This article analyzes the Monju kōshiki (Mañjuśrī ceremonials) written by Jōkei (1155–1213) and Eison (or Eizon; 1201–1290), two leaders of Nara Buddhism in the Kamakura period. These texts are illuminating for the study of medieval Japanese religion, as they combine devotion to Mañjuśrī with Lotus Sutra, Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Pure Land faith. I argue that the treatment of medieval devotional cults in many previous analyses obscures the shared contexts of “Kamakura New Buddhism” and the exoteric-esoteric (kenmitsu) Buddhism of the Nara schools, understating the fluidity of identities among deities and practitioners so characteristic of the time. Moreover, these texts serve as powerful examples of a literary and ritual genre widely employed by medieval Nara leaders. I thus use the texts and the kōshiki genre to highlight a creativity and plurality among such Nara monks extending well beyond the common framework of Śākyamuni faith and competitive reactions to new Kamakura movements.
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The Japanese genre of *kōshiki* 講式 is ideal for challenging common distinctions between the elite and popular, text and ritual, and the monastic and lay. *Kōshiki* are a type of liturgical text originating in tenth-century Buddhist circles, proliferating in the medieval period, and still performed in modern Japan. These “ceremonials” are usually devoted to specific buddhas, bodhisattvas, saints, or kami, but they can also eulogize individual scriptures, *waka* 和歌 poetry and poets, or such concepts as the awakening of the aspiration for enlightenment (Sk. *bodhicitta*).¹ As a simultaneously literary and ritual genre, written and enacted for individual and small group practice as well as larger public performances, *kōshiki* illuminate diverse aspects of Buddhist teaching and practice, particularly for the Kamakura period (1185–1333) when the majority of the datable extant texts were composed.

This study analyzes and compares two such Kamakura-period texts, a five-part *Monju kōshiki* 文殊講式 written by the Hossō monk Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213) and a three-part *Monju kōshiki* by the Shingon Ritsu founder, Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290). The significance of this rich liturgical genre has just begun to be explored in Western studies of Japanese Buddhism, and the two *kōshiki* examined here only scratch the surface. However, they form a natural pair and illuminate several key issues in the study of the genre, medieval Buddhist devotional cults, and Nara Buddhism more broadly. First, both were written by leaders of Nara Buddhism in the Kamakura period, underscoring the fact that the most prolific authors of *kōshiki* in the most prolific time of their production were connected to the Nara schools. Second, Jōkei’s and Eison’s lineages were closely linked, and the two texts serve well to highlight shared and differing aspects of their characteristic emphases. Third, each text focuses on the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, whose place in the medieval devotional landscape has not received the attention it merits.

¹*This research was first presented at a conference on Buddhist Training in Japan at the University of Toronto, 18 April 2009, and a panel on “Points of View on the History of *Kōshiki*: Discourse and Performativity of a Liturgical Genre” at the American Academy of Religion annual meeting in Montreal, 8 November 2009. I would like to thank the participants in these conferences, and particularly Dr. Niels Guelberg and Michaela Mross, for valuable feedback on the study. I would also like to thank the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), whose award of a JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowship for Foreign Researchers enabled me to complete the article at the University of Tokyo.

¹*“Ceremonials” is the translation for *kōshiki* used by Niels Guelberg (1993), the leading Western scholar of the genre.
its. Fourth, Mañjuśrī is repeatedly invoked in these and other medieval texts as the deity who engenders bodhicitta, a concept of pivotal importance among medieval Nara leaders and in Mahayana practice across schools, times, and regions. Last, the devotion to Mañjuśrī in these texts combines in varying ways with Lotus Sutra, Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Pure Land faith. This last point, when considered alongside the vast array of deities venerated in kōshiki literature, underscores the radically pluralistic approach to Buddhist practice that is much more characteristic of medieval Buddhism than the exclusive paradigm so often invoked and associated with the new Pure Land, Zen, and Nichiren movements.

To address these interrelated issues, this study will first provide a background sketch of the kōshiki genre and the role of Nara monastics in propagating the genre. I will then briefly introduce the links between Jōkei’s and Eison’s movements, before turning to a detailed analysis of their respective Monju kōshiki. Here, I will pay particular attention to their views on Japan as “a peripheral land in a latter age” and the similar ways in which they exhort and cajole their audiences toward generating bodhicitta. At the same time, I will explore notable differences between the texts and the authors’ characteristic concerns. The study concludes by arguing that the secondary literature on medieval devotional cults often obscures the shared contexts for “Kamakura New Buddhism” and the exoteric-esoteric (kenmitsu 显密) Buddhism of the Nara schools, understating the interpenetrating identities of deities and practitioners that is a hallmark of Buddhist practice in medieval Japan.

The Development and Nature of Kōshiki Literature

It is generally agreed that the kōshiki genre began with the Nijūgo zanmai shiki 二十五三昧式 attributed to Genshin 源信 (942–1017) and associated with the group of twenty-five Mt. Hiei monks he joined in the Nijūgo Zanmai’ e. The version passed down in the Tendai school includes a collectively signed vow (ganmon 願文) by twenty-one members of the group dated 986/5/23. Yamada Shōzen—one of the leading contemporary specialists of kōshiki—suggests that it is reasonable that the kōshiki was also composed around this time, the date of the founding of the assembly of twenty-five (Yamada 1995, 23).2 These origins are significant for the study of kōshiki and their relationship to early medieval devotional practices for several reasons. The assembly of twenty-five vowed to establish karmic

2. Though it is quite plausible for a version of the Nijūgo zanmai shiki to have been composed around this time, for a more detailed analysis of the various versions of this kōshiki and their dating, see Horton 2001, 104–077. As Horton points out, because this kōshiki was modified many times in the Heian (794–1185) and Kamakura periods, there is no definitive version, and (as Yamada also indicates) many questions surround the attribution to Genshin.
bonds, support each other as “good spiritual friends” (zenchishiki 善知識), and practice the nenbutsu 念仏 together monthly. In particular, they focused on preparing for death and attaining birth in the Pure Land, and to facilitate this, they pledged to attend the deathbed of any member becoming fatally ill. The kōshiki 供養 reflects these concerns, as it centers on devotion to Amida Buddha and was to be performed monthly by the group, thereby helping forge karmic bonds with each other and with Amida. Although the object of devotion would come to vary greatly among kōshiki, this function of providing a concrete liturgy for establishing karmic bonds with the object of devotion and among likeminded practitioners remained consistent. Many kōshiki, such as Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki examined here, would show a similar concern with deathbed practices and rebirth in one of various purified realms.

The nature and form of kōshiki, while also showing some variation, similarly found a blueprint in the Nijūgo zanmai shiki. As with this text, most kōshiki aim to explicate scriptural passages and teachings associated with the object of devotion in a readily comprehensible format. Unlike other sermons or sutra explanations (sekkyō 説教), however, the text of the “reading” (kō 講) was fixed. Although usually written in Chinese (kanbun 漢文), the texts were read by ceremony leaders in vernacular Japanese or Sino-Japanese hybrid form (wakan konkōbun 和漢混交文), helping make them more accessible. When kōshiki were conducted as a group performance, the other monastics gathered would chant in chorus the Chinese or Sanskrit verses of praise (kada 伽陀; Sk. gāthā) that were interspersed throughout the kōshiki. Kōshiki texts generally began with a communal obeisance (sōrai 総礼), which included the first verses, and an indication of the subsequent sequence of rites. These opening rites were followed by a pronouncement of the intentions for the ceremony (hyōbyaku 白表). After the pronouncement, the text was commonly divided into three or five sections (dan 段), but kōshiki could be as short as one section, consisting only of a hyōbyaku, or as long as nine sections. Both the pronouncement and any ensuing sections constitute the fixed reading and are usually collectively called the shikimon 式文. The sections were divided by such performative elements as the chanting of the verses of praise or courtly music, including bugaku 舞楽 or saibara 催馬楽 melodies. When held indoors, performances were usually conducted before a painted image, although sculptures could also be used to represent the object of devotion. There are also records of theatrical outdoor performances. For example, in performances of the Ōjō kōshiki 往生講式 by the Tōdaiji 東大寺-affiliated monk Yōkan 永観 (1033–1111), monks were said to have worn bodhisattva masks and proceeded from

3. On the kō of kōshiki as a “reading,” see Guelberg 1993, 268, 267, and Ford 2006, 74. See Bouchy 1987, 260–61, on the evolution of the term kō, from indicating a “ceremony and discourse” in the early Heian period to a late medieval sense of “confraternity.”
the temple hall, which represented the Gokuraku 極楽 Pure Land, to welcome and guide audience members gathered in a hut representing this sahā world. The Kegon-Shingon monk Myōe 明恵 (1173–1232) was particularly celebrated for his outdoor performances (Guelberg 1993, 265; Yamada 1995, 17–20).

Also noteworthy as a blueprint for practice in the apparently first kōshiki in Japan is the diversity of practitioners among the monastic group that formed the assembly of twenty-five. As Sarah Horton has explained, the monks in the original group ranged from twenty-four to sixty-two years old, from those of lofty rank to those with few significant accomplishments. Such diversity of stature and age remained the norm even when new members were soon added. These new members included one about ten years old and such elites as Genshin himself and Retired Emperor Kazan 花山 (r. 984–986), who had by then taken the tonsure (Horton 2001, 100, 117–21). Although the assembly of twenty-five was limited to monastic members, kōshiki performances would quickly come to include mixed groups of monastic and lay. The Seigan kōshiki 誓願講式 authored by the Tendai monk Myōken 明賢 (1026–1098) appears to be one example, as does the Rokudō kōshiki 六道講式 that is largely an abbreviated version of the Nijūgo zanmai shiki (Yamada 1995, 27–30; Ford 2005, 46–47). These mixed assemblies, and particularly performances led by such adepts as Myōe, were celebrated in engi 縁起 (origin accounts), setsuwa 説話 (tale literature), and hagiographic records.

Perhaps because of this development, scholars have tended to emphasize the lay involvement in kōshiki assemblies, viewing the genre and its simplified lectures and practices as a “new media” for spreading Buddhist teachings among the general populace (Guelberg 1993; Fujimori and Yoneyama 1994; Yamada 1995; Ford 2005). There is certainly some truth to this. But as the monastic diversity of the assembly of twenty-five should remind us, it is not only the lay who can benefit from Buddhist training through an accessible lecture-ritual format. We must always keep in mind the great diversity of practitioners in premodern monastic establishments, from child novices, to worker and attendant monks, to learned scholars and aristocratic elites. Moreover, when we look at the contents of individual kōshiki, the picture of them as addressed to mixed groups of monastic and lay begins to shift.

For example, one of the leading authors of kōshiki in the late Heian period was the Shingon monk Kakuban 觉鑁 (1095–1143), who is credited with sixteen. Most of these, however, do not appear to be designed for large groups of practitioners but instead for his own veneration of the deity (Yamada 1995, 35). Similarly, based on the evidence from Jōkei’s colophon, his Hosshin kōshiki 発心講式 seems to have been written for his own daily practice.4 Again, James Ford, like

4. The colophon is printed in Taishō Daigaku 2000, 278–79, and followed by an analysis by Yamada. The full text of the kōshiki and the colophon can be found on 45–60.
many scholars writing on kōshiki, has tended to emphasize the significance of the lay involvement in his introductions to the genre. It is noteworthy, however, that when he turns to the specific kōshiki he translates, Jōkei’s five-part Miroku kōshiki 弥勒講式, he comments that “this text seems to have been written for a specifically Hossō monastic audience” (Ford 2005, 55). As we will see, although the doctrinal parts of Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki are more general, there are also indications here that Jōkei may have been primarily addressing his remarks to monastics. The same holds true for Eison’s Monju kōshiki.

My point is not to deny that many kōshiki were in fact addressed to, or performed before, mixed groups of lay and monastics. Rather, I wish to emphasize that we should not let the prominence of the relatively few kōshiki performances celebrated in premodern sources speak for the whole of the genre. For most kōshiki, we simply do not have detailed records concerning their performances or audiences. That should not deter us, however, from the more painstaking task of making evaluations at the level of individual kōshiki, based on careful investigation of their contents and any records we may have for them. When we do, I suspect we will find that here—as in many other areas of Buddhism—much of what we term “popular” and link to lay-oriented practices is equally relevant to our understandings of “elite” or more strictly monastic audiences.5

Nara Monastics and Kōshiki Literature

As the preceding sketch of the development of kōshiki literature shows, although the genre appears to have begun among Tendai monks with particular interests in Pure Land practices, it soon spread to other groups, including Shingon practitioners and monastics associated with the Nara schools. The object of devotion would similarly diversify. In his still-valuable overview of the kōshiki genre, Yamada (1995, 40) indicated that, among those taking a buddha as their object of devotion, Amida was by far the most frequently venerated buddha. However, kōshiki study—sparked largely by Yamada’s own efforts—has advanced considerably since then, and an investigation of the kōshiki in Niels Guelberg’s thorough online database reveals a different picture. Based on Guelberg’s classifications, out of 372 kōshiki he has listed, only 14 take Amida as their primary object of devotion, while 55 are devoted to Śākyamuni Buddha. When we extend our analysis to include bodhisattvas and other deities and saints, the picture

5. In this regard, note that a discussion of a reference to the term kura 求羅 in Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki can be found in a record by Kōin 光胤 (1396–1468) of sermons and discussions on the Yuishikiron 唯識論 held at Kōfukuji’s Tōhoku’in 東北院 in 1437; see Yuishikiron kikigaki 唯識論聞書, t 2264 66: 65a12–15. The reference to the kōshiki in this text shows that it was used in debates by Kōfukuji scholar–monks in the early fifteenth century (I am grateful to Niels Guelberg for this reference).
becomes even more diverse. There are no less than 19 devoted to Kannon in his (or her) varying forms, 12 to Jizō, 9 to Mañjuśrī, and 7 to Maitreya, just to name some of the more popular bodhisattvas. Many are also devoted to such guardian deities, heavenly beings, and saints as Aizen 異染 (8), Benzaiten 辨財天 (12), and Shōtoku Taishi 聖徳太子 (16). And lest we think this is a purely “Buddhist” phenomenon, local gods and honji suijaku 本地垂迹 thought are also well represented by many kōshiki devoted to kami, either individually or as a group. Of course, these numbers depend on how we classify certain kōshiki,7 and many kōshiki devoted to a deity other than Amida, or to a particular scripture or practice, will still show Pure Land faith. It is fair to say, however, that the remarkable diversity of such objects of devotion indicates that the genre extends well beyond Pure Land faith, particularly exclusive Pure Land faith.

This diversity reflects the plurality of devotional practices that, I argue, has always been more representative of Japanese Buddhism than the exclusive movements originating in the Kamakura period.8 It also reflects the proliferation of the genre among medieval Nara monastics committed to maintaining this pluralism before, during, and after the rise of such exclusive movements. Notably, two of the three most prolific authors of kōshiki are the Nara monks Jōkei and Myōe, with thirty and sixteen attributed to them respectively. Although we cannot always trust the author attributions for kōshiki, this tends to be most true for those attributed to the earliest reputed authors, such as Kūkai 空海 (774–835), Saichō 最澄 (767–822), and Genshin. Those listed for Jōkei and Myōe in Guelberg’s database have already gone through a certain amount of vetting based on original colophons and other records, and closer text-critical investigation of their content has affirmed the attributions for many, particularly Jōkei’s.

Eison was not as prolific as these two earlier leaders of medieval Nara Buddhism, but my investigation of the two kōshiki listed for him in Guelberg’s database (a Shōtoku Taishi kōshiki 聖徳太子講式 and the Monju kōshiki) suggests that these are also authentically attributed. Also noteworthy is that the Genroku 元禄 period (1688–1704) Saidai chokushi Kōshō Bosatsu gyōjitsu nenpu 西大勅諡興正菩薩行實年譜 (hereafter Nenpu) numbers among the texts authored by Eison these two kōshiki as well as ones dedicated to Benzaiten, Daikokuten 大黒天, and Nanzan 南山 [Risshi 律師].9 Other evidence for the performance and author-

---

6. These numbers are based on the classifications in Guelberg’s database (Guelberg 2006), accessed 15 February 2010.

7. As one example, we might cite the many kōshiki centering on the veneration of relics, which Guelberg includes in the Śākyamuni group.

8. On this point, see also Ford 2006, 205.

9. See seds, 201. The Nanzan kōshiki presumably refers to Nanzan-risshi, or Daoxuan 道宣 (596–667), considered the founder of the Nanzan (Ch. Nanshan) Ritsu tradition Eison was said
ship of *kōshiki* by Eison and his first-generation disciples includes the record of Eison’s influential trip to Kamakura in 1262, which reports that his group held “lectures” (*kō* 講) for the Buddha’s nirvana and for relics en route, on 2/15; for Shōtoku Taishi on 2/22 (also en route) and 5/22; for Mañjuśrī on 3/25 and 4/25; and for the Buddha’s son, Rāhula, on 7/14.10 Our earliest biography of Eison’s most famous disciple, Ninshō 忍性 (1217–1303), notes that he regularly recited a *Monju kōshiki*,11 and it seems likely that this was the one Eison composed. In addition, Eison’s disciple A’ichi 阿一 left behind a *kōshiki* devoted to Eison himself.12 Further indication of the significance of *kōshiki* in Eison’s Saidaiji 西大寺 order can be found in the many *kōshiki* from the medieval and early modern periods that are listed in the catalogue of scriptures held by the temple (Inagi 1998). Last, the 1322 liturgical calendar *Hokke metsuzaiji nenjū gyōji* 法華滅罪寺年中行事 of the Nara convent Hokkeji 法華寺, which was also affiliated with Eison’s movement, numbers many *kōshiki* among its regular rites, including a *Monju kōshiki* and a *Shōtoku Taishi kōshiki*. Although the authors of these two *kōshiki* are not mentioned, given the close connections between the convent and Eison’s movement during the Kamakura period, the possibility that these were the ones authored by Eison is again high. For the *Monju kōshiki*, this possibility is further heightened by the discovery of a three-part one copied by the nun Shōin 正因 and donated to Hokkeji in 1293 (Nishiyama 2008, 96), which appears to be the oldest copy of Eison’s *Monju kōshiki* found to date.13

10. See the entries for these dates in the *Kantō ōkanki* 関東往還記, seds, 72, for the nirvana, relics, and first Taishi *kō*; 80 for the second Taishi *kō*; 76 and 78 for the Mañjuśrī *kō*; and 87–88 for the Rāhula *kō* (which was followed by a Rāhula offering service [*ku* 供] the next day, on 7/15). Of course, the *kō* used to identify these rites can refer to more standard lectures or explications of a given topic, rather than *kōshiki* performances, and there are many examples where this is the case in the *Kantō ōkanki* and other records of Eison’s activities. But it seems likely for the rites identified above that the term does refer to *kōshiki*—which were often simply abbreviated as *kō*—considering 1. our records of Eison’s already having authored *kōshiki* for Shōtoku Taishi and Mañjuśrī before his trip; 2. the fact that the Buddha’s nirvana and relics were common objects of devotion for *kōshiki* by this time; and 3. the considerable evidence for Eison’s active involvement in the cults of Śākyamuni, relics, Shōtoku, and Mañjuśrī.

11. This is recorded in the 1310 *Shōkō daitokufu* 性公大徳譜 (Tanaka 1973, 48), compiled seven years after Ninshō’s death by his disciple Chōmyō 澄名. In general, the reliability of this biography is considered quite high.

12. See the *Kōshō Bosatsu kōshiki* 興正菩薩講式, dated 1322/8, in seds, 216–22.

13. I have not yet had access to this manuscript, which is now held by Yakushiji 薬師寺 in Nara and includes Shōin’s colophon, and Nishiyama’s comments on it are brief. But those comments, and my comparison of the facsimile reproduction of the end of the manuscript (Nishiyama 2008, 96), which appears to be the oldest copy of Eison’s *Monju kōshiki* found to date.13
It is evident, then, that medieval Nara monastics were very active in proliferating the kōshiki genre. Indeed, based on the evidence in Guelberg's database, eminent monks of the Nara schools in the early- to mid-Kamakura period seem to have taken over the lead in the composition of kōshiki. Clearly, this was a genre well suited to the traditional pluralism of the Nara schools and the creative efforts of Jōkei, Myōe, and Eison to make Hossō, Kegon, Ritsu, Shingon, and other Buddhist teachings and practices accessible to broader audiences.

For a concrete taste of such efforts and this innovative genre, let us now turn to an investigation of key links between Jōkei's and Eison's movements, followed by an analysis of their respective Monju kōshiki.

Links between Jōkei’s and Eison’s Movements

Although there are also significant differences between them, Jōkei’s and Eison’s Monju kōshiki reveal many similarities, reflecting some of the monks’ shared concerns. Thus before examining the texts, a brief look at the connections between Jōkei’s and Eison’s movements is warranted. Jōkei and Eison were both active in efforts to strengthen the study and practice of the precepts in the Kamakura period. Best known as a Hossō scholar-monk, Jōkei is also renowned for his composition of a vow for the restoration of the precepts in the Jōgen 承元 era (1207–1211),14 and he authored four other texts on the precepts (Ford 2006, 32). Jōkei’s precepts-revival efforts were particularly influential through the construction of the Jōki’in 常喜院 as a center for Vinaya studies at Kōfukuji 興福寺. This cloister was established in 1212 by Jōkei’s disciple Kakushin 觉真 (1170–1243) at Jōkei’s request, and three of the twenty monks chosen as the first students there—Kakujō 觉盛 (1194–1249), Ensei 圓晴 (1180–1241), and Ugon 有厳 (1186–

---

YAMA 2008, 96, plate 25) with the versions of Eison’s Monju kōshiki consulted for this study (see 275 below), suggest that Shōin’s copy does belong to the same line of texts. On the Hokke met-suzaizii nenjū gyōji, for the full text see Ōta et al. 1976–1978, 5: 86a–87b. The references to the kō devoted to Shōtoku Taishi and Mañjuśrī indicate that they are to be performed on the 22nd and 25th days respectively, among the rites “starting in the first month” (86a). The 25th day of the month is Mañjuśrī’s “karmic-affinity day” (ennichi 縁日), and the designation of that day for the Hokkeji Monju kō is consistent with the Nenpu record of the Monju kōshiki performed at Saidaiji (sed5, 129) and with many other Saidaiji-order Mañjuśrī rites. The correspondence here with the Kantō ōkanki records cited above—of the 22nd for the Shōtoku rite and the 25th for the Mañjuśrī rite—is also significant. In addition, see Lori Meeks’s investigation of kōshiki listed in the Hokkeji liturgical calendar; her analysis gives particular attention to those devoted to the Buddha’s disciple Ānanda and to Rāhula (Meeks 2010, 230–40).

14. This text, alternatively referred to as the Kairitsu saikō ganmon 戒律再興願文 or the Kairitsu kōgyō gansho 戒律興行願書, has been translated in Morrell 1987, 7–9.
1275)—would be joined by Eison in a dramatic 1236 self-ordination ceremony at Tōdaiji that established a new Ritsu lineage.

The entries for 1235 and 1236 in Eison’s autobiography that detail the events leading to this ceremony begin with his participation in lectures by Jōkei’s disciple Kainyo 戒如 (d.u.) and Kainyo’s disciple Kakushō 警證 (d.u.), from 1235/1/16 to 2/3. The 1235 entry then shows Eison joining lectures by Ensei on the Shibun ritsu gyōjishō 四分律行事鈔 in the spring and fall of the same year.16 Reflecting particularly on the lectures by Ensei, Eison writes: “After hearing the Ritsu portions [of the scriptures] for these two seasons of spring and fall, looking back on what I had practiced previously, it greatly violated the true dharma. If one does not loathe impure resources, it does not amount to having left the household (shukke 出家). If one does not fulfill the precepts of regulating behavior (ritsu-gikai 律儀戒), one should not be called a disciple of the Buddha.” Particularly important for understanding Eison’s notion of Buddhist training and practice is his conclusion that “Based on these precepts, one can attain the various meditative concentrations (zenjō 禪定) and the wisdom for eliminating suffering.”17 Thus for Eison, the precepts form the basis for the attainment of the other two trainings in the Buddhist scheme of the three trainings (morality, meditation, and wisdom). Also significant is the fact that he explicitly credits disciples of Jōkei for sparking these realizations.18 The debt of his Ritsu thought to Hossō monks would be further attested shortly thereafter.

Having come to believe that both his initial ordination and his observance of the precepts were insufficient, Eison wished to be reordained but thought that the personal and external conditions for receiving an orthodox ordination were lacking. He found an innovative solution, however, in the preparations of Kakujō, Ensei, and Ugon for a self-ordination ceremony that could overcome the perceived absence of pure monks who had properly kept the precepts (and who would thereby be qualified to conduct ordinations). The ceremony depended on

15. Although this is the monk’s name as it appears in the Gakushōki, Hosokawa Ryōichi suggests that it should probably be Kakuchō 覚澄 instead (HOSOKAWA 1999, 66, note 4).

16. The Shibun ritsu gyōjishō (Ch. Sifen lü xingshi chao; t 1804) is a commentary by Daoxuan on the Four-Part Vinaya (Ch. Sifen lü; t 1428).

17. See the Kongō Busshi Eison kanjin gakushōki 金剛仏子叡尊感身学正記 (hereafter Gakushōki) entry for 1235 in seds, 8–9.

18. That said, we must also recognize that in 1234 Eison had found inspiration for his study of the precepts in specifically Shingon texts as well, and Shingon was his primary area of specialization before he began his joint study of Shingon and Ritsu. Here, I am just highlighting the connections with Jōkei’s movement. For Eison’s inspiration in Shingon texts, see the Gakushōki entry for 1234 (seds, 6–8), where he cites fascicle 2 of the Dainichikyō 大日経 (Ch. Darijing; t 848), fascicle 9 of the commentary on the Dainichikyō by Yixing 一行 (683–727) (Ch. Darijing shu; t 1796), and two Yuikai 遺誡 (admonitions to disciples) attributed to Kūkai on 813/5/30 and 834/5/28.
an elaborate series of repentance rites, ordination before an image of a buddha or bodhisattva, and the reception of auspicious signs while dreaming or awake. These signs were used to confirm the purification of one’s transgressions and attainment of the precepts, and the precepts were believed to have been conferred directly by a buddha or bodhisattva. Taking his cue from his Kōfukuji-affiliated comrades, Eison chanted the Prātimokṣa list of precepts for fourteen days (1236/8/11 to 8/24). He then prayed fervently at Tōdaiji’s Buddha Hall throughout the night of the 26th for the attainment of the signs that would enable him, like the others, to take part in the self-ordination. On 8/28, he received the divine confirmation he had been seeking, and two days later, he joined the three Kōfukuji-affiliated monks in the self-ordination at Kensaku 羽索 (or Kenjaku) Hall. After fulfilling the self-ordination rites, Eison and Kakujō became leaders in the trans-sectarian precepts revival movement, with Eison founding his own group of Ritsu monks at Saidaiji and Kakujō heading a group at Tōshōdaiji 唐招提寺. The cooperation among these two groups further strengthened the ties between Eison’s movement and monks associated with Jōkei.

Jōkei’s and Eison’s Monju kōshiki

In addition to Eison’s personal ties with first- and second-generation disciples of Jōkei, he also shared with Jōkei a pluralistic devotion to many deities and saints. Although the two monks’ mutual Śākyamuni faith is the shared devotion most commonly cited in studies of the Kamakura-period Nara Buddhist “revival,” they also both participated to varying degrees in the cults of Maitreya, Kannon, Mañjuśrī, Shōtoku Taishi (c. 574–621), and other Buddhist deities and saints. Among these, Jōkei’s devotion to Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Kannon is the most evident in his activities, while for Eison it is Śākyamuni and Mañjuśrī. But as Jōkei’s Mañjuśrī faith has been little analyzed by previous scholars, and

19. For Eison’s accounts of his participation in the self-ordination ceremony, see the Gakushōki entries for 1236 (SEDS, 9–10) and the 1236/9 Jisei jukaiki 自誓受戒記 inserted in a statue made of him in 1280 (SEDS, 337–38). See also Paul Groner’s helpful analysis (2005, 212–14).

20. In addition to the activities of Eison already discussed, three other apparent links between him and Kōfukuji even before his entry to Saidaiji are worth mentioning. First, Eison’s father was a Kōfukuji scholar-monk. Second, Eison’s training for the exalted gushi kanjō 具支灌頂 esoteric initiation took place at Chōgakuji Ryōzen’in 長岳寺霊山院, and Chōgakuji was a branch temple of Kōfukuji’s Daijō-in 大乗院 in the Kamakura period (see the Gakushōki entries for the 8th and 9th months of 1225, SEDS, 5). Third, the Nenpu indicates that Eison studied Hossō at Kōfukuji when he was thirty (SEDS, 117). Although Eison does not mention this in his autobiography, he does not actually record any of his activities in the entries for ages twenty-nine to thirty-two (SEDS, 6), thus the Nenpu account could be accurate. For additional details on the close institutional connections between Kōfukuji and the Saidaiji order, see Tanaka 1966; Hosokawa 1987, particularly chapter 2; Matsuo 1998a, 185–93; and Ōishi 2004, especially 23–61, 88–126.
the Mañjuśrī cult was so central to Eison’s closely aligned movement, I will focus here on this aspect of their shared faiths.

My translations in this study from Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki are based on the annotated kanbun edition in the Jōkei kōshiki shū (貞慶講式集) (TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 143–60). I have also referred to a 1350 copy from Daikōji 大光寺 in Hyūga Province, titled Monju kōshiki 文殊講私記 (MIYAZAKI-KEN 1973, 47–53), that was not mentioned in the Jōkei kōshiki shū or the Kōshiki Kenkyūkai’s earlier edition of Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki (1994). Although the Daikōji copy does not provide an author attribution for the kōshiki, the contents show only minor differences with the Jōkei kōshiki shū version, and as far as I am aware, the 1350/4/25 date for the copy in the colophon makes this the earliest clearly dated one found yet. The Jōkei kōshiki shū edition is based on a 1917 copy held by Tokyo University’s Shiryō Hensanjo 史料編纂所, with reference to mid-Muromachi period (1333–1568) copies held at Otani University and at Koyasan University (the Koyasan University copy is held on behalf of Kongō zanmai’in 金剛三昧院). The Shiryō Hensanjo version is part of a compilation of Jōkei’s writings referred to variously as Gedatsu shōnin bunsō 解脫上人文草 and Shōnin gosō tō 上人御草等 (which appears to have been the original title). 21 The Shōnin gosō tō held by Shiryō Hensanjo is based on a manuscript now held by Hanazono University and previously by Kōzanji Höbenchi’in 高山寺方便知院. Most Jōkei specialists believe that the texts in this compilation are all genuine writings of Jōkei’s. Sugisaki Takahide has made a careful study of the Hanazono University manuscript of the Shōnin gosō tō and concludes that, although the compilation is not in Jōkei’s own hand, the handwriting style does suggest a Kamakura-period origin and that it was likely made and copied not long after Jōkei’s death (see SUGISAKI 2001, especially 61).

The three versions of Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki consulted for the Jōkei kōshiki shū edition are generally quite similar, with the most notable difference being a shift concerning Maitreya and Tuṣita Heaven in the Kongō zanmai’in version, which I will address in the final two sections of the study. 22

21. The fact that the Daikōji Monju kōshiki was another version of the one in the Jōkei compilation held by the Shiryō Hensanjo was pointed out by UEDA Jun’ichi (1987, 36, note 9).

22. For more details on these three manuscripts, see TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 305–6. Guelberg’s Kōshiki Database also includes a Tokugawa-period copy of a seven-part Monju kōshiki, held by Koyasan University, which he indicates is an expanded version of Jōkei’s five-part one (GUELBERG 2006, kōshiki no. 328). The additional sections include all of the fourth, parts of the fifth, and all of the sixth dan. Shinkura Kazufumi has recently argued that Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki should instead be considered a contracted version of the seven-part one, with the seven-part one representing the earlier tradition (SHINKURA 2008b, 11). I follow Guelberg here. I will address this issue again in the discussion of the variations concerning the references to Maitreya and Tuṣita Heaven.
kōshiki is undated, but Guelberg indicates that the writing style is similar to Jōkei’s 1196 five-part Miroku kōshiki and Jizō kōshiki, and it shares certain passages verbatim with his earliest dated kōshiki, Hosshin kōshiki in 1192. In general, Jōkei’s datable kōshiki are concentrated into three time periods, and Guelberg suggests that the Monju kōshiki likely belongs to the earliest group, those composed by 1196. By this point, Jōkei had secluded himself at Kasagidera 筩置寺 and completed the long process of copying the Daihannya’kyō 大般若経 in six hundred fascicles. As Mañjuśrī was said to have preached this and other Perfection of Wisdom sutras, it is possible that the composition of Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki was connected with this landmark event (Kōshiki Kenkyūkai 1994, 124).

My translations from Eison’s three-part Monju kōshiki are based on a handwritten manuscript facsimile included in the Kōyasan kōshiki shū CD-ROM (Kōyasan Daigaku Toshokan 2001). This copy is dated Tenmon 天文 19 (1550) and is held by Koyasan University.23 Eison’s Monju kōshiki, like Jōkei’s, is undated, but the Nenpu records that it was written in 1246/2 (seds, 129). As the Nenpu is a Tokugawa-period source, we cannot be certain this date is accurate, but that general time frame is plausible based on other activities of Eison’s. By 1246, Eison had recently completed the most concentrated period of his involvement in Mañjuśrī assemblies. From 1240 to 1244, he and Ninshō led eight assemblies for various hinin 非人 (outcast) communities. And on 1246/10/25—about eight months after Eison’s reputed authorship of the kōshiki—he led another assembly, this time a collective one for the various Kawachi Province hinin communities, at Hajidera 土師寺.24 In general, these assemblies entailed the chanting of Mañjuśrī’s name before an image of the bodhisattva, the conferral of lay precepts on the participants, and the distribution of charitable offerings to lepers, beggars, and other hinin. It is also likely that Eison delivered at least brief sermons on Mañjuśrī at these events; a record in his autobiography for an assembly at Ōjō no Ichiba 大路堂市庭 on 1243/2/25 refers to a participant being inspired to leave the household after hearing an origin account for Mañjuśrī offering ceremonies (Monju kuyō engi 文殊供養縁起; see Gakushōki, seds, 18). Surviving dedicatory texts for Mañjuśrī assemblies at Hannyaji in 1267 and 1269 also

23. For a full transcription and translation of the handwritten manuscript, see Quinter 2006, 319–39; translations of a few passages in the present article have been modified from my earlier study. I have benefited greatly in my deciphering of the Koyasan manuscript from the guidance of Ōtsuka Norihiro at the University of Tokyo and from a composite transcription based on various manuscripts in Guelberg’s Kōshiki Database (Guelberg 2006, kōshiki no. 170).

24. Hajidera, the name for the temple Eison used in his reference to the assembly (Gakushōki, seds, 21), is better known as Dōmyōji 道明寺, a temple that subsequently developed into a leading Ritsu convent associated with Eison’s movement. On the history of this temple, and its conversion into a convent under Eison’s influence, see Borgen 2007.
include such sermons. In addition, a vow inserted in a 1280 Saidaiji statue of Eison and dated 1246/1/6 indicates that the text was originally “placed inside the body of the hinin Mañjuśrī” (seds, 340). Although no Saidaiji Mañjuśrī statue survives from as early as 1246, this reference does provide additional evidence for the order’s intense participation in the Mañjuśrī cult from 1240 to 1246. Last, Eison’s Shōtoku Taishi kōshiki is dated 1254/1/28, and this is not too far removed from the reputed 1246 composition of the Monju kōshiki. In any event, the text is largely consistent with Eison’s thought and characteristic passages in his writings on Mañjuśrī elsewhere, as well as other texts reliably attributed to him, and I consider the attribution of the kōshiki to Eison to be accurate.

Turning to the texts themselves, they both begin with the communal obeisance, followed by brief instructions on other preliminary rites for the ceremony. They then declare the intentions for the ceremony in the hyōbyaku. Jōkei’s begins by establishing in no uncertain terms the challenging existential situation that the ceremony aims to redress:

We should loathe birth-and-death. We should loathe it, but we do not yet. We should rejoice in bodhi [Jp. bodai 菩提; enlightenment]. We should rejoice in it, but we do not yet. We are like the children playing in a burning house, unaware and thus unafraid. Again, we are like the blind approaching a mountain of treasures, unable to see it and thus not longing for it…. While transmigrating and reincarnating through countless lives since the distant past, we fall into the three paths and the eight difficulties, suffering and anguishing without respite, unable to bear arousing [the aspiration for enlightenment]. Or we come [to be born] among the heavenly beings, coveting and pursuing, incapable of liberation.

The wicked conditions of our favorable and adverse [circumstances] persist before our eyes; the false conceptions of our attachments and aversions blaze in our dreams. The reversal of permanence, bliss, selfhood, and purity is end-


26. The “three paths” (sanzu 三途) are the three lowest realms of existence: fire (kazu 火途), where demons and sinners dwell; blood (ketsuzu 血途), where animals dwell; and the sword (tōzu 刀途), where hungry ghosts dwell. The “eight difficulties” refer to the eight conditions in which one can be born that make it difficult to see a buddha or hear the dharma. These conditions include: 1. hell-dwellers; 2. hungry ghosts; 3. animals; 4. dwellers in long-life heavens, where it is easy to simply enjoy one’s long life and thus not be motivated to pursue the Buddhist path; 5. residents of Uttarakuru, the continent to the north of Mt. Sumeru, which is similarly too pleasant; 6. the blind, deaf, and mute; 7. the worldly-wise; and 8. beings born in the time between buddhas.
less; the cycle of birth, old age, sickness, and death is limitless. Affections and attachments are like shackles and chains; we are long bound in the prison of the three worlds. Fame and profit are like poison, always afflicting the body and mind in this and future lives. From darkness into darkness, we do not hear the Buddha’s name for ages. Even chance of approach the three jewels, those with faith and reverence are few. (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 143–44)

It is revealing in such passages to see how monks such as Jōkei and Eison preached to diverse audiences of devotees. First, although my English translations can only bring this out partially, there is a poetic quality to both texts and their extensive use of parallel prose. Second, there is much reinforcement of basic Buddhist notions, rendered in readily grasped prose and verse form. Also revealing is the choice of scriptures referred to implicitly or explicitly. For example, the first scripture invoked in the pronouncements by each monk is actually the *Lotus Sutra*, rather than a specifically Mañjuśrī scripture. I suggest that the multiple but always unattributed references to *Lotus Sutra* concepts in these two *kōshiki* reflect a shared awareness that Jōkei and Eison expected their audiences to have.

Jōkei implicitly refers to the *Lotus Sutra* three times in the passages translated above, first in the reference to the children in the burning house, from the famous Burning House parable.27 This is followed immediately by an implicit reference to the Phantom City parable, in which travelers on a steep mountain path to a “place of treasures” have grown weary and are ready to abandon the search.28 The third reference is a direct, though also unattributed, quote from this same parable, when Jōkei laments the journey “from darkness into darkness, without hearing the Buddha’s name for ages.”29

For Eison, the first *Lotus Sutra* reference comes with a more positive spin, reflecting a somewhat different tone at the start of his text. Like Jōkei, Eison is

27. In the Burning House parable, the children of a wealthy man remain playing in their large house even as it begins to burn down around them. Their father lures them out using various contrivances, or “expedient means” (hōben 方便; Sk. upāya). The children are a metaphor for sentient beings trapped in the realm of transmigration, and their father represents the Buddha. See Watson 1993, 56–79, for an English translation of the parable and T 262 9: 12b13–16b6 for the original.

28. In the parable of the Phantom City, a guide induces travelers seeking rare treasures to finish crossing a steep and dangerous path. Not yet having found the treasures, they are ready to give up. But the guide conjures a phantom city and assures them that they can rest there before proceeding on the path to the place where the treasures can be found. In this parable, the guide is the Buddha and the weary travelers are sentient beings on the treacherous road of birth and death. The “place of treasures” refers to the true nirvana attained by followers of the “one Buddha vehicle.” See Watson 1993, 135–37, in prose and 140–42 in verse; or T 262 9: 25c26–26a24 for the original in prose and 26c29–27b8 in verse.

29. This phrase can be found in two verses from the Phantom City parable; see Watson 1993, 121, or T 262 9: 22c24. Jōkei also uses this phrase in his *Gumei hosshin shū* 愚迷発心集 (in Kamata and Tanaka 1971, 306–11), *Hosshin kōshiki*, and other writings (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 154, note 19).
also concerned with establishing the existential challenges his audience faces. The emphasis at the start of his hyōbyaku, however, is more on the great opportunity offered by faith in Mañjuśrī:

Born by chance into a body in the eastern regions, we are fortunate to encounter the teachings of the Western Heavens. Fastening our hopes on the unsurpassed, superior mind, we extend our thoughts to the sentient beings of the dharma-realm. If not now, when will there be another chance? However, the four snakes have differing strengths, and the five aggregates of our temporary castles are easily disordered. The six thieves seek their opportunities, and the seven kinds of sacred treasures are difficult to accumulate.

If it were not for the Great Sage’s empowerment, how could we succeed in arousing the single thought of enlightenment [ichinen no hosshin 一念之發心]? Accordingly, when we search the three worlds for precedents, Mañjuśrī alone has obtained the supreme title of “Mother of Awakening.”

These opening passages are immediately followed by an implicit Lotus Sutra reference. Based on references in the introductory section of the sutra, Eison hails Mañjuśrī as the teacher of both Śākyamuni and Maitreya, the future Buddha:

When we search the ten directions for antecedents, Myōkichi has already been the guide for the various buddhas. The Honored Śākyamuni is the king of the

30. The “Western Heavens” (saiten 西天) usually refers to India in general. As discussed below, in this kōshiki Eison also uses the terms nantenjiku 南天竺 (Southern Heavens) and chūten 中天 (Central Heavens), which can refer to India generally or to the southern and central portions specifically.

31. Shōshin 勝心 refers to the superior or victorious mind that seeks enlightenment.

32. The “four snakes” (shija 四蛇) refer to the four elements composing the body: earth, water, fire, and wind. The reference to their “differing strengths” here suggests that these elements are out of balance, which disrupts the “temporary castles” of our bodies and leads to sickness and death. The “five aggregates” (goun or goon 五蘊; Sk. pañca-skandha) refer to the five elements composing existence, especially what is ordinarily considered a “self”: form (shiki 色; Sk. rūpa), feelings (ju 受; Sk. vedanā), perceptions (sō 想; Sk. samjñā), volition or “karmic constituents” (gyō 行; Sk. saṃskāra), and consciousness (shiki 識; Sk. vijñāna).

33. The “six thieves” (rokuzoku 六賊) refers to the six sense organs (rokkon 六根): eyes, ears, nose, tongue, body, and mind. The “seven sacred treasures” or “seven sacred virtues” (shichishu no shōzai 七種之聖財) considered necessary for Buddhist training are faith (shin 信), the precepts or moral discipline (kai 戒), conscience (zan 慚), shame (gi 愧), hearing the dharma (mon 听), being unattached (sha 舍), and wisdom (e 慧).

34. “Empowerment” here translates kabi 加被—literally, “add and make receive”—referring to a buddha’s or bodhisattva’s power and blessings endowed on another sentient being. This term is close in meaning to kaji 加持 (“add and hold”; Sk. adhiṣṭhāna), which is usually similarly rendered as “empowerment” or “grace.”

35. Myōkichi (or Myōkichijō 妙吉祥 in unabbreviated form) is an alternate rendering of Mañjuśrī’s name. According to Nakamura Hajime, myō (wondrous) refers to Mañjuśrī’s supreme
dharma for the present; gratefully, he reveres his ninth-generation teacher.\(^{36}\)
Maitreya is the lord of the teachings for the future; in the past, he numbered among [Mañjuśrī’s] eight hundred disciples.\(^{37}\)

Immediately following this, in passages showing more clearly Eison’s original appropriation of this Lotus Sutra-based notion, he writes:

After hundreds of thousands of ten-thousand kalpas, we have chanced to encounter the Honored Śākyamuni’s bequeathed teachings. Who, scooping from the stream, would not try to trace the source? After five billion six hundred million years, we will surely journey to the dharma assembly of the Compassionate Master. Why, breaking off a branch, would we not try to return to the roots?\(^{39}\)

Later in Eison’s kōshiki, a direct substitution of Mañjuśrī for Śākyamuni’s role in the Lotus Sutra is striking. In the second section of the main text,
implicitly referring twice to the Burning House parable (the “burning house” and the “white ox”) and once to the Phantom City parable (the guide for those on the “treacherous path”), Eison insists:

If it were not for Mañjuśrī’s dimming his radiance, who would serve as the compassionate father for those in the burning house? If it were not for the transformative workings of his great compassion, who would serve as the guide to save those on the treacherous path? … Exclusively, we pray to the Mother of Awakening for the three times, the Great Sage Mañjuśrī: may you ready your compassionate expedient means and, without fail, hitch up the jeweled carriage of the white ox.

It seems clear in such passages that the *Lotus Sutra* was also seen as particularly useful for establishing the existential situation that Jōkei’s and Eison’s *kōshiki* were meant to address. Although the order in which they elaborated the themes of challenge and opportunity differed, each author did give substantial attention to both sides of the equation. For example, after Jōkei’s initial lament on the difficulties of sentient beings, he more optimistically affirms:

The unsurpassed enlightenment is vast and deep. Even the initial awakening of the aspiration for enlightenment will inevitably become the three wondrous contemplations [sansmyōkan 三妙観].

Again, after a lament on the difficulty of embarking on the buddha-path, he encourages his audience:

have been composed not long before the 1338 *Bosatsu kai senteishō* 菩薩戒潜底鈔 compiled by Dōki 道基. Thus, although this is merely speculative at this point, the use of this particular metaphorical combination in the *Bosatsu kai kōyōshō* could be an implicit reference to Eison’s *Monju kōshiki*. For another application of these metaphors in an early medieval Nara context, see the *Kusharon hongishō* 倶舍論本義抄 (t 2249 739c15) by the Tōdaiji monk Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1278), who also had connections to Jōkei’s movement and was influenced by his Maitreya faith. (I am indebted to Niels Guelberg for the additional references to these metaphors.)

40. Intriguingly, one of the poems about Mt. Wutai 五臺山 preserved among the Dunhuang manuscripts similarly refers to “Mañjuśrī’s burning house”; for the original verse and an English translation, see Cartelli 1999, 237. The reference is found in the poem Cartelli translates as “The Holy Region of the Vajra Grotto,” from the *Eulogy on the Holy Regions of Five Terrace Mountain* (Wutai shan shengjing zan 五臺山聖境讚; manuscript 4617 from the Pelliot Collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). I am grateful to Susan Andrews for this reference.

41. Note that the passages rendered here as “who would serve as the compassionate father for those in the burning house? If it were not for the transformative workings of his great compassion…” (誰為於火宅之慈父、若非大悲之化用者), based on the Kōyasan manuscript, are not found in the Kōshiki Database version (Guelberg 2006, kōshiki no. 170, line 86).

42. TAISHO DAIGAKU 2000, 144. I will examine the “three wondrous contemplations” in more detail in the section on “The Mother of Awakening.”
The origins of all the past buddhas were as deluded beings always drowning [in the sea of transmigration]. From within the lightless egg, they established the superior mind.... Now, the awakening of the aspiration even occurs among hell-dwellers, spirits, and animals. How much more so among those who are born into the human realm and attain the Way? Even those from the “yellow gate” [eunuchs] and those with both forms [hermaphrodites] fall into the ranks of the bodhisattvas. How much more so for the likes of šramaṇas and renunciants [shukke 出家]?43

(Taishō Daigaku 2000, 145)

Perhaps most striking in terms of the optimistic side of Jōkei’s text is the immediately ensuing passage:

Do not protest, “But this land is a peripheral land!”: The country of Japan is replete with [those who have] great capacities. Do not think, “But this time is the latter days [masse 末世]!,” because the teachings of the Māhāyana are spread vigorously. (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 145)

This passage in turn leads us to another persistent theme in the two texts and medieval Japanese Buddhism more broadly, a theme that Mark Blum (2006) has aptly dubbed the “Sangoku-Mappō Construct.”

The Sangoku-Mappō Construct in the Texts

It is common in studies of medieval Japan to emphasize the role of mappō 末法 thought, or the discourse on the “latter days of the dharma,” as a driving force behind the new Kamakura Buddhist movements, particularly the Pure Land and Nichiren lineages. But as Taira Masayuki’s provocative study on mappō views suggests, the increasing emphasis on this discourse from the mid-Heian through the Kamakura periods owes as much if not more to developments in the exoteric-esoteric Buddhism of the Shingon, Tendai, and Nara schools (Taira 1992, 110–53). And as Blum’s study suggests, it may be more revealing to view mappō thought in conjunction with a broader Heian- and Kamakura-period rhetoric on the place of Japan in the Buddhist world of the time. Specifically, views on mappō were often paired with a model of the Buddhist world that emphasized the “three countries” (sangoku 三国) of India, China, 43. The reference to “šramaṇas and renunciants” here is one of the indications that Jōkei may have particularly had a tonsured audience in mind for his text. Also in this regard, see Jōkei’s statement in part two of his text that “Truly, now our forms are those of šramaṇas” (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 148). Similarly, Eison exclaims in the opening pronouncement for his text that “even those with slight faith in the law of cause and effect should repay that debt—how much more so for those who retreat from the world (tonsei 遁世) and seclude themselves? Even those who rarely accumulate a single good deed should possess the merit [from that deed]—how much so for those who leave the household (shukke) and study the Way?”
and Japan. The implications for Japan in this scheme would shift according to the author, but Japan always has a sense of coming last in the sequence of Buddhist transmissions among these countries, as the scheme was based not only on space but time. In this regard, the three country scheme formed a natural pair with notions of a latter-day period of the dharma. This sangoku-mappō construct often gave rise to laments on Japan’s situation as a “peripheral land” in a degenerate age, far removed from India and Śākyamuni’s time. In a frequently seen motif in rhetorics of decline across religious traditions, however, such laments were almost equally often paired with optimistic statements about the continuing salvific possibilities if only this or these particular practices were followed.

Let us see how this construct unfolds in the two texts examined here. It is notable that Jōkei’s first use of the sangoku-mappō construct comes as the explicit denial of its limitations we saw above: he exhorts his audience not to use the claim of being in a peripheral land in a latter day as an excuse to abandon the aspiration for enlightenment and the bodhisattva path. In fact—in an expression of national pride that is one of the forms the sangoku rhetoric can take—he insists that Japan is full of people with great spiritual capacities and that the Mahayana teachings prosper in this land. He immediately follows with a favorable comparison between his audience and two Indian examples. Jōkei first briefly refers to the story of an Indian practitioner who set out to murder one thousand people, based on a heretical teaching by his Brahman master. On the thousandth, the practitioner encountered the Buddha and was converted, attaining the status of an arhat in that same lifetime. The second anecdote concerns a disciple of the Buddha that was so dull he could not memorize a single verse for four months. Yet he too was said to have become an arhat. Jōkei then reminds his audience:

The immediate transformations of delusion and enlightenment are just like flipping the back of a palm. Though we are transgressors, we have not yet mur-

44. Obviously, much of the Buddhist world at the time is omitted in this scheme, and the erasure of Korea’s role in transmitting the teachings to Japan is notable. However, it is fair to say that—inaccurate though it may have been—this scheme does reflect how many premodern Japanese Buddhists chose to view the Buddhist world and the process of transmission to Japan.

45. On such rhetorics of decline in Buddhist traditions, particularly for Chinese Buddhism and the Three Levels movement, see Hubbard 2001.

46. This is the story of Aṅgulimāla (Jp. Ōkutsumara 猿屈摩羅); Taishō Daigaku 2000, 155, note 45.

47. Accounts of this disciple, Cūḍapanthaka (or Šuddhipanthaka; Jp. Shurihandoku 周利経陀), can be found in many canonical and Japanese Buddhist texts. For a specifically Kamakura-period example, see Shasekishū 沙石集 (Sand and pebbles), compiled by Mujū Ichien 無住一円 (1226–1312) between 1279 and 1283 (Watanabe 1966, 93; for an English paraphrase, see Morrell 1985, 104).
dered anyone. Though we may be slow and dull, how could we not recite four verses? ... Even if our aspirations and vows are faint, how could we not have that merit in the end? (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 145)

Also notable in Jōkei’s text is that the “three countries” scheme is explicit, as he twice uses the term sangoku. Much as in his first invocation of the sangoku-mappō construct, however, he uses both references to highlight the widespread availability of the path to enlightenment, and he ties that promise to the specific kōshiki practices and Mañjuśrī’s blessings. In the hyōbyaku, he insists:

In accordance with the empowerment of the Great Sage, our superior minds should be provoked. Who surpasses the Mother of Awakening in elucidating the gist [of the teachings]? Among the three countries, the precedents are truly abundant. Thus some will recite the divine spells [shinju 神呪 or jinshu], and others will chant the jeweled name. Fastening our thoughts and eulogizing, we will long have a bit of merit. (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 146)

In part four, “Eulogizing the Benefits of According with Conditions, “ Jōkei praises Mañjuśrī’s multiple manifestations and salvific activity through the various realms and forms of birth. After suggesting that all who encounter Mañjuśrī, “in favorable or adverse conditions,” will form karmic bonds with the bodhisattva, Jōkei offers the following encouragement:

In the good gate or the evil gate, all reveal the virtues and faults of their likes and dislikes [when they encounter Mañjuśrī]. There is no way they will not enter the gate of bodhi. When we widely investigate the writings of the three countries, Mañjuśrī’s meritorious deeds, spiritual powers, and transformations are truly inconceivable. (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 150)

As we will see in the next section, on Mañjuśrī’s special gift for awakening bodhicitta, Jōkei’s paradigm of the three countries is reinforced by examples of Mañjuśrī’s manifestations that link the spread of the teachings from India to China then Japan. First, though, let us examine the sangoku-mappō construct in Eison’s text.

Although Eison does not specifically use the term sangoku in his text, the discourse of a peripheral land in the latter days and an implicit three countries model is clear. In a rhetorical flourish, Eison uses three different directional terms to refer to India in different parts of the text. First, as we have seen in his hyōbyaku, Eison insists that those who happen to have been born “in the eastern regions” are “fortunate to encounter the teachings of the Western Heavens.”

48. Note that in this sentence, after “meritorious deeds” (zenkō 善動), the Kongō zanmai’in version (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 152) and the Daikōji version (Miyazaki-ken 1973, 52) both add the term “expedient means” (方便 hōben).
While this passage at once reminds the audience of their peripheral location relative to the Buddhist homeland, it also urges them to treasure all the more highly this opportunity and to direct their intentions to the “superior mind” that seeks enlightenment. The second reference occurs in part one, “Eulogizing the Merits of the Name”:

Thus when [Mañjuśrī] was born in a country in the Southern Heavens, he immediately manifested the ten kinds of auspicious signs. Among the worlds of the ten directions where he manifests his traces, he always provides unlimited comfort. Among times, there are none which are not the most wondrous; among places, there are none which are not auspicious [when he manifests].

Eison’s third general reference to India occurs in part two, “Eulogizing the Benefits Adapted to Varying Capacities.” In contrast to the preceding passage, which denies the limitations imposed by time and place, here Eison at first recognizes the greater difficulties faced by his audience. After poetically depicting Śākyamuni’s passing, he laments:

Afterward, the children playing in the burning house were immediately separated from their compassionate father’s beautiful face, and the weary travelers crossing the steep path suddenly lost the inducements of their guide. How regrettable for the Central Heavens—how much more so for peripheral lands! How lamentable for the periods of the true and the semblance [dharma]—how much more so for the latter-day dharma!

Yet such laments only reinforce the indispensability of Mañjuśrī’s manifestations and his replacement of Śākyamuni “as the compassionate father for those in the burning house” and “the guide to save those on the treacherous path.”

Again similar to Jōkei’s text, Eison’s citations of specific examples of those manifestations reinforce a “three country” paradigm and Mañjuśrī’s fundamental role in ensuring the spread of the Mahayana teachings:

At times, [Mañjuśrī] manifests in the shape of Indra-Brahma or a Wheel-King and uses the expedient means of charitable offerings and loving words. At

49. There are two variant traditions of Mañjuśrī’s ten auspicious signs at birth. The first can be found in Amidakyō tsūsansho 阿彌陀經通贊疏 (Ch. Amituo jing tongzanshu), attributed to the Chinese Faxiang (Jp. Hossō) patriarch Cien 慈恩 (also known as Kuiji 窺基 or simply Ji 基; 632–82); see T 1758 37: 337a15–18. The second can be found in the Kō seiryōden 廣清涼傳 (Ch. Guang qingliang zhuan), compiled c. 1060 by Yanyi 廻一 (d.u.); see T 2099 51: 1102b17–22.

50. Note that in this passage, we see another paired reference to the Lotus Sutra’s parables of the Burning House and the Phantom City, similar to Jōkei’s text.

51. Due to the parallelism with “auditors” and pratyekas in the next sentence, I have treated “Indra-Brahma” (Shaku‑Bon 釋梵; referring to the Indian gods Indra and Brahma) as a single unit and “Wheel King” (rinnō 輪王) as another. “Wheel King” is short for “Wheel-Turning Sage
other times, he manifests in the form of an auditor or pratyeka [buddha] and
offers the transformative workings of beneficial acts and cooperative deeds.\textsuperscript{52}
At times, he dwells amid the Five-Terraced Peaks in Cīnasthāna [China] and
instructs multitudinous sentient beings, thereby leading them to the bodhisat-
tva path.\textsuperscript{53} At other times, he travels to countries with and without the Buddha
and spreads the Mahayana, thereby making known the principle of cause and
effect.

Shortly thereafter in that same second section, Eison makes the transmission
from China to Japan explicit:

In that Cīnasthāna’s Dai Province, [Mañjuśrī] appeared as the likes of a poor
woman and began the non-discriminatory grand assemblies at Mt. Clear-and-
Cool.\textsuperscript{54} In this Land of the Sun’s [nichiiki 日域] Yamato Province, he manifested
in the form of a starving man and assisted in the transforming methods of the
Prince of the Upper Palace.\textsuperscript{55}
Mañjuśrī’s virtues—and the specific practices undertaken in this kōshiki performance—again ensure that any limitations suggested by the audience’s place in a peripheral land and a latter day are overcome:

Thus, though we may have been born in the latter days of the dharma, we frequently hear the name of Mañjuśrī—why shouldn’t the evil deeds we committed in the past be erased? Though we may make our homes in a peripheral land, we repeatedly pay reverence to the image of the Mother of Awakening for the Three Times—why should we doubt that we will attain the benefit of encountering the buddha and hearing the dharma? How much more so for each month’s unfailing, diligent practice [of this Mañjuśrī rite]? How much more so for the majestic power of chanting the divine spell?

In the third and final section of the text, “Declaring the Awakening of the Aspiration for Enlightenment and the Dedication of Merit,” Eison brings the point home in equally clear terms. Though again at first giving a nod of the hat to the extra difficulties of practice “in the latter ages” and “a peripheral land,” similar to Jōkei he uses two examples of transformations of lowly practitioners from other lands to remind the audience of their own potential. Eison first invokes the story of Nandā, an old beggar woman who “generated the vow to benefit others,” donated a single lamp to the Buddha, and received a proclamation of her enlightenment.56 He then refers to the story of “Compassionate Child,” or Citong, a once-filial son who committed an unfilial act and was imprisoned with a burning wheel fastened to his head. When the boy—as Eison puts it, “in a body from an evil destiny”—vowed to take on all the sufferings of others imprisoned in the same iron city, the wheel immediately fell off his head. He was ultimately reborn in the Tuṣita Heaven, where Maitreya resides.57 In light of these examples, Eison concludes:

Though the past and the present may be different times, why shouldn’t we set our hopes on bodhi? Though the center and the periphery may be distant places, why shouldn’t we generate the vow to benefit sentient beings?

The Mother of Awakening

It is clear in these texts that many different virtues of Mañjuśrī’s are celebrated, and collectively, such virtues give cause for optimism amid the prevailing discourse on being in a peripheral land in a latter age. These virtues include

56. See the Kengukyō 賢愚經 (Ch. Xianyu jing), t 202 4: 370c22–371c26.  
57. The story of Citong (Jp. Jidō) can be found in the Zappōzōkyō 雜寶藏經 (Ch. Za bao zang jing; t 203). See fascicle 1, record 7, of the Zappōzōkyō (t 203 4: 450c18–451c8) for the original parable and Willemen 1994, 21–25, for an English translation.
Mañjuśrī’s often-noted wisdom, but also his compassion, multiple manifestations, and ability to extinguish transgressions. Most fundamental, however, in these texts is his renowned ability to engender bodhicitta, as recognized in the epithets the “Mother of Awakening” (kakumo 觉母) and “Mother of Buddhas” (butsumo 佛母) used liberally by Jōkei and Eison. There are two loci classici for this conception of Mañjuśrī in Jōkei’s and Eison’s writings. First is the following passage from the Hōhatsukyō 放鉢經, which Jōkei paraphrases in both his Monju kōshiki and Shin’yōshō 心要鈔 chapter 8, “The Gate of the Mother of Awakening” (Kakumo mon 覺母門):

Now, my [Śākyamuni’s] attaining buddhahood; having the thirty-two marks and eighty auspicious signs, majesty, and dignity; and saving the sentient beings of the ten directions is all due to the benevolence of Mañjuśrī. Originally, he was my teacher. In the past, the innumerable buddhas were all Mañjuśrī’s disciples. Those in the future will also be led by his majesty and benevolent power. Just as all the infants of the world have fathers and mothers, Mañjuśrī is the father and mother on the buddha-path.58

Second is the following verse from the Shinji kangyō 心地観經, which is to be collectively chanted according to Jōkei’s text:

The various buddhas of the three times take the Honored Great Sage Mañjuśrī as their mother. The initial awakening of the [bodhi] mind for all the Thus Come Ones of the ten directions is due to the power of Mañjuśrī’s guidance.59

Similarly, Eison quotes the second sentence of this Shinji kangyō passage in the prose portion of part three for his Monju kōshiki. And though not used as a gāthā in the Kōyasan version of Eison’s Monju kōshiki translated for this study, the full fourfold gāthā does occur in other versions of this kōshiki (GUELBERG 2006, kōshiki no. 170). The verses are also invoked in many vows composed by monastics in Eison’s order.60

In addition to these classical references, Mañjuśrī’s pivotal role in Mahayana practice by helping engender bodhicitta can be seen in the two texts’ many references to the “initial awakening of the aspiration [for enlightenment]” (sho

58. Translation based on Hōhatsukyō (Ch. Fang bo jing), T 629 15: 451a14–19, with reference to LAMOTTE 1960, 93–94. For Jōkei’s paraphrase of this passage in the Monju kōshiki, see TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 146–47; for his very similar paraphrase in the Shin’yōshō, see SUZUKI GAKUJITSU ZAIDAN 1973–1978, 63: 350.


60. See UCHIDA 1988, 56, for examples.
hōshin (初發心), the “single thought of awakening the aspiration” (ichinen no hōshin 一念之發心), “joyfully seeking bodhi” (gongō bodai 欣求菩提), the “superior mind” that seeks enlightenment (shōshin 勝心), and of course bodhicitta itself (bodai shin 菩提心, or the “bodhi-mind”). Just to cite a few salient passages, we have already seen Jōkei’s statements in the hyōbyaku concerning the initial awakening of the aspiration inevitably transforming into the “three wondrous contemplations.” Here is his fuller description of the contemplations:

The first is called the mind that loathes and separates from the conditioned [有為], because one loathes the pervasive void of the conditioned. Second is the mind that deeply considers sentient beings, because one saves the exhaustive void of sentient beings. Third is the mind that joyfully seeks bodhi, because one realizes the suchness void of bodhi.61

Interestingly, the same three contemplations appear in part three of Eison’s Monju kōshiki as the “three kinds of superior mind” and the “three bodhi-minds,” but with the order of the last two contemplations reversed.62 This passage is worth quoting in full, as Eison skillfully weaves together the three contemplations and cultivation of bodhicitta as well as the threefold pure precepts that were so central to his movement. It also provides another strong example of the straightforward way that such concepts were broken down in kōshiki:

We should quickly generate the three kinds of superior mind: namely, loathing and separating from the phenomenal world, joyfully seeking bodhi, and deeply considering sentient beings.

First, regarding the mind that loathes and separates from the phenomenal world, all phenomena are impermanent. Impermanence inevitably leads to distress. Because it leads to distress, we should separate from it. Because we should separate from it, we should loathe it. If we wish to separate from distress, we should certainly abandon self-indulgence.63 If we wish to abandon self-indulgence, we should certainly receive the strict precepts. That is why the World-Honored One preached the precepts of regulating behavior [ritsugikai 律儀戒] first.

61. “Suchness void” here translates nyokū 如空, corrected from nyojō 如定 in the edition used in Taishō Daigaku 2000, 144. This correction is based on the Kongō zanmai’in version (152), the rendition of this passage in Jōkei’s Hosshin kōshiki (46), and the Daikōji version (Miyazaki-ken 1973, 48).

62. Jōkei also refers to the three wondrous contemplations in his Hosshin kōshiki with the order of number two and three reversed; see Taishō Daigaku 2000, 46. These three contemplations are also referred to in two texts by Cien, in the same order as the Hosshin kōshiki. See Kongō hannya kyō sanjutsu 金剛般若贊述 (Ch. Jingang banruo jing zanshu), T 1700 33: 130b28–c8; Hannya haramitta shingyō yûsan 般若波羅蜜多心經贊 (Ch. Banruo boluomiduo xinjing yuansan), T 1710 33: 525c22–526a2.

63. “Self-indulgence” (hōitsu 放逸) generally refers to giving oneself over to secular pleasures, such as singing, dancing, or watching entertaining performances.
Next, regarding the mind that joyfully seeks bodhi, all bodhi are constant. Constancy inevitably leads to comfort. Because it leads to comfort, we should certainly realize it. Because we should realize it, we should take joy in it. If we wish to realize it, we should certainly accumulate the provisions [that is, good roots and merit]. If we wish to accumulate the provisions, we should certainly practice all good deeds. That is why the Thus Come One preached the precepts of cultivating all good deeds [shōzenhōkai] second.

Next, regarding the mind that deeply considers sentient beings, all sentient beings are our fathers and mothers. Inevitably, we are heavily indebted to our fathers and mothers. Because we are heavily indebted, we should certainly repay them. Because we should repay them, we should certainly save them. If we wish to repay our heavy debts, we should certainly generate the impartial mind. If we wish to generate the impartial mind, we should certainly benefit sentient beings. That is why the Original Teacher preached the precepts of benefiting all sentient beings (shōshujōkai) third.

These three bodhi-minds, these threefold pure precepts, are the constant teachings of the various buddhas and the direct cause for ensuring the wondrous fruit of the three bodies [of a buddha]. We pray that we will attain it in this life without fail and assuredly not regress in the next.

Eison here ties the issues in the kōshiki to specifically Ritsu concerns. For Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki, the specifically Hossō framework is not as strong as it is in many of his other texts. For the crucial matter of generating bodhicitta, however, in addition to scriptures strongly connected to Mañjuśrī, he does cite a Hossō, or Yogācāra, text in part one:

Moreover, we consider the Yugaron, which states: “The initial awakening of the bodhisattvas’ aspiration incorporates well all the extraordinary good roots of the different aspects of enlightenment. Among all correct vows, this is the premier one.”

He then immediately ties this awakening of the bodhi-mind to the transmission of Buddhism from India to China then Japan by virtue of Mañjuśrī:

Accordingly, before Cinasthāna [China] received the buddha-teachings, Mañjuśrī came and persuaded King Mu of Zhou. Before the Land of the Sun heard of the Three Jewels, Mañjuśrī journeyed and encouraged the Meditation

64. Here, the Kōshiki Database has ri (“separate;” Guelberg 2006, kōshiki no. 170, line 129), but this should be corrected to shu (“practice” or “cultivate”) as in the Kōyasan manuscript.
65. Taishō Daigaku 2000, 147. This passage is paraphrased from the Yugashijiron (Ch. Yujia shidi lun), t 1579 30: 480c6–11.
66. The Daoxuan lüshi gantong lu 道宣律師感通錄 (t 2107), compiled shortly before Daoxuan died, records a revelation from a celestial informant that Mañjuśrī and Maudgalyāyana journeyed to China and converted King Mu to Buddhism (52: 436b25–26). (At that time, it was widely believed
Master Huisi.67 Among the lands in the ten directions, compare [such precedents] and know well: the virtue of the meritorious act of the initial cultivation [of the bodhi-mind] is truly great. (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 147)

Finally, it is clear that the respective audiences for the two kōshiki also can and should generate the bodhi-mind through the karmic connections forged with Mañjuśrī in the kōshiki performance. As Jōkei insists in the next passage,

Fortunately, we count ourselves among the ranks of Śākyamuni’s disciples and have chanced to hear the name of the Mother of Buddhas. The karmic conditions for the “taking-in through great compassion” [daihi no shōju 大悲之攝受] are already ripe. The single thought of awakening the aspiration for enlightenment—how can we not arouse it now? (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 147)

Differences between the Monju Kōshiki

We have so far focused on shared aspects of Jōkei’s and Eison’s Monju kōshiki, but we must also recognize that there are significant differences. The most distinctive aspects of Eison’s text relative to Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki are Eison’s greater emphasis on the precepts and his broader invocation of Mañjuśrī as a bodhisattva of compassion, in contrast to Mañjuśrī’s standard epithet as the bodhisattva of wisdom. Of course, Jōkei does recognize the compassionate side of Mañjuśrī’s activities, in his references to the bodhisattva’s many manifestations and his ability to form bonds among those “in favorable and adverse conditions” and “in the good gate or the evil gate.” This aspect is much more explicit, however, in Eison’s text:

Although his beneficial activity does not distinguish between the noble and the base, he widely mixes with the likes of beggars and hinin. Although his

---

67. Huisi 慧思 (515–77) is considered the second patriarch of the Tiantai school and is reported in Shōtoku Taishi legends to have been an earlier incarnation of the prince. Elaborating on this account, various late Heian and Kamakura period texts suggest that Mañjuśrī and Shōtoku Taishi were linked as teacher and disciple through Mañjuśrī’s manifestation as Bodhidharma appearing before Huisi. For example, the Fukuro zōshi 袋草子, composed by Fujiwara Kiyo SUKE藤原清輔 (1104–1177) c. 1157–58, reports that Bodhidharma, in the form of a starving man, delivered a reply poem (henka 返歌) to Shōtoku Taishi and that Bodhidharma was a manifestation of Mañjuśrī (for the original passages, see Fujioka 1995, 151). In addition, Eison’s Shōtoku Taishi kōshiki 矢部徳士 covers indicate that when Shōtoku Taishi was in China at Mt. Heng 衛山 in his previous life as Huisi, Mañjuśrī transformed into Bodhidharma and encouraged him to spread the dharma in Japan (the text can be found in Ishida 1943, 74). A similar account to Eison’s appears in the Shasekishū 色界集 just a few decades later (Watanabe 1966, 253–54). See also Oishio 1995, 232.
great compassion does not separate the high and the low, he especially pities those who are abandoned or afflicted.

Even in the “three countries” paradigm Eison shares with Jōkei, it is notable that Eison refers specifically to beggars and the poor when highlighting Mañjuśrī’s transformations and the continuing availability of the bodhisattva path. As we have seen, for India, he points to the “poor beggar woman” Nandā as an example of one who has generated the bodhisattva vow and attained enlightenment. For China, Eison indicates that Mañjuśrī manifested as a poor woman and began the well-known practice of holding egalitarian feasts at Mt. Wutai. For Japan, he cites Mañjuśrī’s appearance before Shōtoku Taishi as a starving man.

Differences in Eison’s and Jōkei’s respective citations from the Mañjuśrī Parinirvāṇa Sutra further underscore this differing emphasis. Jōkei and Eison at first each cite a similar section from this sutra, a text that formed an early blueprint for the model of Mañjuśrī as a bodhisattva of compassion in East Asia. The passage they share indicates that sentient beings “who merely hear Mañjuśrī’s name” will have their transgressions from twelve hundred million kalpas removed. The passage continues: “After the Buddha’s nirvana, all the sentient beings who have been able to hear Mañjuśrī’s name or see his image will not fall into the evil paths for one hundred thousand kalpas.” Such sentient beings will constantly be “reborn in the Pure Lands of other directions” and “encounter the buddha, hear the dharma, and attain the receptivity to [the dharma of] non-arising.”

Later in his Monju kōshiki, however, Eison cites the following passage from this sutra, not found in Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki:

The Buddha proclaimed to Bhadrapāla: “The Dharma-Prince Mañjuśrī… turns into an impoverished, solitary, or afflicted sentient being and appears before practitioners. When people call to mind Mañjuśrī, they should practice compassion. Those who practice compassion will thereby be able to see Mañjuśrī.”

The same proclamation from the Buddha, with the same ellipsis, appears in Eison’s autobiography. Consistent with the simplified format of the kōshiki

68. The “receptivity to the dharma of non-arising” (Sk. anutpattikadharmaśaṁti) refers to a state of realization in which one recognizes and accepts that all phenomena are unproduced.

69. The brackets here indicate Eison’s ellipsis from the Mañjuśrī hatsunehangyō passage. The omitted passage reads: “When people call to mind [Mañjuśrī], when they wish to make offerings and cultivate meritorious deeds, then [Mañjuśrī] will transform himself” (t 14: 481a29–b1).

70. This passage is from the Mañjuśrī hatsunehangyō, t 14: 481a28–29, b1–3.

71. See the Gakushōki entry for 1268/9, seds, 34.
genre, however, in the *Monju kōshiki* Eison goes on to provide a fuller and very clear explanation of the passage:

You should know that Mañjuśrī is none other than compassion. To promote compassion, Mañjuśrī manifests in the form of a suffering being.\(^72\) For example, when we see the form of a suffering, ordinary being, if we arouse our compassion, we will see Mañjuśrī afresh.\(^73\) We often see various types of suffering beings; happening to arouse compassionate minds, we will surely see Mañjuśrī. That being the case, we have already been able to encounter invisible and visible good spiritual friends.

Eison and his disciples were renowned for their charitable relief activities on behalf of beggars, lepers, and other *hinin*, and Eison's greater emphasis in this regard than Jōkei's is reflected in the two *kōshiki* analyzed here.\(^74\) Yet it is also clear in Eison's *kōshiki* that this difference is tied to his greater emphasis on the precepts in the text: the passage just cited leads directly into Eison's equation of "the three kinds of superior mind" with the threefold pure precepts of regulating behavior, cultivating all good deeds, and benefiting all sentient beings.

While Eison's specialization in Ritsu is explicit in his text, Jōkei's specialization in Hossō is generally more implicit than explicit in his *Monju kōshiki*. One aspect of the text that does reflect Jōkei's Hossō affiliation, however, is his greater emphasis on Maitreya faith, and again this difference is tied to another noteworthy one between the two texts, Jōkei's greater concern with Pure Land faith. In Eison's text, Maitreya faith is evident, but this primarily appears in the form of a Śākyamuni-Mañjuśrī-Maitreya triad conception that he shares with Jōkei. That is to say, Mañjuśrī is celebrated as the foundational teacher

\(^72\) These first two sentences are also very close to the *Gakushōki* passage interpreting the Buddha's proclamation, but the rest is not found in the *Gakushōki*.

\(^73\) The term I have translated in this sentence as "afresh" is *shin* 新 ("new," or perhaps here "anew") in the Kōyasan manuscript but rendered as *shin* 親 (intimate, familiar) in the Kōshiki Database (Guelberg 2006, *kōshiki* no. 170, line 119). Based on the Kōshiki Database version, the meaning of the final clause would change to one of seeing Mañjuśrī *up close or right before one's eyes* (親見文殊), which would also be appropriate here.

\(^74\) Of course, Jōkei's devotional activities also express compassion toward the impoverished and afflicted, and many examples of this can be found in his *kōshiki* dedicated to Benzaiten (Kusunoki 2002), Kannon (Nishiyama 1988, Ford 2008), and other deities. Moreover, Jōkei's involvement with *hinin* is attested to in his composition of a 1209/10 vow to help construct a Mandala Hall for the Kitayama 北山 *hinin* community, just north of the then-deteriorated Nara temple Hanayaji (for Jōkei's original Chinese text, along with an annotated classical Japanese rendering by Hosokawa Ryōichi, see Buraku Mondai Kenkyūjo 1988, 168–70). Hanayaji later became a significant branch temple of Saidaiji and a center for the Saidaiji order's activities concerning Yamato-area *hinin*; thus here as elsewhere Jōkei's activities may have served as a precedent for Eison's. But it is also fair to say that Eison's involvement with *hinin* was much more sustained than Jōkei's, and this more sustained emphasis is evident in Eison's *Monju kōshiki*.
for the previous and next buddhas of this world. Simultaneously, Mañjuśrī is recognized as a bodhisattva for the present, positioned between those two buddhas. Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki, however, shows a more distinctive link between Mañjuśrī and Maitreya, as he first connects Mañjuśrī faith to Pure Land faith, then uses this to segue to Maitreya. At the beginning of the final section of this kōshiki, Jōkei quotes a sutra passage on Mañjuśrī leading followers to rebirth in a Pure Land: “A sutra states: “Those who call and keep Mañjuśrī in mind, when facing the end of their lives, settled and in accordance with their hearts’ desires, shall all attain birth.” He immediately follows this with a declaration of Maitreya faith: “[We] Buddha-disciples take refuge in Maitreya’s original vow and joyfully seek birth in Tuṣita.” After dedicating the merit from the kōshiki performance, Jōkei prays that “On the evening of the end of our lives, may we dwell in true mindfulness, and at the time of the closing of our eyes, pay reverence to the Honored Maitreya. Together with sentient beings, may we dwell in Tuṣita Heaven” (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 151).

The sudden leap from Mañjuśrī faith to Maitreya is somewhat jarring, and an alternate version of this kōshiki omits the references to Maitreya and Tuṣita, pointing instead to taking refuge in Mañjuśrī’s original vow and seeking birth simply in a “pure realm.” In keeping with this variation, the deathbed prayer then becomes one of paying reverence to the Honored Mañju曼殊 (Mañjuśrī) and attaining birth in an unspecified “pure Buddha country.” In turn, a seven-part Monju kōshiki that appears to be an expanded version of Jōkei’s five-part one shows yet another variation. In the seven-part text, the references to Maitreya and Tuṣita point instead to Amida and the Western Pure Land or

75. As attested by the use of Mañjuśrī’s fuller epithet as the Mother of Awakening for the Three Times (sanze kakumo 三世覺母) in both texts, neither Jōkei nor Eison limit their praise of Mañjuśrī’s salvific activity to the present. But as I have argued elsewhere (Quinter 2006, 158–65), in Eison’s writings at least, the emphasis on Mañjuśrī as the bodhisattva for the present is conspicuous.

76. Although the sutra is not named in this version, the seven-part Monju kōshiki related to this one identifies the sutra as the Darani jikkyō 陀羅尼集經 (Ch. Tuoluoni jing); see Guehlberg 2006, kōshiki no. 328, line 153. A similar passage does appear in this sutra, as one of the efficacious results of performing the six-syllable Mañjuśrī mantra. The text indicates that if practitioners “can complete 108 recitations daily, when facing the end of their lives, [they] shall be settled and attain the sight of Mañjuśrī. In accordance with their hearts’ desires, all shall attain birth” (t 901 18: 839b13–14; see 838c15–839b24 for the full section). It is likely that Jōkei’s quote was a paraphrase of this passage.

77. The start of this sentence could be translated instead as “[This] Buddha-disciple (busshi 佛子),” referring to Jōkei himself. Although Jōkei does in various writings use the term busshi as a self-reference, here, in keeping with the generally collective nature of kōshiki, I have rendered the sentence and the passages that follow in the third person. See also the Kongō zanmai’in version (Taishō Daigaku 2000, 152), which adds the pluralizing marker tō 等 after busshi.

78. These variations occur in the Kongō zanmai’in version; Taishō Daigaku 2000, 152, 306.
Gokuraku (variant designations for Amida’s Pure Land). But the passages in the five-part version used for this study and the Jōkei kōshiki shū, as well as in the early Daikōji copy, are consistent with Jōkei’s emphasis in other writings on Maitreya and the aspiration for birth in the Tuṣita Heaven where the bodhisattva resides. Although such Maitreya faith is of course not limited to the Hossō school, in Jōkei’s case, it is likely that this reflects his Hossō orientation. Jōkei’s Hossō school was based on Yogacara teachings, and Maitreya was said to have been the author of various fundamental Yogacara texts and the teacher of the reputed founder of Yogacara, the fourth to fifth century Indian monk Asaṅga.

That said, the differences between Eison’s and Jōkei’s Monju kōshiki should not obscure the broader intertextuality and shared vocabulary and rites that characterize Jōkei’s and Eison’s movements as well as medieval Japanese Buddhism more broadly. I would thus like to conclude with a few reflections on the implications of the two kōshiki for this shared context.

Conclusions

As we have seen, these two texts centering on devotion to Mañjuśrī also show varying degrees of Lotus Sutra, Šākyamuni, Maitreya, and Pure Land faith. This multiplicity bears particular attention here. I suggest that the treatment of these varying cults in many previous analyses understates the shared contexts of

79. For these variations in the seven-part Monju kōshiki, see Guelberg 2006, kōshiki no. 328, lines 155–56, 159–61. The references to Amida and his Pure Land here, instead of Maitreya and Tuṣita, is the evidence Shinkura cites for his view that the seven-part version represents the earlier tradition. Shinkura (2008b, 11) also suggests that Jōkei may have made the changes himself, as his opposition to Hōnen’s doctrines grew. I am not convinced, however, that this is sufficient evidence for considering the seven-part Monju kōshiki in its entirety as the earlier tradition, particularly the two extra dan. Shinkura also mentions (2008b, 22, note 24), without providing any supporting details, that a six-part Monju kōshiki is Jōkei’s (kōshiki no. 327 in Guelberg 2006). Based on my investigation of the text, although it does show various correspondences with Jōkei’s writings elsewhere, and may have been composed with reference to Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki, the organization is completely different, with considerable variation in content. Further, as far as Guelberg and I are aware, the unattributed Muromachi-period copy held by Koyasan University is the only version of this six-part Monju kōshiki found to date. Put simply, at this stage, both this text and the seven-part Monju kōshiki Shinkura refers to lack the corroborating manuscript support that Jōkei’s five-part Monju kōshiki has, and it is preliminary to attribute them to Jōkei. In general, Shinkura has a much more inclusive view of the texts that we can reliably attribute to Jōkei than do Guelberg and the editors of the Jōkei kōshiki shū.

exoteric-esoteric Buddhism and the new Kamakura movements as well as the fluidity of identities among deities and practitioners so characteristic of medieval Japan. Such shared contexts can be seen in cultic activities, constructions of mappō-sangoku discourse, the development of simplified practices, and many other trends in Japanese Buddhism from the mid-Heian period on. In perhaps the most accurate English-language overview of medieval Buddhism to date, William Bodiford (2006, 171) highlights the “shared vocabulary, rites, and initiations” across lineages, and aptly notes: “Scholarship that too quickly identifies people, ceremonies, or institutions exclusively with one religious identity or another risks overlooking the rich intertextuality, multiplicity of religious referents, and fluidity of identities that constitute one of the prominent features of medieval culture.”

A sometimes dizzying array of substitutions and correspondences among deities is most vivid in medieval esoteric texts and original enlightenment discourse. Yet such shared vocabulary and rites, intertextuality, and interpenetrating identities also abound in kōshiki literature and the Monju kōshiki examined here. The shifting roles of deities in these kōshiki stand out because they are exoteric texts not grounded in original enlightenment discourse and, typical of their genre, are blueprints for devotional practice centering on a single deity. For example, in the pronouncement of intentions for each text, where we might have expected the first scripture invoked to be one centering on Mañjuśrī, instead we found the Lotus Sutra, underscoring the shared vocabulary of the texts and their audiences.

The Lotus Sutra is, of course, most strongly associated with devotion to Śākyamuni. It would thus be easy to attribute Jōkei’s and Eison’s references to the typically emphasized Śākyamuni faith of these Nara leaders. But Eison’s text in particular should give us pause in assuming that Śākyamuni faith was primary. In Eison’s case, Mañjuśrī clearly substituted for Śākyamuni’s role in the Lotus Sutra, taking over in the Buddha’s absence as “the compassionate father for those in the burning house.” Moreover, Eison’s text explicitly recognizes Mañjuśrī as the “source” for Śākyamuni’s teaching stream and the “roots” for Maitreya’s future conversion of sentient beings under the dragon-flower tree.

81. For the most detailed Western-language analysis of this phenomenon in original enlightenment discourse, see Stone 1999.
82. In addition to the shared use of the Lotus Sutra, Shinji kanyō, and Monjushiri hatsunehangyō discussed above, Jōkei’s and Eison’s Monju kōshiki also each paraphrase a very similar portion of the Daijō yuga kongō shōkai Manjushiri senbi senpatsu daikyōōkyō 大乘瑜伽金剛性海曼殊室利千臂千钵大教王経 (Ch. Dasheng yujia jingang xinghai Manshushili qianbi qianbo dajiao wang jing; t 1177A 20: 726b25–27, 726c3–10). The passages in question are based on the second, fourth, and fifth of Mañjuśrī’s ten great vows in this text; for the full text of the ten vows, see 726b10–727a28.
Here is a strong example of how Mañjuśrī faith can be seen to encompass both Śākyamuni and Maitreya faith—in contrast to Matsuo Kenji’s often-stated argument that Eison’s Mañjuśrī faith and his other main cultic activities were subsumed within his Śākyamuni faith.83 Naturally, the centrality accorded Mañjuśrī in Eison’s Monju kōshiki reflects the fact that this is a liturgy for devotion to that deity in particular. Thus I am not claiming that Mañjuśrī faith was always primary for Eison. Such passages, however, remind us of the need to be as flexible in our interpretations of the relative weight of Nara monks’ devotional commitments as they were in their multifaceted cultic activities.

For Jōkei, the most noteworthy “substitution” in his five-part Monju kōshiki is two-tiered. Amida is the Buddhist deity most often associated with deathbed rites, and that may be why the seven-part Monju kōshiki related to this one refers to Amida and his Pure Land when discussing the time of death and aspiration for rebirth. In the final section of Jōkei’s five-part text, however, he insists that those who contemplate Mañjuśrī shall attain birth “when facing the end of their lives.” Yet rather than rebirth in a realm presided over by Amida or Mañjuśrī, we find instead that Jōkei eulogizes Tuṣita Heaven, and he urges his audience to pay reverence to Maitreya “at the time of the closing of our eyes.” As James Ford has suggested for Jōkei (2005, 2006), one context for the emphasis on rebirth in Maitreya’s realm could be rivalry with Hōnen’s exclusive Pure Land movement. At the same time, though, I urge caution against overemphasizing this aspect. Instead I would point to the shared contexts of Pure Land faith and deathbed rites among both older and newer schools.84 For example, Jōkei’s early Hosshin kōshiki includes a section devoted to Amida’s vows, and we can find evidence for his faith in multiple Pure Lands, including Amida’s, throughout his writings.85 His indignation over Hōnen’s exclusive Pure Land practices can therefore be

83. See, for example, Matsuo’s analyses of Eison’s cultic activities in Matsuo 1996, chapter 4, and 1998b.
85. For the Hosshin kōshiki reference, see Taishō Daigaku 2000, 51–53. Note too Nishiyama Atsushi’s argument that for Jōkei, Amida and Kannnon faith were not opposing but complementary, as was often the case in the cults of the two deities (NISHIYAMA 1988, 246). Moreover, pointing to evidence of Jōkei’s Amida faith in the newly discovered Kanzeon Bosatsu kannōshō 観世音菩薩感應抄 and Annyō hōke 安養報化, among other texts, Kusunoki Junshō and his fellow research group member Shinkura Kazufumi have recently argued for Jōkei’s Amida faith, especially in the early part of Jōkei’s career, as one of his core devotional commitments alongside his more commonly cited devotion to Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Kannnon (see Shinkura 2007, 2008a, 2008b; KUSUNOKI 2009). More research is needed to confirm Shinkura’s and Kusunoki’s findings, particularly the fairly strict chronological succession they assign to Jōkei’s devotional foci on these four buddhas and bodhisattvas. That said, thanks largely to their research, there is indeed increasing evidence for the role of Amida faith in Jōkei’s multifaceted cultic activities.
viewed as a reflection of his own Pure Land faith, his anger “that of one who felt that a part of his own tradition had been insulted, not of an outsider trying to discredit a rival school,” as George Tanabe, Jr. (1992, 97) so aptly writes of Myōe. I would thus like to close by suggesting that the broader context for Jōkei’s and Eison’s devotional practices in these texts and elsewhere is a creativity and plurality extending well beyond competitive reactions to the new Kamakura movements. And for the study of Nara innovators in this period, no ritual genre demonstrates that creativity and plurality more clearly than kōshiki.
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