

David QUINTER

Invoking the Mother of Awakening

An Investigation of Jōkei's and Eison's *Monju kōshiki*

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.

KEYWORDS: Jōkei—Eison—Mañjuśrī—*kōshiki*—Kamakura period—*bodhicitta*—Nara Buddhism—*Lotus Sutra*—Pure Land—*sangoku-mappō*

David QUINTER is an assistant professor of East Asian religions in the Interdisciplinary Program in Religious Studies and the Department of East Asian Studies at the University of Alberta.

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 mer-

*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* 顯密) 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* 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 explications (*sekkyō* 説教), however, the text of the “reading” (*kō* 講) was fixed.³ 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* 表白). 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* 舞樂 or *saibara* 催馬樂 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 極樂 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 覚鑊 (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: 651a12–15. 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 愛染 (8), Benzaiten 辨財天 (12), and Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子 (16).⁶ 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* 聖德太子講式 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* 西大勅謚興正菩薩行實年譜 (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

to have revived. As the *Nenpu* is a later record, we cannot always accept its accounts of Eison's activities or the texts he was said to have authored. However, much of the information in this text does tally well with reliable records elsewhere, including the indications of his faith in Daoxuan.

10. See the entries for these dates in the *Kantō ōkanki* 關東往還記, 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* 性公大德譜 (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 (NISHI-

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 覚真 (1170–1243) at Jōkei's request, and three of the twenty monks chosen as the first students there—Kakujō 覚盛 (1194–1249), Ensei 圓晴 (1180–1241), and Ugon 有嚴 (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-suzaiji 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 (SEDS, 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 覺澄¹⁵ (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 Kakujiō, 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 覺澄 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* 金剛仏子觀尊感身學正記 (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* 大日經 (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 羈索 (or Kenjaku) Hall.¹⁹ After fulfilling the self-ordination rites, Eison and Kakujiō became leaders in the trans-sectarian precepts revival movement, with Eison founding his own group of Ritsu monks at Saidaiji and Kakujiō 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.²⁰

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 長岳寺靈山院, and Chōgakuji was a branch temple of Kōfukuji's Daijōin 大乘院 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* 解脱上人文章 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 Hōbenchi'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 The *Monju*

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 笠置寺 and completed the long process of copying the *Daihannyakyō* 大般若經 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 Ōjidō 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* 文殊供養緣起; see *Gakushōki*, SEDS, 18). Surviving dedicatory texts for Mañjuśrī assemblies at Hannyajī 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 BORGAN 2007.

include such sermons.²⁵ 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].²⁶ 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-

25. See the *Hannyaji Monju engi* 般若寺文殊縁起 in ŌTA et al. 1976–1978, 3: 135a–36a, and Eison’s *ganmon* dated Bun’ei 文永 6 (1269)/3/25 in TAKEUCHI 1971–1997, 14: 24–26 (document 10404); this latter text is commonly referred to as the *Hannyaji Monju Bosatsu zō zōryū ganmon* 般若寺文殊菩薩像造立願文, based on the title given to it in SEDS. For annotated translations and analysis of the two Hannyaji Mañjuśrī dedicatory texts, see QUINTER 2007. On the earlier Mañjuśrī assemblies led by Eison and Ninshō, and Ninshō’s influence on Eison’s Mañjuśrī faith, see QUINTER 2008.

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 chancing to 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 graspable 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.³⁰ Fastening our hopes on the unsurpassed, superior mind,³¹ 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.³² The six thieves seek their opportunities, and the seven kinds of sacred treasures are difficult to accumulate.³³

If it were not for the Great Sage's empowerment,³⁴ 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.³⁵ 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. *saṃjñā*), 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* 聞), being unattached (*sha* 捨), 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.³⁸ 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,

wisdom, while *kichi* or *kichijō* (auspicious) refers to the various merits he possesses (NAKAMURA 1981, 1302d, s.v. "Myōkichijō bosatsu").

36. In the introductory passages to the *Lotus Sutra*, Mañjuśrī is depicted as having been Bodhisattva Wonderfully Bright (Myōkō 妙光; Ch. Miao guang) in a previous life. As Bodhisattva Wonderfully Bright, he was said to have been the teacher of the eight sons of the final Buddha Sun Moon Bright. Each of these sons in turn became buddhas themselves. This passage thus led to an interpretive tradition in which the final son, known as Buddha Burning Torch, was said to have been Śākyamuni's teacher and Mañjuśrī was understood as the ninth-generation ancestral teacher of Śākyamuni. For the *Lotus Sutra* passage, see T 262 9: 4a22–b16, and WATSON 1993, 16–17, for an English translation. For three examples of the interpretive tradition based on this passage that explicitly refer to Mañjuśrī as Śākyamuni's ninth-generation teacher, see the *Hokke gisho* 法華義疏 (Ch. *Fahua yishu*; T 1721 34: 481b2–3) by the Sanlun founder Jizang 吉藏 (549–623) as well as the *Hokke gengi shakusen* 法華玄義釋籤 (Ch. *Fahua xuanyi shiqian*; T 1717 33: 922c23–26) and the *Hokke mongu ki* 法華文句記 (Ch. *Fahua wenju ji*; T 1719 34: 207c27–208a3), both by the Tiantai patriarch Zhanran 湛然 (711–782).

37. The reference to Maitreya as one of Mañjuśrī's "eight hundred disciples" is based on the same section of the introduction to the *Lotus Sutra* as in the previous note. Immediately following the reference to the final son of Buddha Sun Moon Bright becoming Buddha Burning Torch, the *Lotus Sutra* notes that among Mañjuśrī's eight hundred disciples during his life as Bodhisattva Wonderfully Bright was a bodhisattva called Seeker of Fame. Seeker of Fame is then revealed to have been Maitreya in a previous life. See T 262 9: 4b11–16, and WATSON 1993, 16–17.

38. "Compassionate Master" (*jishi* 慈氏) is another name for Maitreya. Maitreya is supposed to appear after 5,670,000,000 years and convert people in three dharma assemblies under the dragon-flower tree.

39. A similar metaphorical combination as in this passage appears in the *Bosatsukai kōyōshō* 菩薩戒綱要鈔. Here, in recounting the "three country transmission," the text indicates that "Breaking off a branch and scooping from the stream, [we shall] certainly return to the source" (T 2358B 74: 98b4–5). The author and date of composition are unclear, but the text was clearly based on Eison's Ritsu lineage and composed after his death; see, for example, the reference in the introductory section to transmission of the teachings "bequeathed by Kōshō Bosatsu," using Eison's posthumous title (74: 98a28). MINOWA Kenryō (1999, 328–29) suggests that the text may

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?⁴⁰ If it were not for the transformative workings of his great compassion,⁴¹ 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 [*sanmyōkan* 三妙觀].⁴²

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 *Bosatsukai senteishō* 菩薩戒潛底鈔 compiled by Dōki 道基. Thus, although this is merely speculative at this point, the use of this particular metaphorical combination in the *Bosatsukai 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* 俱舍論本義抄 (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. TAISHŌ 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 *śramaṇas* 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 “*śramaṇas* 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 *śramaṇas*” (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.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵

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.⁴⁶ 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*.⁴⁷ 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 殃屈摩羅); TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 155, note 45.

47. Accounts of this disciple, Cūḍapanthaka (or Śuddhipanthaka; Jp. Shurihandoku 周利般特), 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 bodhisatva, 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)⁴⁸

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* 善功), 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.⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹ 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 延一 (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.⁵² At times, he dwells amid the Five-Terraced Peaks in Cīnasthāna [China] and instructs multitudinous sentient beings, thereby leading them to the bodhisattva path.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.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.⁵⁵

King" (Jp. *tenrinjōō* 轉輪聖王; Sk. *cakravartin*), the ideal king in Indian mythology, who rules the world using a wheel he obtains when he ascends the throne.

"Charitable offerings" (*fuse* 布施) and "loving words" (*aigo* 愛語) in this sentence, together with "beneficial acts" (*rigyō* 利行) and "cooperative deeds" (*dōji* 同事) in the next, constitute the "four methods of winning over" (*shishōbō* 四攝法) sentient beings to the Buddhist way or to emancipation. "Charitable offerings" can be either material or nonmaterial, such as preaching the dharma. "Loving words" refers to using kind words to guide people.

52. "Transformative workings" (*keyū* 化用) refers to the activities, or functions, of bodhisattvas and buddhas in changing their forms and guiding sentient beings. "Beneficial acts" indicates benefitting sentient beings through one's acts of body, speech, and mind. "Cooperative deeds" refers to putting oneself on the same level as others and joining them in activities; for a bodhisattva, therefore, it can mean assuming the same form as the sentient beings to be saved.

53. The "Five-Terraced Peaks" (*godai no mine* 五臺之峯) refers to Mt. Wutai, widely believed to be Mañjuśrī's dwelling place in China. The term used for China here, *Shintan* 震旦, is a transliteration of the Sanskrit term *Cīnasthāna*.

54. "Dai Province" translates *Dai-shū* 代州 (Ch. *Dai zhou*), an ancient name for the area in which Mt. Wutai is located. "Mt. Clear-and-Cool" is a common epithet for Mt. Wutai. For an account of the origins of Mt. Wutai's "non-discriminatory grand assemblies," including the reference to Mañjuśrī manifesting as a poor woman, see the record of the Tendai monk Ennin's (793–864) pilgrimage to China (*Nittō guhō junrei gyōki* 入唐求法巡礼行記); REISCHAUER 1955, 257–59.

55. "Yamato Province" translates *Wa-shū* (和州). "Transforming methods" (*kegi* 化儀) refer to the methods or format of Buddhist teachings.

"Prince of the Upper Palace" (*Jōgū-taishi* 上宮太子) is an alternate name for Shōtoku Taishi. The story of Mañjuśrī manifesting as a starving man before Shōtoku Taishi can be found in the *Shunpishō* 俊秘抄, composed c. 1115 by Minamoto Toshiyori 源俊賴 (1055–1129); see MUROMATSU and MOTOORI 1910–1913, 2: 2, for the original passage. Oishio Chihiro points out that the rendering of the starving man as truly being Mañjuśrī, rather than Bodhidharma, was a change in the tale from such texts as the *Shichidaiki* 七代記 and the *Shōtoku Taishi denryaku* 聖德太子伝曆 (OISHIO 1995, 232).

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 unflinching, 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 慈童, 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* 覺母) 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* 心地觀經, 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 GAKUJUTSU ZAIDAN 1973–1978, 63: 350.

59. See *Shinji kangyō* (Ch. *Xindi guan jing*), T 159 3: 305c25–26. In Jōkei's *Monju kōshiki*, this is the *gāthā* to be chanted at the end of part one (TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 147). The verse in the *Shin'yōshō* immediately precedes the aforementioned *Hōhatsukyō* paraphrase (SUZUKI GAKUJUTSU ZAIDAN 1973–1978, 63: 350).

60. See UCHIDA 1988, 56, for examples.

hosshin 初發心), the “single thought of awakening the aspiration” (*ichinen no hosshin* 一念之發心), “joyfully seeking *bodhi*” (*gongu bodai* 欣求菩提), the “superior mind” that seeks enlightenment (*shōshin* 勝心), and of course *bodhicitta* itself (*bodaiishin* 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 [*ui* 有爲], 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 hanyakyō sanjutsu* 金剛般若經贊述 (Ch. *Jingang banruo jing zanshu*), T 1700 33: 130b28–c8; *Hannya haramitta shingyō yūsan* 般若波羅蜜多心經幽贊 (Ch. *Banruo boluomiduo xinjing youzan*), 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 practice⁶⁴ all good deeds. That is why the Thus Come One preached the precepts of cultivating all good deeds [*shōzenhōkai* 攝善法戒] 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* 攝衆生戒) 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.”⁶⁵

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 Cīnasthāna [China] received the buddha-teachings, Mañjuśrī came and persuaded King Mu of Zhou.⁶⁶ Before the Land of the Sun heard of the Three Jewels, Mañjuśrī journeyed and encouraged the Meditation

64. Here, the *Kōshiki* Database has *ri* 離 (“separate;” GUELBERG 2006, *kōshiki* no. 170, line 129), but this should be corrected to *shu* 修 (“practice” or “cultivate”) as in the *Kōyasan* manuscript.

65. TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 147. This passage is paraphrased from the *Yugashijiron* 瑜伽師地論 (Ch. *Yujia shidi lun*), T 1579 30: 480c6–11.

66. The *Daoxuan lishi 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 precepts] 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

in China that Śākyamuni had died during the fifty-second year of King Mu's reign, or 878 BCE; see ZÜRCHER 1972, 273.) Shortly after, in the same text, Daoxuan reports through his celestial informant that King Mu built a temple and made offerings on Mt. Wutai, Mañjuśrī's numinous dwelling place (437a21–26; for an English translation of this latter passage, see BIRNBAUM 1986, 125).

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 Kiyosuke 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* indicates that when Shōtoku Taishi was in China at Mt. Heng 衡山 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* 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.”⁶⁸ 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 Bhadrāpāla: “The Dharma-Prince Mañjuśrī...⁶⁹ 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.”⁷⁰

The same proclamation from the Buddha, with the same ellipsis, appears in Eison's autobiography.⁷¹ Consistent with the simplified format of the *kōshiki*

68. The “receptivity to the dharma of non-arising” (Sk. *anutpattikadharmakṣānti*) refers to a state of realization in which one recognizes and accepts that all phenomena are unproduced. The mutually cited passages are based on the *Monjushiri hatsunehangyō* 文殊師利般涅槃經 (Ch. *Wenshushili banniepan jing*), T 463 481a15–b10. For a complete annotated translation and study of this scripture, see QUINTER 2010.

69. The brackets here indicate Eison's ellipsis from the *Monjushiri 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 *Monjushiri 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 Hannyaji (for Jōkei's original Chinese text, along with an annotated classical Japanese rendering by Hosokawa Ryōichi, see BURAKU MONDAI KENKYŪJO 1988, 168–70). Hannyaji 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.⁷⁵ 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.'⁷⁶ 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."⁷⁷ 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 Manju 曼殊 (Mañjuśrī) and attaining birth in an unspecified "pure Buddha country."⁷⁸ 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 ji jing*); see GUELBERG 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 (*bushhi* 佛子)," referring to Jōkei himself. Although Jōkei does in various writings use the term *bushhi* 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 *bushhi*.

78. These variations occur in the Kongō zanmai'in version; TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 152, 306.

Gokuraku (variant designations for Amida's Pure Land).⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ 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 Yogācāra teachings, and Maitreya was said to have been the author of various fundamental Yogācāra texts and the teacher of the reputed founder of Yogācāra, 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*, Śākyamuni, 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*.

80. Note too that the "Mother of Awakening" chapter of *Shin'yōshō* also shows Jōkei synthesizing Mañjuśrī faith with aspiration for birth in Tuṣita Heaven (SUZUKI GAKUJUTSU ZAIDAN 1973–1978, 63: 349–56). On Jōkei's faith in Maitreya and birth in Tuṣita, see in particular HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 3: 576–649, and FORD 2005, which includes a careful annotated translation of Jōkei's *Miroku kōshiki* in five parts. A slightly modified translation of this *kōshiki* can be found in FORD 2006, 207–14.

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.⁸¹ Yet such shared vocabulary and rites, intertextuality, and interpenetrating identities also abound in *kōshiki* literature and the *Monju kōshiki* examined here.⁸² 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 kangyō*, 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鉢大教王經 (Ch. *Dasheng yujia jingang xinghai Manshushili qianbi qianbo dajiaowang 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.

84. On deathbed rites in Heian- and Kamakura-period Buddhist practices, see the recent work of Jacqueline STONE (2004, 2007, 2008).

85. For the *Hosshin kōshiki* reference, see TAISHŌ DAIGAKU 2000, 51–53. Note too Nishiyama Atsushi’s argument that for Jōkei, Amida and Kannon 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* 觀世音菩薩感應抄 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 Kannon (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*.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- SEDS *Saidaiji Eison denki shūsei* 西大寺叡尊伝記集成. Nara Kokuritsu Bunkazai Kenkyūjo 奈良国立文化財研究所, ed. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1977.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 100 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭 et al., eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES

BIRNBAUM, Raoul

- 1986 The manifestation of a monastery: Shen-Ying's experiences on Mount Wut'ai in T'ang context. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106: 119–37.

BLUM, Mark L.

- 2006 *The Sangoku-Mappō* construct: Buddhism, nationalism, and history in medieval Japan. In *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Richard K. Payne and Taigen Dan Leighton, 31–51. London: Routledge.

BODIFORD, William M.

- 2006 The medieval period: Eleventh to sixteenth centuries. In *Nanzan Guide to Japanese Religions*, ed. Paul L. Swanson and Clark Chilson, 163–83. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

BORGEN, Robert

- 2007 A history of Dōmyōji to 1572 (or Maybe 1575): An attempted reconstruction. *Monumenta Nipponica* 62: 1–74.

BOUCHY, Anne-Marie

- 1987 The cult of Mount Atago and the Atago confraternities. *Journal of Asian Studies* 46: 255–77.

BURAKU MONDAI KENKYŪJO 部落問題研究所, ed.

- 1988 *Burakushi shiryō senshū* 部落史資料選集. Vol. 1, *Kodai, chūsei hen* 古代・中世篇. Kyoto: Buraku Mondai Kenkyūjo.

CARTELLI, Mary Anne

- 1999 *The Poetry of Mount Wutai: Chinese Buddhist Verse from Dunhuang*. PhD dissertation, Columbia University.

FORD, James L.

- 2005 *Competing with Amida: A study and translation of Jōkei's Miroku Kōshiki. Monumenta Nipponica* 60: 43–79.
- 2006 *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 2008 Jōkei and Kannon: Defending Buddhist pluralism. *Eastern Buddhist*, n.s., 39: 11–28.

FUJIMORI Ken'ichi 藤森賢一 and YONEYAMA Takako 米山孝子

- 1994 *Shiryō shōkai: "Gyōki Bosatsu kōshiki"—kaisetsu to honkoku* 資料紹介一『行基菩薩講式』—解説と翻刻. In *Nara jidai no sōryo to shakai* 奈良時代の僧侶と社会, ed. Nemoto Seiji 根本誠二, 281–97. Tokyo: Yūzankaku Shuppan.

FUJIOKA Tadaharu 藤岡忠美, ed.

- 1995 *Fukuro zōshi* 袋草紙. Shin Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei 29. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

GRONER, Paul

- 2005 Tradition and innovation: Eison's self-ordinations and the establishment of new orders of Buddhist practitioners. In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*, ed. William M. Bodiford, 210–35. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

GUELBERG, Niels

- 1993 Buddhist ceremonials (*kōshiki*) of medieval Japan and their impact on literature. *Taishō Daigaku sōgō bukkō kenkyūjo nenpō* 15: 268–54.

GUELBERG, Niels, ed.

- 2006 *Kōshiki Database*. 23 December 2006 ed. <http://www.f.waseda.jp/guelberg/koshiki/kdb/main/kousiki.htm> (accessed 15 February 2010).

HIRAOKA Jōkai 平岡定海, ed.

- 1958–1960 *Tōdaiji Sōshō shōnin no kenkyū narabi ni shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人の研究並史料. 3 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai.

HORTON, Sarah

- 2001 *The Role of Genshin and Religious Associations in the Mid-Heian Spread of Pure Land Buddhism*. PhD dissertation, Yale University.

HOSOKAWA Ryōichi 細川涼一

- 1987 *Chūsei no risshū jūin to minshū* 中世の律宗寺院と民衆. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

HOSOKAWA Ryōichi, ed.

- 1999 *Kanjin gakushōki 1: Saidaiji Eison no jiden* 感身学正記 1: 西大寺叡尊の自伝. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

HUBBARD, Jamie

- 2001 *Absolute Delusion, Perfect Buddhahood: The Rise and Fall of a Chinese Heresy*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

INAGI Nobuko 稲城信子, ed.

- 1998 *Nara-shi Saidaiji shozō tenseki monjo no chōsa kenkyū* 奈良市・西大寺所蔵典籍文書の調査研究. Nara: Gangōji Bunkazai Kenkyūjo.

ISHIDA Mosaku 石田茂作, ed.

- 1943 *Shōtoku Taishi zenshū* 聖徳太子全集. Vol. 5, *Taishi kankei geijutsu* 太子関係芸術. Tokyo: Ryūginsha.

KAMATA Shigeo 鎌田茂雄 and TANAKA Hisao 田中久夫, eds.

- 1971 *Kamakura kyū Bukkyō* 鎌倉旧仏教. Nihon Shisō Taimei 15. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

KŌSHIKI KENKYŪKAI 講式研究会

- 1994 *Monju kōshiki to Kasuga gongen kōshiki* 文殊講式と春日権現講式. *Taishō Daigaku sōgō bukkyō kenkyūjo nenpō* 16: 119–62.

KŌYASAN DAIGAKU TOSHOKAN 高野山大学図書館, ed.

- 2001 *Kōyasan kōshiki shū* 高野山講式集. CD-ROM. Osaka: Kobayashi Shashin Kōgyō.

KUSUNOKI JUNSHŌ 楠 淳澄

- 2002 Jōkei sen “Benzaiten shiki,” “Benzaitenno kōshiki” ni mirareru rishō shisō 貞慶撰『辨財天式』・『辨財天女講式』にみられる利生思想. In *Shakai fukushi to bukkyō: Tanki daigakubu shakai fukushika kaisetsu yonjūshūnen kinen ronshū* 社会福祉と仏教—短期大学部社会福祉科開設四十周年記念論集, ed. Ryūkoku Daigaku Tanki Daigakubu 龍谷大学短期大学部, 48–91. Kyoto: Hakkaen.

- 2009 Jōkei no Mida shinkō saikō: Hongan nenbutsu rinjū raigō ron to hōke ittai dōsho ron ni yoru “bonnyū hōdo” no tenkai 貞慶の弥陀信仰再考—本願念仏臨終来迎論と報化一体同処論による「凡入報土」の展開. *Nanto bukkyō* 93: 1–28.

LAMOTTE, Étienne

- 1960 Mañjuśrī. *T'oung Pao* 48: 1–96.

MATSUO Kenji 松尾剛次

- 1996 *Kyūsai no shisō: Eizon kyōdan to Kamakura shin-bukkyō* 救済の思想—叡尊教団と鎌倉新仏教. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.

- 1998a *Chūsei no toshi to hinin* 中世の都市と非人. Tokyo: Hōzōkan.

- 1998b *Eizon no shisō: Saidaiji Eizon zō nōnyū monjo nado o tsukatte* 叡尊の思想—西大寺叡尊像納入文書などを使って. In *Seiten to ningen* 聖典と人間,

- ed. Ichikawa Hiroshi 市川 裕 and Kamada Shigeru 鎌田 繁, 3–17. Tokyo: Taimeidō.
- MEEKS, Lori
 2010 *Hokkeji and the Reemergence of Female Monastic Orders in Premodern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- MINOWA Kenryō 袁輪顕量
 1999 *Chūsei shoki nanto kairitsu fukkō no kenkyū* 中世初期南都戒律復興の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- MIYAZAKI-KEN 宮崎県, ed.
 1973 *Hyūga komonjo shūsei* 日向古文書集成. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan. (Originally published 1938)
- MORRELL, Robert E.
 1987 *Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Minority Report*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press.
- MORRELL, Robert E., trans.
 1985 *Sand and Pebbles (Shasekishū): The Tales of Mujū Ichien, a Voice for Pluralism in Kamakura Buddhism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- MUROMATSU Iwao 室松岩雄 and MOTOORI Toyokai 本居豊穎, eds.
 1910–1913 *Kagaku bunko* 歌學文庫. 8 vols. Tokyo: Itchidō Shoten and Hōbunkan.
- NAKAMURA Hajime 中村 元, ed.
 1981 *Bukkyōgo daijiten* 仏教語大辞典. Reduced size ed. Tokyo: Tōkyō Shoseki.
- NISHIYAMA Atsushi 西山 厚
 1988 Kōshiki kara mita Jōkei no shinkō: “Kannon kōshiki” o chūshin ni 講式から見た貞慶の信仰—『観音講式』を中心に. In *Chūsei jīnshi no kenkyū*, vol. 2, ed. Chūsei Jīnshi Kenkyūkai 中世寺院史研究会, 231–56. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
 2008 Sōryo no sho 僧侶の書. *Nihon no bijutsu* 502.
- ŌISHI Masaaki 大石雅章
 2004 *Nihon chūsei shakai to jīn* 日本中世社会と寺院. Osaka: Seibundō.
- OISHIO Chihiro 追塩千尋
 1995 *Chūsei no nanto bukkyō* 中世の南都仏教. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.
- ŌTA Hirotarō 太田博太郎 et al., eds.
 1976–1978 *Yamato koji taikan* 大和古寺大観. 7 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- QUINTER, David
 2006 The Shingon Ritsu School and the Mañjuśrī Cult in the Kamakura Period: From Eison to Monkan. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
 2007 Creating Bodhisattvas: Eison, *hinin*, and the “living Mañjuśrī.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 62: 437–79.
 2008 Emulation and erasure: Eison, Ninshō, and the Gyōki cult. *Eastern Buddhist*, n.s., 39: 29–60.

- 2010 Visualizing the *Mañjuśrī Parinirvāṇa Sutra* as a contemplation sutra. *Asia Major*, 23: 97–128.
- REISCHAUER, Edwin O., trans.
1955 *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- SHINKURA Kazufumi 新倉和文
2007 Tōdaiji shozō Jōkei sen “Kanzeon Bosatsu kannōshō” 東大寺所藏貞慶撰『観世音菩薩感應抄』. *Nanto bukkyō* 89: 46–67.
2008a Jōkei cho “Kanzeon Bosatsu kannōshō” no honkoku narabi ni sakuhin no igi ni tsuite: Amida shinkō kara Kannon shinkō e 貞慶著『観世音菩薩感應抄』の翻刻並びに作品の意義について—阿弥陀信仰から観音信仰へ. *Nanto bukkyō* 92: 1–30.
2008b Jōkei no Amida shinkō to “Hosshin kōshiki” ni tsuite 貞慶の阿弥陀信仰と『発心講式』について. *Gifu Shōtoku gakuen daigaku bukkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 8: 1–22.
- STONE, Jacqueline I.
1999 *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
2004 By the power of one's last nenbutsu: Deathbed practices in early medieval Japan. In *Approaching the Land of Bliss: Religious Praxis in the Cult of Amitābha*, ed. Richard K. Payne and Kenneth K. Tanaka, 77–119. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
2007 The secret art of dying: Esoteric deathbed practices in Heian Japan. In *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, ed. Bryan J. Cuevas and Jacqueline I. Stone, 134–74. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
2008 With the help of “Good Friends”: Deathbed ritual practices in early medieval Japan. In *Death and the Afterlife in Japanese Buddhism*, ed. Jacqueline I. Stone and Mariko Namba Walter, 61–101. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- SUGISAKI Takahide 杉崎貴英
2001 Kōzanji Hōbenchi'in denrai “Shōnin gosō tō” (shō): Gedatsubō Jōkei kankei shiryō no shōkai to honkoku 高山寺方便智院伝来『上人御草等』(抄)—解脱房貞慶関係史料の紹介と翻刻. *Hakubutsukan gaku nenpō* 33: 57–95.
- SUZUKI GAKUJUTSU ZAIDAN 鈴木学術財団, ed.
1973–1978 *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大藏經. Revised and enlarged edition. 100 vols. Tokyo: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan.
- TAIRA Masayuki 平 雅行
1992 *Nihon chūsei no shakai to bukkyō* 日本中世の社会と仏教. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō.

- TAISHŌ DAIGAKU SŌGŌ BUKKYŌ KENKYŪJO KŌSHIKI KENKYŪKAI 大正大学総合
仏教研究所講式研究会, ed.
2000 *Jōkei kōshiki shū* 貞慶講式集. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- TAKEUCHI Rizō 竹内理三, ed.
1971–1997 *Kamakura ibun* 鎌倉遺文. 52 vols. Tokyo: Tōkyōdō Shuppan.
- TANABE, George J., Jr.
1992 *Myōe the Dreamkeeper: Fantasy and Knowledge in Early Kamakura Buddhism*. Cambridge: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University.
Distributed by Harvard University Press.
- TANAKA Minoru 田中 稔
1966 Saidaiji ni okeru “rikke” to “jisō” 西大寺における「律家」と「寺僧」. *Bukkyō geijutsu* 62: 43–52.
- TANAKA Toshiko 田中敏子
1973 Ninshō Bosatsu ryaku gyōki (Shōkō daitokufu) ni tsuite 忍性菩薩略行記
(性公大徳譜)について. *Kamakura* 21: 40–53.
- UCHIDA Keiichi 内田啓一
1988 Saidaiji Eison oyobi Saidaiji-ryū no Monju shinkō to sono zōzō 西大寺叡
尊及び西大寺流の文殊信仰とその造像. *Bijitsushi kenkyū* 26: 42–61.
- UEDA Jun'ichi 上田純一
1987 Heian-ki shokoku Monju-e no seiritsu to tenkai ni tsuite 平安期諸国文殊
会の成立と展開について. *Nihon rekishi* 475: 20–36.
- WATANABE Tsunaya 渡辺綱也, ed.
1966 *Shasekishū* 沙石集. Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei 85. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- WATSON, Burton, trans.
1993 *The Lotus Sutra*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- WILLEMEN, Charles, trans.
1994 *The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables*. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- YAMADA Shōzen 山田昭全
1995 Kōshiki: Sono seiritsu to tenkai 講式一その成立と展開. In *Bukkyō bungaku kōza 8: Shōdō no bungaku* 仏教文学講座8一唱導の文学, ed. Itō Hiroyuki 伊藤博之 et al., 11–53. Tokyo: Benseisha.
- ZÜRCHER, E.
1972 *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. Revised edition. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill.