

Association of Christian Schools International v. Stearns, et al.

Expert Report of Professor Robert Sharf, Ph.D.

I. I have been asked to respond to the following question:

“Is it reasonable for the University of California to conclude that a high-school course on religion and ethics that (1) addresses the subject from only one denominational viewpoint or (2) has as a primary goal the personal religious growth of the student, will not adequately teach those subjects from the standpoint of scholarly inquiry so as to prepare students for the academic study of religion at UC?”

II. Expert Qualifications

My CV is appended to this report. My relevant qualifications include that: I received a B.A. in Religious Studies, and a Ph.D. in Buddhist Studies, and I have been teaching in the discipline of religious studies since 1987 at three public universities: McMaster University (Hamilton, Ontario), the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and the University of California, Berkeley. In addition to my expertise on world religions, I have published on a range of theoretical and methodological issues in the academic study of religion. I have been a member and served in the administration of the American Academy of Religion (AAR), the major professional organization for scholars of religion in North America, since 1987. I also serve on a number of journal and university press editorial boards, including the board of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. In this capacity I regularly review scholarly monographs and articles on the subject of religion submitted for publication.

At McMaster University I was a member of the Department of Religious Studies, at the University of Michigan I served on the Executive Committee of the Program in Religion, and at UC Berkeley I am now Director of Religious Studies. I am currently heading the creation of a Center for the Study of Religion at UC Berkeley, which will oversee, among other things, a new graduate program in religion. In addition to my experience with curriculum and program development, my teaching has included graduate and undergraduate courses on theory and method in the study of religion, as well as a variety of courses on world religions.

As Director of Religious Studies at Berkeley I oversee curriculum and assess new course proposals. In addition to utilizing regular faculty at UC Berkeley, the Religious Studies Program regularly employs visiting professors and lecturers to augment our undergraduate course offerings, and I am responsible for these hires. In this capacity I am frequently approached by outside organizations and religion scholars with proposals for lectures and new courses to be taught in our program. As such, I have considerable experience with how to assess whether a particular course meets the academic standards of the discipline of religious studies.

III. Criteria Used to Evaluate Courses

There are several criteria we use in evaluating course proposals: the course must be academically rigorous, it must represent the current state of scholarship, the instructor must have recognized expertise in the field, teaching materials must be appropriate and up to date, and it must not promote or favor any particular religious denomination or religious point of view. This last criterion is absolutely essential to the discipline of

religious studies and it applies no less to high school courses meant to be preparatory for a UC undergraduate education.

The reasons for this are many. The academic study of religion is multidisciplinary in nature; it draws on a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, history, literature, philosophy, and psychology. But whatever one's approach, the methods and modes of reasoning and analysis must be suited, at least in principle, to any and all religious phenomena. In other words, the approach must be applicable across cultural, regional, and temporal distances. In the academy, one does not privilege a Christian point of view in the analysis of Christianity, a Jewish point of view in the analysis of Judaism, a Buddhist point of view in the analysis of Buddhism, and so on. Privileging one tradition or point of view is considered unacceptable and counter-productive in the scholarly study of religion at UC and similar colleges and universities.

One of the methodological foundations of the field of religious studies is the ability to step back and gain intellectual and emotional distance from the subject matter. This attitude of scholarly detachment is requisite for unbiased analysis into the nature of religious phenomena as performed in the UC Berkeley Religious Studies Program. Such critical distance does not come naturally, however. It must be learned through a course of study that requires mastering a host of categories, concepts, and analytic tools that are central to the discipline.

IV. Critical Distance

The particular need for critical distance is not always evident to those without academic training in the field of religious studies. This is in part because of a tendency to confuse the subject of study (religious beliefs, practices, perspectives) with modes of

scholarly inquiry. First-hand familiarity with religious traditions and commitment to religious truth-claims constitute a very different order of knowledge and understanding than that sought by the scholar of religion. Scholars refer to these two perspectives--the “insider’s” point of view on the one hand, and the “outsider’s” on the other--by the technical terms “emic” and “etic” respectively. (The terms were coined in 1954 by the linguistic anthropologist Kenneth Pike, but they are now used in a variety of fields.)

Insider (“emic”) descriptions foreground the experiences, understandings, and perspectives of religious adherents; this insider testimony serves, in part, as data for scholarly analysis. The scholar, however, is expected to move beyond the insider point of view to an outsider (“etic”) perspective that does not rely on categories, concepts, and truth claims allied to a particular religious community. An outsider account relies on modes of description and analysis that are extrinsic to the community of religious actors. Whereas religious practitioners are in a position to evaluate the accuracy and evenhandedness of an insider description of their tradition, the community of scholars is in a position to evaluate an outsider rendering of this data. The outsider account is evaluated on the basis of whether it is observer-independent, repeatable, falsifiable, rational, and so on. Reputable scholarly analysis of religious systems and religious behavior is predicated on this kind of objectivity.

The need to distinguish insider and outsider perspectives is not unique to the study of religion or anthropology; it is a foundation for many of the human sciences. In linguistics, for example, only “insiders”--native speakers of a language--can pass judgment on whether a particular linguistic utterance is meaningful, fluent, eloquent, awkward, and so on. Native speakers provide the primary data for linguistic analysis. But

being fluent in one or more languages does not, in and of itself, provide knowledge of what language is or how it works. The first step toward an analytic understanding of language as such is the study of grammar, and this requires mastering a set of categories, concepts, and modes of analysis that are not dependent on the particular workings of any single language. The theoretical structures and conceptual categories developed by linguists for this task--syntax, morphology, semantics, phonetics, phonology, and so on--are analytically powerful precisely to the degree that they are, in principle, universal. Learning these concepts and categories requires the ability to step outside of one's own language. The goal is to understand the nature of language itself, and this requires seeing particular languages as instances of a larger, more universal category: "language."

As mentioned above, the act of gaining critical distance in the human sciences does not come naturally--it is learned in the process of mastering categories, concepts, and modes of analysis used in the discipline. Anthropologists in the field, for example, work closely with "native informants" who provide the primary data on which anthropological analysis depends. An understanding of the subject-position of their informants (i.e., the insider point of view) is key to gaining an empathic and intuitive appreciation of the informants' culture. But anthropologists must move to a more objective stance if they are to understand any single culture as an instance of a larger, more universal category, "culture." Critical distance is necessary not only when studying foreign cultures, but also, and perhaps even more crucially, when studying one's own. (This act of gaining an outsider's perspective on one's own culture is sometimes called "self nativizing.") The goal, at the end of the day, is to contribute to the understanding of human society and culture writ large.

Critical distance is of singular importance when engaging in the academic study of religion, because feelings about religion are often personal and intense, rendering impartial scholarly analysis more challenging. The scholar must learn to disaggregate insider from outsider perspectives. Both perspectives have their place: only Christians can provide an authoritative “insiders” perspective on the meaning Christians find in scripture, on the Christian experience of faith, on Christian attitudes toward various soteriological, ethical, and political issues, and so on. Hindus have the same authority when it comes to Hinduism, Buddhists when it comes to Buddhism. But “outsider” training in the discipline of religious studies is required to place such insider perspectives in the context of religion as a universal mode of human thought and behavior.

V. Religious Studies and Religious Commitment

In order to acquire this critical distance the scholar of religious studies must suspend or “bracket” his or her own religious commitments while involved in the work of scholarly analysis. Such bracketing is essential in the discipline. (This act of suspending or bracketing one’s own point of view is referred to by the technical Aristotelian term *epoché*.)

It is important to emphasize that such suspension or “bracketing” in no way requires a religiously committed person to abandon or modify his or her personal faith. This suspension is an intellectual and cognitive exercise--a way to gain the critical detachment and objectivity necessary for a particular kind of analytical knowledge and insight. Here, religious studies is similar to anthropology, linguistics, and psychology; each of these disciplines demands that the scholar suspend his or her normal habits of

mind and judgments in order to acquire a more global and observer-independent perspective.

The bracketing is strategic; the analytic distance it affords the psychologist, the anthropologist, the scholar of religion, can be discordant with the demands of day-to-day living, and the scholar is not expected to maintain a state of analytic detachment. When not engaged in scholarly analysis many scholars feel perfectly comfortable embracing a particular religious tradition and point of view, and the discipline of religious studies is not antithetical to or subversive of religious commitment. Indeed, many scholars of religion are themselves religious.

It is not correct to assume that being a member of a religious tradition, or having faith in a religious teaching, will make one a better scholar of religion. A Hindu does not make a better or worse scholar of Hinduism; a Muslim does not make a better or a worse scholar of Islam; and so on. Nor is being an insider necessarily a hindrance. Good scholarship depends on a certain facility in juggling both insider data and outsider perspectives, irrespective of one's own religious background. In my own field, one of the leading scholars of Buddhism in the 20th century, Monseigneur Étienne Lamotte (1903-1983), was a Belgian Catholic priest. There are many other examples.

Some scholars of religion have skillfully made use of their personal religious backgrounds and experiences as “data” for their analyses--they serve as their own “informants” as it were. Professor Robert Orsi of Harvard University is a good example; he draws on his own Catholic upbringing to inform his sensitive and astute studies of American Catholicism. But like all good scholars, Orsi appreciates the distinction between an insider's perspective and an outsider's perspective, and his work is exemplary

precisely because of his skill in moving adeptly between the two while never confusing them.

VI. Evaluation of Courses

I have examined a number of the courses that have been submitted for UC accreditation under the “g” category of “religion and ethics,” including both approved and rejected courses. From the materials that I have reviewed, the application of the two stated UC criteria for courses in this category appears to have been working well to date: approved courses appear to be structured so as to introduce students to the basic conceptual and analytical skills necessary for college-level study.

Many of the approved religion courses I examined fall into one of three categories: (1) courses on comparative religion or world religions, (2) courses on the Bible as literature, and (3) courses on church history. The approved courses in comparative religion or world religions appear to place the study of religion in a pluralistic framework that does not privilege the truth claims or world-view of any single denomination. A single course will typically draw on a broad array of religious traditions, including Buddhism, Hinduism, Sikhism, Daoism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam, as well as native American religions and religions of Africa. While the curricula cover the histories, literatures, ritual practices, and beliefs of various traditions, the focus is on seeing these religions in a nonpartisan and comparative context that fosters an observer-independent understanding of the nature of religion writ large.

The approved courses on the Bible as literature appear to bring critical tools from the discipline of literary studies to bear on the Jewish and/or Christian bibles. Students are encouraged to apply a range of concepts and analytical methods that do not privilege

Jewish or Christian points of view. Indeed, the literary tools (genre theory, form criticism, close reading, structural analysis, etc.) are valuable precisely because they can be applied not only to the Bible, but also to any piece of world literature, including the scriptural traditions of Buddhism, Daoism, Hinduism, Shinto, and so on.

Finally, the approved courses in church history place the study of church history in the larger context of world history. They do not appear to explain historical causation with reference to parochial religious beliefs or supernatural agency. Nor do they appear to demand that the student adhere to a particular religious orientation. As such, the theoretical perspectives and analytical tools employed in the study of church history could, in principle, be applied to the history of any and all religious institutions.

For each accepted religion course, it was reasonable for UC to conclude that the analytical framework and critical methodologies of the course did not rely upon the authority of scripture, religious doctrine, divine agency, or revelation, and that the course instead maintained a distinction between the insider “data” that is the subject of study, and the outsider modes of analysis that are essential to the academic study of religion. It likewise was reasonable for UC to conclude that the approved courses would teach students to think critically--to gain perspective on their habitual ways of thinking and to distance themselves, if only temporarily, from preformed opinion and belief. The analytical tools they appear to employ are applicable, in principle, across the range of religious traditions, without privileging the view point of any one tradition. Finally, it was reasonable for UC to conclude that the approved courses would encourage students to present their thoughts and conclusions in a form that is amenable to critical evaluation by a community of scholars.

Among the courses that failed to receive UC approval, some appear to promote a particular religious teaching or point of view. They include statements such as: “This course is an examination of the New Testament message and of Jesus Christ as the Messenger of Faith and Love to all creation. The various books of the New Testament are explored, with the goal of making their understanding pertinent to the faith experience of the Catholic adolescent” (Cantwell/Sacred Heart of Mary High School, course on New Testament); “Students will be prepared to defend the truth of Christianity in a pluralistic world” (Capistrano Valley Christian Schools, course on Philosophy and Ethics: Relationships); and “students will develop a deeper understanding of how God works in human history” (Junipero Serra High School, course on The Christian Church, 100/Present). Such courses do not meet the two criteria that UC has been using to evaluate “religion and ethics” courses. They appear to promote one particular religious point of view, and they privilege the truth claims of one religious denomination. It seems reasonable to assume that these courses do not teach students how to study and analyze religious phenomena from an objective “outsider’s” position, and as such will not provide high-school students with the set of analytical skills necessary for college-level study.

Other courses that were not approved appear not to have provided sufficient information or documentation to ensure that they meet UC criteria. My understanding is that any course that does not receive approval can be revised and resubmitted.

VII. Conclusion

The two criteria used by UC--that courses not address the subject from a single denominational viewpoint and that the primary goal not be the personal religious growth of the student--are proper criteria for determining whether a course will adequately

prepare students for the academic study of religion at UC. Any course that restricts the presentation to a single point of view, or that uses the course to propagate a particular vision of personal religious growth, fails to instill a basic critical skill required in the academic study of religion--the ability to step outside of one's normal frame of reference to take a more observer-independent view. Such a perspective is the foundation of all critical, analytical, and theoretical work in the field. The stated UC criteria are a minimum standard to ensure that high-school religion courses that receive UC accreditation will impart the basic conceptual skills required for college-level work in the field.

VIII. A Note on the Issue of Ethics

The question that I have been addressing concerns high-school courses on "religion and ethics." As my focus has been on "religion," a word is in order concerning the category "ethics."

At the university level, the subject of ethics is approached very differently depending on whether it is placed within the discipline of religious studies, or whether it is placed within the discipline of philosophy. When ethics is taught in the context of the study of religion, it is treated as part of the normative or doctrinal teachings of a particular religious tradition. In this context, ethical claims and arguments are studied as part of the "insiders'" description of a tradition. As such, ethical teachings are regarded with the same attitude of critical detachment as are religious doctrines concerning cosmology, soteriology, metaphysics, and so on.

The study of ethics is handled quite differently in departments of philosophy, where ethical claims and arguments are subjected to the rigorous standards of logical

analysis and argumentation that characterize philosophical inquiry. In the academic discipline of philosophy it is axiomatic that philosophical arguments cannot aver to the authority of religious teachings, of revelation, of scripture. Philosophical claims must be grounded in sound argument and exposition.

As such, whether in the context of religion or philosophy, the two criteria stated above, namely: that courses are acceptable as long as they (1) treat the study of religion or ethics from the standpoint of scholarly inquiry rather than in a manner limited to one denomination or viewpoint, and (2) do not include among its primary goals the personal religious growth of the student, constitute an appropriate minimum standard for evaluating courses in ethics, whether such courses are taught within the context of the discipline of religion or philosophy.

IX. Comments on the Expert Witness Report submitted by Dr. Daniel Guevara

Professor Guevara's discussion revolves not around the content of the courses in dispute, or even on the criteria that UC uses to evaluate such courses, but rather on access to higher education. He believes that UC should not deny access to otherwise qualified students merely because they have enrolled in courses that represent a religious point of view. But it seems evident to me, from the documentation to which I have access, including the correspondence between Ken Smitherman (President, ACSI) and Susan Wilbur (UC Director of Undergraduate Admissions) that accompanied Professor Guevara's report, that UC has no intention of, nor interest in, denying access to students on the basis of non-accredited courses they have taken. Rather, UC views its role in determining whether to approve high school courses under the a-g guidelines as determining whether the courses provide adequate preparation for a UC course of study.

UC's policy does not deny admission on the basis of either a student's religious affiliation and beliefs, or a student's participation in a specific course. UC has also made it clear that students can satisfy a-g subject matter requirements by testing as well as by coursework.

As my own report concerns only elective or "g" courses under the heading of "religion and ethics," it seems evident that non-accreditation of these elective courses should not negatively impact a student's opportunity to gain UC admission, provided that the student receives informed guidance in his or her selection of courses. The UC system has no interest in dictating, and does not dictate, what elective courses private schools can teach or what courses individual students can take. UC does have a vital and compelling interest in letting private schools know whether it believes that a particular course will or will not prepare students for UC-level work. The system in place for accrediting courses serves this function. I see no basis for Guevara's assertion that the a-g guidelines raise a moral question concerning open access to public higher education.



Robert Sharf, Ph.D.

Professor, East Asian Languages and
Cultures; Director, Program in Religious Studies;
and Chair, Center for Buddhist Studies,
University of California, Berkeley

Robert Sharf, Ph.D.

Information Considered As Basis and Reasons for Opinions

My years of research and teaching

The Complaint in this case and the parties' briefs on the Motion to Dismiss

UC a-g Guide (http://www.ucop.edu/a-gGuide/ag/content/Guidetoa-gReqs_2007.pdf)

UC Helpful Hints

(http://www.ucop.edu/agguide/ag/course_submissions/helpful_hints.html)

Report of Dr. Guevara, produced by Plaintiffs in this case

Course Applications listed on the following pages

Copies Attached

Copies are attached of the following items, not publicly available or produced in discovery in this action:

- Appendix to report (Sharf CV)

Compensation

The compensation to be paid for work on this report, deposition testimony, and trial testimony is \$250 per hour.

Testimony in Other Cases

In the preceding four years, I have not testified at trial or by deposition.

Course Applications Reviewed

Tab	School	Course	Subject Area	Bates Number
1	Cantwell/Sacred Heart of Mary High School	New Testament	G-elective	UC00018957; UCPROD0040491 - UCPROD0040495
2	Cantwell/Sacred Heart of Mary High School	Social Justice	G-elective	UC00018958; UCPROD0041200 - UCPROD0041204; UCPROD0040496- UCPROD0040500
3	Capistrano Valley Christian School	Ancient Hebrew Lit. & Basic Logic	G-elective	UC00016714; UCPROD0039375 - UCPROD0039379
4	Capistrano Valley Christian School	Philosophy and Ethics: Relationships	G-elective	UC00016717; UCPROD0039322 - UCPROD0039327
5	City of Knowledge School	Ethics II +	G-elective	UC00015095; UCPROD0018627 - UCPROD001832
6	Santa Margarita Catholic High School	Theology in Literature, Film and Music	G-elective	UC00002588; UCPROD0000353 - UCPROD0000356
7	Hebrew Academy	Braishis III	G-elective	UC00009169; UCPROD0001908 - UCPROD0001913
8	Jewish Community High School of the Bay	Bible and Commentaries II	G-elective	UC00014934; UCPROD0017236 - UCPROD0017242
9	Jewish Community High School of the Bay	Ethical Dilemmas in Jewish Texts	G-elective	UC00014935; UCPROD0017243 - UCPROD0017250
10	Junipero Serra High School	The Christian Church, 100 - Present	G-elective	UC00012098; UCPROD0020267 - UCPROD0020272
11	Mary Star of the Sea High School	Ethics I/II	G-elective	UC00018151; UCPROD0040093 - UCPROD0040098
12	Mary Star of the Sea High School	History of the Bible I/II	G-elective	UC00018152; UCPROD0040055 - UCPROD0040061
13	New Community Jewish High	Modern Jewish History	A-history/social science	UC00019326; UCPROD0045160 - UCPROD0045165

Tab	School	Course	Subject Area	Bates Number
14	Saint Lawrence Academy	Christian Lifestyles	A-history/social science	UC0001850; UCPROD0046204 - UCPROD0046209
15	Saint Lawrence Academy	Church History	A-history/social science	UC00018052; UCPROD0046192 - UCPROD0046197
16	Saint Lawrence Academy	Introduction to Catholicism	A-history/social science	UC00018054; UCPROD0046166 - UCPROD0046171
17	San Domenico School	History of Christianity	G-elective	UC00016500; UCPROD0017228 - UCPROD0017235; UCPROD0018190 - UCPROD0018197; UCPROD0004556 - UCPROD0004558
18	San Domenico School	Christian Scriptures	G-elective	UC00019305; UCPROD0039615 - UCPROD0039620

Tab	School	Course	Subject Area	Bates Number
19	Amador Valley High School	Comparative Study of World Religions	G-elective	UCPROD0000692 - UCPROD0000698
20	Army and Navy Academy	Comparative Religion	G-elective	UCPROD0000819 - UCPROD0000824
21	Castilleja School	The Bible as Literature and Source	B-English	UCPROD0006741 - UCPROD0006743
22	Cornerstone Christian School	Church History	G-elective	UCPROD0016995 - UCPROD0017001
23	Fallbrook Union High School	Bible as Literature	B-English	UCPROD0043206 - UCPROD0043217
24	Holy Names High School	World Religions	G-elective	UCPROD0000153 - UCPROD0000159
25	Marin Academy	Religion and Politics	A-history/social science	UCPROD0011031- UCPROD0011035
26	Oxford School	Comparative Religion	G-elective	UCPROD0001426 - UCPROD0001433
27	Pacific Collegiate School	Bible and Literature	B-English	UCPROD0008285 - UCPROD0008288
28	Rosamond High School	Bible as Literature	B-English	UCPROD0042987- UCPROD0042993
29	Saint Bernard Catholic High School	Comparative World Religions	G-elective	UCPROD0000592 - UCPROD0000597
30	Mission College Prep Catholic High School	Ethics, Values, and the Human Person	G- elective	UCPROD0022493 - UCPROD0022498
31	Cathedral High School	Ethics: Tradition and Issues	G- elective	UCPROD0020821 - UCPROD0020824

CURRICULUM VITAE

May, 2007

NAME Robert H. Sharf

ADDRESS Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures
University of California, Berkeley
104 Durant Hall #2230
Berkeley, CA 94720-2230
Phone: (510) 642-6369

ACADEMIC POSITIONS

University of California, Berkeley, D. H. Chen Distinguished Professor of Buddhist Studies, Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Director of Buddhist Studies, July 1, 2003-present. Chair, Center for Buddhist Studies, Fall 2004-present. Director of Religious Studies, Fall 2006-present.

University of Michigan, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor, July 1, 2002-May 31, 2003; Associate Professor of Buddhist Studies, Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, July 1, 1995-May 31, 2003. Director, Center for Japanese Studies, Sept. 1999-August 2000.

McMaster University, Associate Professor of East Asian Religions, Department of Religious Studies, July 1, 1994-June 30, 1995. Assistant Professor, 1990-94. Lecturer, 1989-90.

University of Michigan, Visiting Lecturer, Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, 1987-88.

EDUCATION

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, 1981-91. Ph.D. (Buddhist Studies) May, 1991.

Kyoto University, Institute for Research into the Humanities (Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo), April, 1985-June, 1987. Research Fellow.

Middlebury College. Japanese Summer Language School, 1982 and 1983. Chinese Summer Language School, 1979 and 1980.

University of Toronto, 1976-81. M.A. (Chinese Studies) November, 1981. B.A. with distinction (Religious Studies) June, 1979.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Academy of Religion
Association for Asian Studies
International Association for Buddhist Studies
North American Society for the Study of Religion
Society for the Study of Chinese Religion
Society for the Study of Japanese Religions
Tang Studies Society

AREAS OF INTEREST

Medieval Chinese Buddhism, esp. Chan, Pure Land, and Tantra; Shingon, Hossō, and Zen monastic ritual in Japan; Buddhist art; methodological issues in the study of religion.

FELLOWSHIPS, GRANTS, AWARDS

Humanities Research Fellowship, UC Berkeley, Spring 2008-Fall 2008.
 Townsend Center for the Humanities, Mellon Strategic Working Group Award (Religion and Modernity), Fall 2007.
 Townsend Center for the Humanities, UC Berkeley, Senior Fellow, 2004-05.
 University of Michigan Sweetland Center Senior Fellow, Fall, 2002.
 University of Michigan, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor, July 2002.
 University of Michigan Faculty Career Development Award, 2000-01.
 Center for Japanese Studies Faculty Fellowship support for *Living Images: Japanese Buddhist Icons in Context*, Spring 2001.
 Office of the Vice President of Research, subventions for two books: *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the "Treasure Store Treatise,"* and *Living Images: Japanese Buddhist Icons in Context* (see under publications), Spring 2000.
 Michigan Humanities Award, 1999-2000.
 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Research Grant, 1992-95. Project title: "Kōfukuji Monastic Ritual and Its Significance for the Study of East Asian Buddhism."
 Japan Foundation, Conference Grant (coauthored with Elizabeth Horton Sharf and Koichi Shinohara), March 17-20, 1994. Conference title: "The Japanese Buddhist Icon in Its Monastic Context." (Additional funds were raised from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the Numata Foundation.)
 McMaster Students Union Teaching Award, Nominee, 1993; Faculty Finalist (Humanities), 1994.
 Horace H. Rackham Distinguished Dissertation Award, 1992.
 Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan, Fellowship, 1988-89.

PUBLICATIONS

Books:

Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise, Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 14 (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002).

Living Images: Japanese Buddhist Icons in Context, Asian Religions and Cultures, no. 2, co-edited with Elizabeth Horton Sharf (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001). Chapter contributions: "Prolegomenon to the Study of Japanese Buddhist Icons," and "Visualization and Mandala in Shingon Buddhism."

Journal articles and book chapters:

"How to Think with Chan *Gongans*," in *Thinking with Cases: Specialized Knowledge in Chinese Cultural History*, edited by Charlotte Furth, Judith Zeitlin, Hsiung Ping-chen (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007).

"Suzuki, D. T.," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2nd ed., edited by Lindsay Jones (New York: Macmillan, 2005).

“Ritual,” in *Critical Terms for the Study of Buddhism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), pp. 245-269.

“Thinking through Shingon Ritual,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 26, no. 1 (2003), pp. 51-96.

“On Pure Land Buddhism and Ch’an/Pure Land Syncretism in Medieval China,” *T’oung Pao* 88, no. 4-5 (June, 2003), pp. 282-331.

“The Uses and Abuses of Zen in the Twentieth Century,” in *Zen, Reiki, Karate: Japanische Religiosität in Europa* (Bunka: Tübinger interkulturelle und linguistische Japanstudien, band 2), edited by Inken Prohl and Hartmut Zinser (Münster, Hamburg, London: Lit Verlag, 2002), pp. 143-154. (A synopsis of my previously published articles on the subject.)

“Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro,” in *Encyclopedia of Monasticism*, edited by William M. Johnston (Chicago and London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000), vol. 2, pp. 1218-19.

“On the Allure of Buddhist Relics,” *Representations* 66 (Spring, 1999), pp. 75-99. Republished in *Embodying the Dharma: Buddhist Relic Veneration in Asia*, edited by David Germano and Kevin Trainor (Albany: SUNY Press, 2004), pp. 163-191.

“Muchǒng-chungsaeng ūi pulsǒng e tachayǒ (Ttonūn Sǒn ūi kongan ūl ǒddǒk’e pol koshin’ga?)” (“On the Buddha-nature of Insentient Things [or: How to Think about a Ch’an *Kung-an*]”), Korean translation by Sǒ Chǒnghyǒng, in *Cheilhoe Hanguk-sǒn Kukche-haksul-taeboe Nonmunjip*, edited by Pipaek kyohak yǒn’guso (Seoul: Hyoil munhwasa, 1999), pp. 155-191.

“Experience,” in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, edited by Mark C. Taylor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 94-116. Republished as “The Rhetoric of Experience and the Study of Religion,” in *Cognitive Models and Spiritual Maps* (a special issue of the *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 7, nos. 11/12, 2000), edited by Jensine Andresen and Bob Forman. Republished in *Religious Experience: A Reader* (Critical Categories in the Study of Religion), edited by Russell T. McCutcheon (London: Equinox Publishing, 2007).

“The Scripture on the Production of Buddha Images” (*Zuo fo xingxiang jing*), in *Religions of China in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 261-267.

“The Scripture in Forty-two Sections” (*Sishier zhang jing*), in *Religions of China in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 360-371. Republished in *An Anthology of Asian Religions in Practice*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 418-429.

“Buddhist Modernism and the Rhetoric of Meditative Experience,” *Numen* 42, no. 3 (1995), pp. 228-283. To be republished in *Critical Concepts in Buddhist Studies*, edited by Paul Williams (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

“Zen to Nihon no nashonarizumu 禅と日本のナシヨナリズム,” in *Nihon no bukkō 4: Kinsei-kindai to bukkō 日本のお教四: 近世・近代と仏教*, edited by the Nihon bukkō kenkyūkai 日本仏教研究会 (Tokyo: Hōzōkan, 1995), pp. 81-108. Republished in *Zen to gendai 禅と現代*, edited by Nishimura Eshin 西村恵信 (Tokyo: Perikan-sha, 1998), pp. 305-344. An adapted Japanese translation of “The Zen of Japanese Nationalism” (see below).

“Whose Zen? Zen Nationalism Revisited,” in *Rude Awakenings: Zen, the Kyoto School, and the Question of Nationalism* (Nanzan Studies in Religion and Culture), edited by James W. Heisig and John Maraldo (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1995), pp. 40-51.

“Sanbōkyōdan: Zen and the Way of the New Religions,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 22, no. 3-4: *Special Edition: The New Age in Japan*, edited by Haga Manabu and Robert Kisala (1995), pp. 417-458.

“The Zen of Japanese Nationalism,” in *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, edited by Donald S. Lopez, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 107-160. An earlier version appeared in *History of Religions* 33, no. 1 (1993), pp. 1-43.

“Zen and the Art of Deconstruction” (review article on *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism*, by Bernard Faure), in *History of Religions* 33, no. 3 (1994), pp. 287-296.

“On the Ritual Use of Ch’an Portraiture in Medieval China” (with T. Griffith Foulk), in *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 7 (1993-94), pp. 149-219. Republished in *Chan Buddhism in Ritual Context*, edited by Bernard Faure (London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), pp. 74-150.

“The Idolization of Enlightenment: On the Mummification of Ch’an Masters in Medieval China,” *History of Religions* 32, no. 1 (1992), pp. 1-31. To be republished in *Critical Concepts in Buddhist Studies*, edited by Paul Williams (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

“The Religion of Science: Paul Carus and *The Gospel of Buddha*,” *Tricycle* (Summer, 1995), pp. 12-15.

“Lineage and Likeness: The Meaning and Function of Zen Portraiture” (with T. Griffith Foulk and Elizabeth H. Sharf), in *Ten Directions* 14, no. 1 (1993), pp. 20-25.

“A Study of the Treatise on One Śloka (*Ekaślokaśāstra*),” *Spring-Autumn Papers*, 4, no. 1 (1984), pp. 81-96.

Reviews:

Chan Insights and Oversights: An Epistemological Critique of the Chan Tradition, by Bernard Faure, in *The Journal of Religion* 75, no. 2 (1995), pp. 318-319.

Eloquent Zen: Daitō and Early Japanese Zen, by Kenneth Kraft, in *The Journal of Religion* 74, no. 3 (1993), pp. 432-433.

Dōgen’s Manuals of Zen Meditation, by Carl Bielefeldt, in *Chanoyu Quarterly* 68 (1992), pp. 61-65.

An Introduction to Buddhism, by Takasaki Jikido, in *Chanoyu Quarterly* 62 (1990), pp. 67-70.

In preparation:

“How to Read a Zen Kōan.”

“The Enigma of the Dunhuang Caves.”

“Asceticism and Ritual Debate in Contemporary Hossō Buddhism.”

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

University of Minnesota, Institute for Advanced Study, May 1, 2008. Presentation: "Thinking with Zen Koans."

Yale University, Conference on Esoteric Buddhism in East Asia, Nov. 9-11, 2007. Presentation: "The Mystery of the Silver Box: A Clue to the Ritual Culture of the Famen-si Reliquaries."

Princeton University, Conference on "Re-presenting Emptiness: A Symposium on Zen and Art in Medieval Japan," April 14-15, 2007. Discussant on the panel: "Zen Art and its Recent Modernities."

Beijing University, Beida-Khyentse Foundation Lectures, March 15-16, 2007. Lecture series: "What the Transmission of Buddhism to the West Can Tell Us About the Transmission of Buddhism to China (and Vice Versa)."

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Conference on Religion, Law, and the Public Sphere, February 16-18, 2007.

Beijing University, Conference on "Harmony in Discord: Buddhism as a Means of Integration across Cultures," November 24-25, 2006. Presentation: "Cultural Fusion: Literary and Rhetorical Antecedents of the Gonggan Literature."

Yale University, Conference on "The Senses of Religion: Knowledge, Miracles, Worship, and Sensory Experience in the World's Religions," October 27-29, 2006.

Asian Art Museum of San Francisco, Olive Rose Memorial Lecture, May 26, 2006. "What, If Anything, Is Zen Art?"

Yale University, Workshop on "Sand, Stones, and Stars: Nature in the Religious Imagination of Asia," April 21-23, 2006. Presentation: "Do Earth, Trees, Tiles, and Stones Equal Nature?"

Duke University, Nichols Distinguished Lecture, March 31, 2006. Presentation: "How to Read a Chan/Zen Case."

Princeton University, Buddhist Studies Workshop, February 20, 2006. Presentation: "How to Think with Zen Koans."

Society for Asian Art, Arts of Asia Lecture Series, San Francisco, October 21, 2005. Presentation on Chinese Buddhism.

Hsi Lai University, Conference on the Study of Chinese Buddhism, Los Angeles, June 10-12, 2005. Respondent.

UCLA Center for Buddhist Studies, April 29, 2005. Presentation: "The Ritual Function of the Dunhuang Grottoes."

Yale University, Workshop on "Manipulating Magic: Sages, Sorcerers, and Scholars," April 16-17, 2005. Presentation: "The Magic of Magic."

University of British Columbia, Department of Religious Studies, October 14, 2004. Presentation: "Ritual, Play, and Enlightenment." Conference on Buddhist Sacred Sites in Asia, October 15-16,

2004. Presentation: "The Enigma of the Dunhuang Grottoes."

Mogao Caves, Dunhuang, China, Dunhuang Art and Society: 3rd International Seminar. July, 2004.
Lectures: "The Ritual and Institutional Function of the Dunhuang Caves 1: The Evidence," and "The Ritual and Institutional Function of the Dunhuang Caves 2: What Ritual Theory Can Tell Us."

Stanford University, Center for Buddhist Studies, October 20, 2003. Presentation: "Ritual, Play, and Enlightenment."

University of Chicago, workshop on Visual & Material Perspectives on East Asia, May 9, 2003.
Presentation: "Rethinking Tantra."

Yale University, conference on Buddhist Studies on East Asia: Retrospects and Prospects, April 11-13, 2003. Presentation: "What Is the Baby and What Is the Bath Water?"

University of British Columbia, conference on Buddhist monasticism, February, 2003. Discussant.

Honolulu Academy of Arts, symposium entitled "Matrices and Weavings: Expressions of Shingon Esoteric Buddhism in Japanese Culture and Society," held in conjunction with the School of Hawaiian, Asian, and Pacific Studies and the Department of Religion at the University of Hawai'i, August 31 to September 2, 2002. Presentation: "Thinking through Shingon Ritual."

University of British Columbia, conference on Buddhism and Peace, May 25-27, 2002. Discussant.

Boston University, conference on "Tantra and Daoism: A Multidisciplinary Conference on the Globalization of Religion and Its Experience," April 19-21, 2002. Presentation: "On the Status of Tantra in Medieval China."

University of Chicago, conference on "Thinking in Cases: Special Knowledge in Chinese Cultural History," October 12-14, 2001. Presentation: "How to Think with/about Ch'an *Kung-ans*."

Princeton University, Department of Religion, September 24, 2001. Presentation: "Japanese Shingon Art in Its Ritual Context."

Mogao Caves, Dunhuang, China; Dunhuang Art and Society: 2nd International Seminar. July, 2001.
Lectures: "On the Role of Images in Chinese Buddhist Ritual," and "What Makes a Tantric Buddhist Image 'Tantric'?"

Numata conference on "Images in Asian Religions: Texts and Contexts," McMaster University and University of Toronto, May 10-12, 2001. Discussant.

University of California at Los Angeles, March 9, 2001. Presentation: "How to Think about Zen Koans: Zhaozhou's Dog and the Buddha-nature of Insentient Things."

University of Toronto, Numata Lecture, November 3, 2000. Presentation: "How to Think about Zen Koans."

Dartmouth-Georgetown workshop on Translation, Dartmouth University, Sept. 23, 2000.
Presentation: "On the Commensurability of Medieval Zen Buddhism."

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, workshop on "Critical Moments in Chinese Buddhism,"

October 29-30, 1999. Presentation: "Chao-chou's Dog and the Buddha-nature of Insentient Things."

Harvard University, China Colloquium, May 3, 1999. Presentation: "How to Read a Zen Kōan: Zhaozhou's Dog and the Buddha-nature of Insentient Things."

Freie Universität Berlin, symposium entitled "Japanese Religions in Europe," March 15-17, 1999. Presentation: "The Uses and Abuses of Zen in the Twentieth Century."

Yale University, East Asian Studies Colloquium Series, February 18, 1999. Presentation: "Buddhism as Technology: The Ritual Treatment of Buddhist Icons in China and Japan."

Kyoto National Museum, symposium entitled "Art and Prayer at the Imperial Court," in conjunction with the exhibition "Elegance, Virtue, and Ceremony: Buddhist Paintings in the Heian and Kamakura Periods," November 14, 1998. Presentation: "On the Ritual Function of the Ryōkai Mandala."

The Cleveland Museum of Art, symposium entitled "Instruments of Enlightenment as Works of Art," September 26, 1998. Presentation: "How to Worship a Buddhist Icon."

Kobul-Ch'ongnim, Paekyang-sa Buddhist Monastery, Chonnam, Korea, conference on Korean Son Buddhism, August 19-22, 1998. Presentation: "On the Buddha-nature of Insentient Things (or: How to Think about a Ch'an *Kung-an*)."

University of Vermont, Religion Department, symposium on "Cognitive Science and the Study of Religious Experience: A Working Symposium on Theory and Method," June 4-7, 1998. Presentation: "The Rhetoric of Experience and the Study of Religion."

Stanford University, 1997-98 Evans-Wentz Symposium, "New Approaches to Buddhism: Three Recent Works," February 27, 1998. Discussant.

Stanford University and San Francisco Zen Center, conference on "Zen Practice, Zen Scholarship," November 19-20, 1997.

McMaster University, Conference on Material Objects and the Quest for Perfection in Buddhism, Oct. 24-25, 1997. Presentation: "Where Does Adornment End and the Sacred Object Begin? A Meditation on the Paradoxical Logic of Frames."

Western Michigan University, Visiting Scholar, October 13-15, 1997. Public Lecture: "On the Allure of Buddhist Relics."

The Third Chung-Hwa International Conference on Buddhism, Chung-Hwa Institute of Buddhist Studies, Taipei, July 19-21, 1997. Presentation: "What (If Anything) Is Ch'an-Pure Land Syncretism?"

Japan Society, Symposium on Buddhism in America, in conjunction with FIX the New York, June 2, 1997. Presentation: "Whose Buddhism?"

Princeton University, Department of Religion, October 8, 1996. Presentation: "Experience."

Harvard University, Center for the Study of World Religions, and the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, symposium entitled "Religious Experience of Buddhist Ritual Art," in conjunction with the exhibition "Object as Insight: Japanese Buddhist Art and Ritual," May 24-25, 1996. Presentation: "Patriarchal

Portraits as Reliquaries and Holy Icons.”

Harvard University, Buddhist Studies Forum, March 18, 1996. Presentation: “What are Tantric Practitioners Actually Doing When They Are ‘Visualizing’? Or: Entertaining the Thought of Radical Incommensurability.”

University of California Los Angeles, Center for Japanese Studies, May 8, 1995. Presentation: “Ritual Debate, Memorial Rites, and Sectarian Identity in Contemporary Hossō Buddhism.”

University of Toronto Seminars on Buddhism, March 17, 1995. Presentation: “The Ritual Life at Kōfukuji, a Japanese Hossō Temple.”

Columbia University, Institute for East Asian Studies, February 27, 1995. Presentation: “Whose Zen?”

Taniguchi Foundation International Symposium, “Zen, the Kyoto School, and Nationalism,” Santa Fe, New Mexico, March 9-13, 1994.

Kuroda Institute, Spring Seminar, Los Angeles, April 24, 1993. Presentation: “Looking at Zen through Monastic Art, Architecture, and Ritual” (with T. Griffith Foulk and Elizabeth H. Sharf).

Institute of Buddhist Studies, symposium on “The Japanese Imperial System and the Religious Culture of Japan,” Berkeley, May 2, 1992. Presentation: “*Kokutai* Ideology and the Construction of Zen Spirituality.”

Bukkyō University, Kyoto, Fall, 1986. Guest lecture series on Chinese Buddhist history.

ACTIVITIES AT MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in San Diego, November, 2007. Chair on the panel “Establishing ‘authority’ and ‘legitimacy’ in 20th century Chinese Buddhism. Modernity in the reinvention of tradition.”

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Washington, November, 2006. Discussant on the panel “Tantric Buddhism through the Chinese Looking Glass.”

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Chicago, November 21, 2005. Chair on the panel “Re-Wri(gh)ting: Reading Chinese Buddhist Biographies after Wright.”

14th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, London, August 29-September 3, 2005. Presentation: “Tantric Buddhist Practice at the Mogao Caves.”

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in San Antonio, Texas, November 20-23, 2004. Paper presentation: “The Enigma of the Dunhuang Caves.”

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Atlanta, November 24, 2003. Paper presentation: “Does Indian Buddhism Have Tantra Nature? A Response to Ronald M. Davidson’s *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*.”

Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting in Chicago, March 23, 2001. Discussant on the panel “Danger and Protection in Asian Religions.”

Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting in San Diego, March 11, 2000. Discussant on the panel "The Reception of Images in Asian Religions."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Boston, November, 1999. Discussant on the panel "Buddhist Concepts of History."

12th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Lausanne, Switzerland, August 23-28, 1999. Organizer and discussant at the panel "What Is a Sūtra? Reflections on the Material Culture of Buddhist Sūtras in China and Japan."

Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting in Boston, March 14, 1999. Paper presentation: "The Rhetoric of Idolatry and the Study of Buddhist Icons."

Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting in Washington, D. C., March 26-29, 1998. Discussant on the panel: "Patronage and Audience in Later Chinese Religious Narrative."
University of Michigan, Center for Chinese Studies Colloquium Series, February 24, 1998.
Presentation: "What, If Anything, Was Chinese Pure Land Buddhism?"

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in San Francisco, November, 1997. Organizer and discussant at the panel "Monks and Their Money."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Chicago, November, 1996. Seminar presentation: "Why Relics?"

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Philadelphia, November 19, 1995. Paper presentation: "Some Observations on the Notion of Transmission in Ch'an."

Conference on "The Cultural Work of Ritual, Symbol, and the Other," University of Western Ontario, February 10-11, 1995. Paper presentation: "My Chair is Bigger than Yours: On the Ritual Enactment of Zen Enlightenment."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Chicago, November 21, 1994. Paper presentation: "Visualization and *Mandala* in Shingon Buddhism." (An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference "The Japanese Buddhist Icon in Its Monastic Context," McMaster University, March 17-20, 1994.)

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Chicago, November 21, 1994. Respondent on the panel "Religious Meanings of Emptiness: A Tribute to F. J. Streng."

Participant in the Seminar on "Buddhist Relic Veneration," held in conjunction with the annual meetings of the American Academy of Religion, 1994-97.

Panelist in the Tantric Studies Consultation held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion, Chicago, November 20, 1994.

11th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Mexico City, October 25, 1994. Paper presentation: "The Hossō Jion-e."

Conference on "Mediations: Miracles and Magic," McMaster University, November 26, 1993. Respondent.

20th Anniversary Conference for the Group in Buddhist Studies, University of California, Berkeley, October 28-30, 1993. Participant on the panel "Historical Studies."

University of Michigan, symposium on "The Ritual Domestication of Death in Asia," Ann Arbor, April 9-10, 1993. Presentation: "On the Ritual Use of Ch'an Portraiture in Medieval China."

Association for Asian Studies, annual meeting in Los Angeles, March 27, 1993. Organized the panel "New Wine in Old Bottles? 'Traditional' Japanese Buddhism in the Modern Context." Paper presentation: "*Satori* for the Masses: Sanbōkyōdan and the Zen of Japanese New Religions."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in San Francisco, November 21, 1992. Paper presentation: "Buddhism and the Rhetoric of Experience."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in San Francisco, November 22, 1992. Participant on the panel: "A Discussion of Bernard Faure's *The Rhetoric of Immediacy*."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in Kansas City, November 24, 1991. Paper presentation: "'Occidentalism' and the Zen of Japanese Nationalism."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana, November 18, 1990. Paper presentation for the Ritual Studies Group: "Ch'an Buddhist Mortuary Rites and the Mummification of Abbots."

International Congress of Asian and North African Studies, 33rd meeting, Toronto, August 1990. Paper presentation: "Ontogeny and Phylogeny in Shingon Liturgy."

Conference on Buddhism in Canada, Toronto, July 13, 1990. Paper presentation: "The Place of Ritual in the Buddhist Tradition."

College Art Association, annual meeting, New York City, February 15, 1990. Joint paper presentation (with T. Griffith Foulk and Elizabeth Horton): "The Meaning and Function of Ch'an and Zen Portraiture."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting, Anaheim, California, November 20, 1989. Organized the panel "Interpreting Buddhist Ritual." Paper presentation: "Being Buddha: A Performative Approach to Ch'an Enlightenment."

Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, annual meeting (in conjunction with the AAR), November 17, 1989. Respondent on the panel "Reason and Emotion: East-West Perspectives."

American Academy of Religion, annual meeting, Chicago, November 20, 1988. Paper presentation: "Ritual Syntax and Medieval Chinese Buddhist Soteriology."

Canadian Asian Studies Association, annual meeting, Windsor, Ontario, June 9, 1988. Paper presentation: "The Politics of Enlightenment: Shamans, Ch'an Masters, and Strategies of Legitimation in China."

Third International Conference on Buddhism and Christianity, Berkeley, August, 1987. Paper presentation: "Burmese Vipassana Practices and the Laicization of Buddhist Meditation in the West." Discussant: Monastic Encounter Dialogue Group.

The 32nd International Conference of Orientalists in Japan, Tokyo, May, 1987. Paper presentation: "Ritual and Dialectic: A Re-evaluation of the Philosophical Foundations of T'ang Dynasty Ch'an."

Presentation to the Human Science Forum, Kyoto, Japan, May, 1987. "Japanese Tantra and Hossō Monastic Training."

EXTRAMURAL SERVICE

Visiting Committee, Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations at Harvard, 2007-08.

Advisory Board, Yale University-Lanzhou University Dunhuang Institute Exchange Program, 2005-present.

Member of the Editorial Board, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*.

Member of the Editorial Board, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*.

Member of the Editorial Board, "Buddhisms," a series published by University of California Press.

Member of the Editorial Board, Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism and Human Values (published in conjunction with University of Hawai'i Press).

Member of the Steering Committee of the Buddhism Section, American Academy of Religion, 1997-2003.

External Adjudicator for the Buddha Dharma Kyokai (BDK) Canada Graduate Scholarship Competition, 2004-present.

Chair of the Visiting Committee for the external review of the Department of Asian Languages and Civilizations, Amherst College, Fall, 2001.

Selection Committee for Charlotte W. Newcombe Doctoral Dissertation Fellowships, 2001, 2002.

Consulting editor for the Calliope (World History for Young People) issue on Buddhism (March/April, 1995).

Manuscript reviews for: University of California Press, Harvard University Press, Oxford University Press, Princeton University Press, University of Hawai'i Press, SUNY Press, Seven Bridges Press, *Asia Major*, *History of Religions*, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, *Journal of Ritual Studies*, Wisdom Press, and so on.