji because the copy of the *Zhenyuan lu* kept at Nanatsudera has a colophon that reveals how the scribe who copied several rolls simultaneously checked an edition from the scriptures in gold characters at Hōshōji 法勝寺, Fushimi shrine 伏見神 and Bonshakuji (Nanatsudera issaikyō hozonkai 1988, pp. 202–3; Ochiai Toshinori et al. 1991; Ōtsuka 2009; Blair 2013, p. 10; Abe 2013, pp. 177–90, 287–304). Moving into the 13th and 14th centuries, we know that copies of various catalogs of commentaries and sub-commentaries kept at monastic libraries in Nara, long after Sūfukuji seems to have been virtually abandoned or simply folded into the status of Bonshakuji as a branch temple of Onjōji before 1280, but before they were destroyed by sectarian warfare by Tendai monastics, were copied and preserved at Kitanosan Shinpukuji Hōshōin 北野山真福寺宝生院 (Osu [Kannon] bunko 大須[觀音]文庫 in Nagoya). We have rare editions of Annen’s *Shingon mikkyō sōroku* and *Risshō shōsho* 律宗章疏 (Commentaries of the Vinaya School, T no. 2182), *Kaigenroku zuiyōsho* 開元錄随要抄 (Essentials of the Kaiyuan Record), and *Amidabutsu kyōron hei shōsho* 阿弥陀仏経論議 言論 (Catalog of Commentaries to the Amitābha Sūtra(s) and Commentaries), which attest to the lasting significance of the world of exegetical study required by the official monastics who served as abbots at Bonshakuji, and must have played essential roles in creating such an enduring and important library (Ochiai 2005).

5. Conclusions

Bonshakuji and Sūfukuji are geographically quite distinct from the Great Temples in Nara or Kyoto typically associated with officially sanctioned state protection Buddhism in early and medieval Japan. The Six National Histories, as well as *Genkō shakusho* and the later *Jimon denki horoku*, divulge how these two temples situated on the southeastern slope of Mount Hiei were once among the most important Buddhist monasteries in Japan. Eminent scholar-monks and students who studied abroad in Chinese monasteries were made abbots at these temples, and they, in turn, contributed to creating what became one of the most famous libraries in Japan before the 13th century. They were among the monasteries where the *Golden Light Sūtra*, in particular, with its specific rites to protect the state by worshipping this, the “king of sūtras,” was studied and ritually recited; rites to it were followed on behalf of the state both before and after the introduction of esoteric Buddhist teachings from the continent. Without the history of Bonshakuji and Sūfukuji, the narrative of how the nascent Japanese state supported this religion and how it was promoted by scholars and Buddhist monastics would be incomplete. This aspect of Japanese Buddhist history is every bit as relevant to the later history of religion in Japan as is the study of Kūkai’s esoteric Buddhism, so-called Kamakura “New Buddhism,” and perhaps even more so because the state continued to exert influence upon monasteries for centuries through sponsorship of debates (*rongi*) (Sango 2012, 2015a, 2015b; Kusunoki 2018; Kusunoki et al. 2020).
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3 Emmerick, Sūtra of Golden Light, xiii. Following Nobel, Emmerick deduced that the pra in Suvarnaprabhāsottama had been added in later Tibetan translations; the Khotanese and “Central Asian Sanskrit manuscripts [and] renders it probable that Suvarnābhaśottama was the original form of the name.” See also Radich, “On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic Suvarnābhaśottama-sūtra T 664 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part1)”; “Tibetan Evidence for the Sources of Chapters of the Synoptic Suvarnābhaśottama-sūtra T 664 Ascribed to Paramārtha”; Gunner, “Suvarnābhaśottama-sūtra.” See “Chingō kōka 錫穀國家” and “Chinju 鎮守” in Lévi et al., Höbōgirin, 322–327. Cf. de Visser, Ancient Buddhism in Japan, pp. 226, 605–15.

4 Shoku Nihongi 紳日本紀 (Continued Chronicle of Japan, comp. 797) for [Tenpyō 天平 13] 741.11.5 and [Tenpyō Shōhō 天平勝寶] 749.5.15 and 749.5.20 for specific edicts in chronological order. Cf. de Visser, Ancient Buddhism in Japan, pp. 37, 446–57.

5 The relevant sections of the Golden Light sūtra and Nimbokṣyā scriptures are: Nimbokṣyā (see T nos. 245.8.829c9-830a4 [chap. 2] and 246.8.834c25 [chap. 1]) or Konkōmyōkṣyā (see T nos. 663.16.341b13-c3 [chap. 2]; 664.16.382c3-21 [chap. 5], and 665.427c6-27 [chap. 6]). Not only does de Visser pay ample attention to matters of “state protection” Buddhism (Chingō kōka), but he provides the most thorough summary in English of the history of offerings of issaikyō [in Japan] from 651 to 1323; Ancient Buddhism in Japan, pp. 226, 605–15. On ritual readings of the *Mahāprajāpāramitā-sūtra*, see Sagai Tatsuru, Shinbutsu shūgō no rekishi to girei kikō, pp. 139–42; Abe Yasurō, Chūsei Nihon no shūgō teikusuto taikei 中, 430–450 and 196–198; George A. Keyworth, “On Xuanzang and Manuscripts of the *Mahāprajāpāramitā-sūtra* at Dunhuang and in Early Japanese Buddhism.” The precedent for ritual readings of this large compendium in Japan comes from the Japanese biographical essay of Xuanzang, Da Cien sanzang fashi zhuan 大慈恩三藏法師傳 (Z no. 1192) 10, T no. 2053.50.276b5-22, which says that a special lecture was delivered on this scripture and it was read at a ceremony on 663.10. Cf. Komine Michihiko, Katsuzaki Yugetsu, and Watanabe Shōgo, Hannyakyō taizen, 372–382. See below for discussion of ritual readings of the canon (issaikyō) or Issaikyō-e 一切經会, see Blair, “Rites and Rule: Kiyomori at Itsukushima and Fukuharma,” 6; Real and Imagined: The Peak of Gold in Heian Japan, chap.1.2 and 1.3. See also Moerman, Localizing the Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue, chap.4 cited in Blair, and “The Archaeology of Anxiety: An Underground History of Heian Religion.” On the Renzang jing (Nimbokṣyā) in China, see Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom. See below for the Konkōmyōkṣyā. “State” in “state protection” Buddhism remains a problematical term, not only because of the European context for “state” (Peace of Westphalia, 1648) in English, but also because kuni (guo) may not have meant a “state” in premodern Japan or China. In Nara or Heian Japan, for example, kuni meant something much closer to the meaning of a province.

6 On Great Temples in Japan, see “Daiji,” Lévi et al., Höbōgirin, pp. 704–11.

7 Shoku Nihon kōki 3, 834.5.15 in Morita Tei, Shoku Nihon kōki, 99–101. This edict expected the copying to be finished by the ninth lunar month of the following year.


10 On Kūkai and the Zhenyuan lu, see (Abé 1999), The Weaving of Mantra, 117–118. Kūkai’s [Go] Shōrai mokuroku [撰請来目录 (Catalog of Imported Items, T no. 2161) almost perfectly follows the order of the Zhenyuan lu; see (Akatsuka 2016), “Amanosan Kongōjizō no shōrai kyōki ni tsuite’; “Shōrai mokuroku to mikkyō kyōki to no kankei: Amanosan Kongōjì shōgyō o chūshin ni.”
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