

Michael E. JAMENTZ

The Buddhist Affirmation of Poetry and Locating a Thirteenth-century *Fugen kōshiki* in Liturgical Literature

This article examines the authorship and dating of a *Fugen kōshiki* that is found in a mid-Kamakura-era manuscript transcribed by the Tōdaiji prelate Sōshō. It locates this *kōshiki* in its historical context through a comparison with related works and particularly Chōken's *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. The article concludes that Chōken was likely the author of the *kōshiki* as well. The *kōshiki*, which has not been published nor received scholarly attention in either Japan or the West, contains a clear defense of the act of composing poetry in opposition to Buddhist critiques of the practice. It makes an unprecedented argument linking repentance before Fugen to an affirmation of poetry that goes beyond the *kyōgen kigō* ideology, which sought the transformation of profane verse into praise for and propagation of Buddhism, and claims that practicing the “way of poetry” will itself become the “Buddhist Path.”

KEYWORDS: Chōken—*Fugen kōshiki*—*Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*—repentance rite—Sōshō

Michael E. JAMENTZ is a lecturer at Kyoto University.

THERE ARE two important ways that *kōshiki* intersect with Japanese literature. The first nexus is the current recognition that *kōshiki* themselves constitute a distinct literary genre within the broader category of Buddhist liturgical works.¹ The interest of scholars of literature has been stimulated by the dawning realization that the language of these sacred works was shared with other genres of Japanese literature. The second conjunction involves the fact that several important early *kōshiki* concern literary topics, particularly Japanese poetry (*waka* 和歌). The three-part *Fugen kōshiki* in the collection of Tōdaiji Toshokan is a prime example of a *kōshiki* concerned with *waka*. This work makes an unprecedented claim that explicitly links a Buddhist justification of poetry with the ritual “technology” of repentance (*sange* 懺悔) before the bodhisattva Fugen 普賢菩薩 (Sk. Samantabhadra).² This spiritual technique had been developed in the Tendai tradition as the Lotus Repentance Rite (*Hokke senbō* 法華懺法), sometimes called the Samantabhadra Repentance Rite (*Fugen senbō* 普賢懺法).³ This linkage between repentance before Fugen and a justification of poetry is not found in any other of several extant *Fugen kōshiki*, nor is it seen in other *kōshiki*. Indeed, it is not found anywhere in the voluminous corpus of Japanese literature concerned with Japanese poetry. In a leap beyond the bounds of logic, this *kōshiki* strives to fuse faith in the power of Fugen to forgive transgressions with a recognition that the apparently sinful act of literary artifice can itself be sacred. In so doing, it clarifies a long-standing puzzle in a landmark work that is concerned with the Buddhist justification of poetry: why

1. The literature of Buddhist preaching, *shōdō bungaku* 唱導文学, arose as a major literary category in Japanese scholarship in the 1990s. A leading exponent of the use this term is ABE Yasurō (2013). In recent years, KOMINE Kazuaki (2009) has argued that the literature of Buddhist assemblies, *hōe bungaku* 法会文学, is a more appropriate term for the various genres recited by the priest leading a service. A third term, *fujumon gaku* 諷誦文学 (the study of recited writings) is often used by scholars concerned with Japanese philology and historical linguistics to refer to the same genres.

2. “My discovery” of this unpublished manuscript (no. 113.107-1) in 2008 was, I later learned, preceded by that of Abe Yasurō of Nagoya University decades earlier. When I explained my interest in the *Fugen kōshiki* and sought his advice on deciphering it, Abe generously provided his own punctuated transcription of the manuscript. His transcription was an invaluable tool in parsing the text. Niels Guelberg also encouraged me to publish my findings on this work and kindly provided me an analysis of the couplets. I am grateful for the assistance of both these scholars.

3. Despite the intimate relationship of this *kōshiki* to the *Hokke senbō*, the authorship of a Tendai monk cannot be guaranteed.

Fugen appears as the *honzon* 本尊, the central object of worship, at the gathering described in the famous *Waka mandokoro ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku* (hereafter *Waka mandokoro hyōbaku*) of the Tendai preacher Chōken 澄憲 (1126–1203).⁴

Despite the Chinese tradition, also adopted in Japan, that privileged poetry as a sincere expression of the human heart and a spontaneous response to natural phenomena and human emotions, poetic creation might also be deemed one or another of the ten evil actions—false speech (Jp. *mōgo* 妄語; Sk. *mṛṣā-vāda*) or fancy talk (Jp. *kigo* 綺語; Sk. *saṃbhinna-pralāpa*), and sometimes both at once, as seen in the plaintive words of Yoshishige Yasutane 慶滋保胤 (933–1002) collected in *Honchō monzui* (SNKBT 27, 351). Yasutane’s views have been characterized as a “truly agonized rejection of the literary” (YAMADA 2012, 68), and he is also said to have been the first writer in Japan to incorporate Bai Juyi’s 白居易 (772–846) dismissal of his mundane writing (Ch. *shisu wenji*; Jp. *sezoku moji* 世俗文字) as “wild words and fancy phrases” into Japanese literature (Ch. *kuangyan qiyu*; Jp. *kyōgen kigo* 狂言綺語) (ŌSONE 1998, 321). Evolving Japanese interpretations of Juyi’s plea that those sinful words be transformed (*tenjite* 転) into praise for and propagation of Buddhism (*sanbutsujō no tane* 讚仏乗之因 and *tenpōrin no en* 轉法輪之縁) fundamentally altered the understanding of the role of literature in medieval Japan.

As literary artifice amounted to at best delusion and at worst prevarication and sophistry in the minds of many, it presented a dilemma to pious would-be authors of late Heian-period (794–1185) Japan. How were writers to pursue their way (*michi* 道), which was becoming a practice that provided a livelihood for poetic houses during the twelfth century, without transgressing the tenets of their faith? That century largely corresponds to the historical period known as the Inseiki 院政期 (the period of the rule of retired emperors), 1068–1185. The discourse on the sinfulness of poetry is seen even in the most prolific poets of the era. In responding to a poetic topic taken from a passage in the “Peaceful Practices” chapter of the *Lotus Sutra* that “warns against associating closely” (*shinkin sezare* 不親近) with those who “compose worldly letters” (*sezoku no bunpitsu o tsukuru* 造世俗文筆; T 9, no. 262),⁵ the famed poet Shunzei 俊成 (1114–1204) referred to his versifying as “worthless idyling” (*yoshinaki susami* よしなきすさみ; YAMADA 2012, 45). Similarly, monk-poet Saigyō 西行 (1118–1190) wrote of his “accumulation of verbal sins” (*mi ni tsumoru kotoba no tsumi* 身につもることばのつみ). One of his most well-known verses has been understood as expressing the contradiction between the poetic spirit (*utagokoro* 歌ごころ or

4. A literal translation of the full title is the unwieldy “Pronouncement for the dedication of the sutra copied one chapter per scroll at the Office of Japanese Poetry.”

5. These phrases from the sutra are also chanted as part of the *Hokke senbō* rite (T 77, no. 2417, 267).

shishin 詩心), engaged emotionally with this world, and the requirement of Buddhist piety (*dōshin* 道心) to transcend the attractions of the mundane (SAKAGUCHI 1998, 40, 45).⁶

It is difficult to say whether this discourse reflected a true moral dilemma faced by great numbers of people or was merely an intellectual exercise that consumed a literary elite. We can never know how many monks or pious lay people were deterred from creating poetry. The twelfth-century *Fukuro zōshi* 袋草紙, a work of poetic lore and criticism, recounts that Genshin 源信 (942–1017) would not compose *waka* because he felt it was “wild words and fancy phrases” (*waka wa kyōgen kigo nari tote yomitamawazarikeri* 和歌は狂言綺語なりとて読み給はざりけり) (YAMADA 2012, 74). The story goes on to explain that Genshin overcame his moral qualms through a burst of insight. In fact, we know that Genshin was a poet, as were many monks and faithful lay people throughout the Heian period. Nevertheless, given the strictures against false and fancy words, *mōgo* and *kigo*, it is evident that many felt the need to justify their actions. The story about Genshin and the repeated use of the rhetoric of *kyōgen kigo* indicate a concern with this issue, particularly during the twelfth century.

Eventually a solution was found. Over the course of the Kamakura period (1185–1333), creating (and/or reciting) *waka* ultimately came to be seen as a holy act. The conception, which appears in the formula equating *waka* and dharani, was enunciated by Tendai abbot Jien 慈円 (1155–1225), and later more fully articulated by the monk Mujū 無住 (1226–1312) in the *Shasekishū* 沙石集 (Collection of sand and pebbles). The idea that *waka* was somehow sacred was also implicit in prefaces composed in Sino-Japanese (*kanbun* 漢文) for collections of *waka* in early Insei times. These works often employed Bai Juyi’s language, but the phrase *kyōgen kigo*, which alone refers only to the transgression, became a code for the broader idea of the transformation of profane, this-worldly (*zoku* 俗) verse into a positive force. The prefaces also frequently exalted the ancient Japanese poet Hitomaro 人丸 (ca. 660–720) as an exemplar of the practice of Japanese poetry. A particularly trenchant example of this tactic of combining these elements can be found in the “Preface to *waka* anthology to repent the ‘Wild words and fancy phrases’” (*Ungoji Shōnin kyōgen kigo o sen suru waka jo* 雲居寺聖人讖狂言綺語和歌序) in *Honchō bunshū* (KT 30, 236). In justifying Japanese poetry, this preface identifies Sumiyoshi Myōjin 住吉明神, the god and promoter of Japanese poetry, as the local form of a bodhisattva to whose image poets repent in order that their fancy phrases will be transformed into the cause of enlightenment (*zō ni mukai ... shazai su ... kyōgen o motte hirugae sanbodai no innen to nasu* 向像… 謝罪。

6. The verse has been translated by Paul Atkins as: “Even someone / without a heart / may be deeply moved- / snipe taking off from a marsh / in the autumn twilight” (ATKINS 2009). Atkins also provides commentary on the many translations of this verse into Western languages.

以…狂言。翻為三菩提之因緣) (KT 30, 236). Most importantly for understanding the context of the *Fugen kōshiki*, the preface also employs the scriptural assertion that “[whether] coarse words or gentle talk, all conform to the writings of the First Principle” (*sogon oyobi nango; mina daiichi gi no fumi ni kisu* 麁言及軟語皆歸第一義之文), as does this *Fugen kōshiki*.⁷ In other words, whatever language is used, all words return us to the primary truth (Sk. *paramārtha*), the supreme truth of Buddhism. The significance of this concept, its scriptural sources, and its use in twelfth-century Japan are addressed in more detail below.

The Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* falls firmly in this discursive tradition; but whether it should be understood as an important document within a broader intellectual trend or a foundational text in Japanese literary and religious history depends on the date of its composition. This article examines the question of authorship of this *Fugen kōshiki* and the intimately related issue of its dating. If the puzzle of its authorship can be solved, then it may be possible to demonstrate that this *kōshiki* is one of the earliest, perhaps *the* earliest, statement of the doctrine of the essential equivalence of the Way of the Buddha and the Path of Japanese poetry.⁸ Since I would ultimately like to consider the possibility of Chōken’s authorship of this *Fugen kōshiki*, let me first briefly introduce him and his work.

Chōken and the Roots of the Agui Shōdō Tradition

Chōken was one of the most famous preachers of his day, and the putative founder of the Agui tradition 安居院流, the first hereditary line of Buddhist preachers in Japan. His Tendai affiliated school, led by his descendants, flourished from the late Heian through the end of the Kamakura period. A large number of Chōken’s writings, particularly introductory pronouncements, *hyōbyaku* 表白, are extant. He is also known to be among the authors of *kōshiki* during the period immediately prior to the decades of the genre’s greatest flowering. The *Tenpōrinshō mokuroku* 天法輪抄目錄 (NAGAI and SHIMIZU 1972, 213), a catalogue of the massive collection of Agui works compiled within decades of Chōken’s death, contains a section devoted to *kōshiki*.⁹ Most, if not all, of the eleven items

7. This preface, composed by scholar-poet Fujiwara Mototoshi 藤原基俊 (1060–1142), is found in *Honchō shōjoshū* 本朝小序集 (or *Honchō manajo* 本朝真字序), printed in *Honchō bunshū*, fascicle 15 (KT 30, 236).

8. This equivalence is also seen in the phrase “the way of poetry is the Buddhist way” (*kadō soku butsudō* 歌道即仏道), which is a somewhat later formulation of the same idea.

9. Kushida Ryōkō was the first to introduce the list of Chōken’s *kōshiki* found in the catalogue and also a manuscript of his *Nehan kōshiki* 涅槃講式 (KUSHIDA 1967, 16–17). The list in the catalogue does not contain all the *kōshiki* composed by Chōken. For example, Niels Guelberg’s invaluable *Kōshiki Database* lists a *Nyoirin kōshiki* 如意輪講式, no. 079, composed by Chōken (GUELBERG 1997–2016).

listed there can be attributed to Chōken.¹⁰ Unfortunately, the list does not provide evidence that Chōken composed a *Fugen kōshiki*, but it suggests that he was one of the most prolific authors of *kōshiki* in the late-twelfth century. While the *kōshiki* manuscripts attributed to Chōken that do exist have no significant relationship to the content of the *Fugen kōshiki* in question, there are several existing *hyōbyaku* and *shaku* 釈 (exegetical commentaries) attributed to Chōken pertinent to this *kōshiki*. The *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* is the most important example.

First, it should be noted that Chōken and his aristocratic sponsors, including many women, were particularly concerned with defending and justifying the literary arts in Buddhist terms as seen in his famed “Pronouncement for the dedication of the sutra copied in the one-chapter-per-scroll format on behalf of [the author and readers of] the *Tale of Genji*” (*Genji ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku* 源氏一品經供養表白). There, Chōken justified the fictions of the *tsukuri monogatari* (invented tale) genre by arguing that a project to copy the *Lotus Sutra* and to add pictures of the tale to each chapter of the sutra would turn delusion into enlightenment (*bonnō o tenjite bodai to nasu* 転煩惱為菩提). He also claimed that it would transform the error in several volumes of alluring words into adherence to the Buddhist truth and seeds of enlightenment (*sūhen tsuya no kotoba no ayamari o hirugaete, ichijissō no kotowari ni ki shi, sanbodai no tane to nasu* 飜数篇艶詞之過帰一実相之理為三菩薩之因).¹¹ Second, Chōken was himself a poet of some repute and associated with the famed poets of his day. He preached, for example, on behalf of the poets of the circle of Kamo no Shigeyasu 賀茂重保 (1120–1191), as Abe Yasurō demonstrated in his analysis of Chōken’s “Pronouncement for the dedication of the hall of Shigeyasu, Chief Priest of Kamo shrine” (*Kamo kannushi Shigeyasu dōkuyō hyōbyaku* 賀茂神主重保堂供養表白) (ABE 2014).¹² Chōken also offered great praise for Sensei 瞻西 (1062–1127, also read Sensai), the monk and poet who had struggled to justify *waka* in Buddhist terms a generation earlier.¹³

10. The tenth item on the list, a *Hōonkō ekōdan* 報恩講廻向段, may be related to *Hōon kōshiki* found within the Kanazawa Bunko *Shakumon hiyaku* 釋門秘鑰, which is said to have been created by Chōken for Jien in Kenkyū 6 (1195.12.14). Niels Guelberg distributed a transliteration of this work at the Bukkyō Bungakukai, 9 December 2000.

11. This work also relies on the logic of Bai Juyi’s *kyōgen kigo* formula. I have examined several early manuscripts and argued that the version in the *Sōanshū fuju tō* 草案集諷誦等, a collection possessed by Shakamon’in 釈迦文院 on Kōyasan, is the most significant because it is the only manuscript that identifies the sponsor of the sutra-copying project intended to save the author and her readers (JAMENTZ 2015). This argument was amplified by KAJITANI (2005, 253–55).

12. This *hyōbyaku* is found in the volumes of the *Tenpōrinshō* possessed by the National Museum of Japanese History.

13. This exegesis is found in the *Hokekyō narabi ni Amidakyō shaku* 法華經並阿弥陀經釈, a collection of Chōken’s exegeses copied by Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1278), who also copied the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* (ABE 1998).

Finally, Chōken's familial relations reveal his intellectual environment. In addition to his own Agui school, led by his son Shōkaku 聖覺 (1167–1235, also read Seikaku and Seigaku) in the formative decades after his father's death, Chōken was surrounded by talented kin renowned for their intellectual prowess and literary efforts in *kanbun* genres. Most prominent were his father, Fujiwara no Michinori 通憲 (1106–1159), known by his Buddhist name Shinzei 信西, and Toshinori 俊憲 (1122–1167), the eldest of his many gifted siblings. Although seldom recognized, both Michinori and Toshinori were poets and authors of dedicatory prayers, *ganmon* 願文, a literary and liturgical genre whose *kanbun* couplets are mirrored in those that comprise the body, *shikimon* 式文, of *kōshiki*. Other brothers included the celebrated poet Shigenori 成範 (1135–1187), well known as Sakuramachi Chūnagon 桜町中納言 in the *Heike monogatari*. Shigenori has been given the rather dubious attribution of authorship of a *Kōbō Daishi kōshiki* 弘法大師講式. Another sibling was the poet Jōken 靜賢 (1124–at least 1201), a close associate of both Go-Shirakawa'in 後白河院 (1127–1192) and Jien. Jōken's poetry appears in the *Tsukimōde wakashū* 月詣和歌集, compiled by the aforementioned Kamo no Shigeyasu. Other relatives were prominent clerics such as Chōken's brother Kakuken 覺憲 (1131–1213), abbot of Kōfukuji, who composed the *Sangoku dentōki* 三国伝燈記 (classified as a *hyōbyaku*), and Shōken 勝賢 (1138–1196), abbot of both Daigoji and Tōdaiji and an author of *kōshiki* in his own right. From late-Kamakura times, Shōken was identified as the author of a *Jizō kōshiki* 地藏講式 and a *Shari kōshiki* 舍利講式. The *Jizō kōshiki* is apparently lost, but a manuscript of Shōken's five-part *Shari kōshiki* is found at Kongōzanmai'in 金剛三昧院 on Kōyasan. It was published among the works collected in the *Kōyasan kōshikishū* 高野山講式集.¹⁴ Chōken's kin were clearly involved in the creation of writings similar in style to the *Fugen kōshiki*.

Chōken thus found himself in an intellectual, social, and religious environment that would have facilitated his writing of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki*. While it is impossible to go into detail about numerous other relatives and associates that may have inspired him, Chōken's nephew Jōkei 貞慶 (1155–1213), known as Gedatsubō Shōnin 解脱房上人, cannot be overlooked. As is often noted, Jōkei was the most prolific of all *kōshiki* authors and could also be considered a candidate for authorship of this *Fugen kōshiki*. I will not explore that possibility here, but I wish to point out that there is a long history of the conflation of the works of Chōken and Jōkei going back to the Kamakura period. The possibility of his nephew's authorship deserves further investigation on another

14. Shōken also composed a *Shari kō hyōbyaku* 舍利講表白. It indicates that the *kōshiki* that was being introduced was not his own composition, as it had been composed by a virtuous predecessor (*sentoku* 先德). The *hyōbyaku* appears in *Hyōbyakushū* 表白集 (ZGR 28.1, 467–69).

occasion.¹⁵ Finally, in considering Chōken's milieu, it should also be noted that Chōken's son Shōkaku appears as the preacher lending his eloquence to the salvation of Murasaki Shikibu 紫式部 (active late-ninth century) and her readers in most incarnations of *Genji kuyō* 源氏供養 (The Genji offering service), a series of works in various genres that evolved from Chōken's original effort to save the author of the tale. Shōkaku's continual presence in these works indicates how deeply Chōken's school was associated with justifying the literary arts.

*A Summary of the Content of the
Tōdaiji Toshokan Fugen kōshiki: The Argument for Poetry*

As is the case with most *kōshiki*, the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* begins with a brief *shidai* 次第 (the procedures that also serve as a program) placing the performance in a broader ritual context.¹⁶ It begins with the designation communal obeisance, *sōrai* 惣礼, indicating the opening hymn (*kada* 伽陀). The hymn, composed of four five-character phrases, likens Fugen to the Buddhist Wish-Fulfilling Jewel (*nyoiju* 如意珠) that grants the wishes of the faithful.¹⁷ The hymn concludes with a chant of the name of the deity, *shōmyō* 称名, paying homage to Fugen. The main body of the *kōshiki*, the *shikimon*, begins, as is also customary, with an introductory *hyōbyaku*. It should also be noted that an anomalous subtitle indicates that the *kōshiki* was written, and presumably performed, for a gathering of *waka* poets.

The *hyōbyaku* portion begins with ritual praise for Fugen and an assertion of the efficacy of repentance to eliminate one's sins. It continues by describing the character of the sponsoring group and their meetings; they are devoted to the path of Hitomaro 人丸 (fl. late-seventh to early-eighth century) and Akabito 赤人 (fl. early-eighth century), in other words, the way of *waka*. They have chosen Hitomaro to preside over the meeting (presumably in pictorial form), and made Fugen the principal worship object for their repentance. The import of the *kōen* 講演 (performance of the *kōshiki*)¹⁸ is valorized in the phrase "whether

15. For specific cases of such confusion, see MAKINO (1995).

16. The *shidai* portion of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* is quite abbreviated. This is followed by the notation, the "hossoku as usual" (*hossoku tsune no gotoku* 法則如常). *Hossoku* in this case is synonymous with the four-part *shōmyō* 声明 program, *shika hōyō* 四箇法要, that is performed prior to the reading of the main body of most *kōshiki*.

17. This hymn is based on the analogy drawn from a passage in the *Dainichikyō* 大日經. For an explanation of this association, see the entry for *Fugen bosatsu nyōiju* 普賢菩薩如意珠 in *Mikkyō daijiten shukusatsuban* (M 1998, 1917). The entire hymn also appears as the *kada* concluding the sixth part of the Kōzanji manuscript of a disparate *Fugen kōshiki*, addressed below.

18. The term *kōen* is frequently used to refer to the performance of the *kōshiki* within the body of a *kōshiki*. The term *kōshiki* itself is extremely rare in such contexts, and generally used only in titles.

coarse words or gentle talk, all conform to wind of the primary truth” 麁言軟語皆歸第一義諦之風, a poetic elaboration of a phrase from the *Fahua wenju* (Jp. *Hokke mongu* 法華文句; T 34, no. 1718, 16c) of Zhiyi 智顓 (538–597).¹⁹ This passage was interpreted in medieval Japan as affirming that all varieties of language, and poetry in particular, conform to the primary Buddhist principle. This phrase may be considered the central theme of the *kōshiki* as it is repeated in the last lines of the work. The *hyōbyaku* portion concludes with a summary of the *kōshiki*'s three parts: (1) elucidating the elimination of sin through faith in Fugen; (2) the vow that the path of *waka* will be the way of the Buddha; and (3) stating the inspiration for the transfer merit.²⁰

Part one of the *kōshiki* begins with a statement of the necessity of repentance before Fugen due to “our” sinfulness as poets. It describes how poets in China and Japan have deliberately bent the truth in their verse and, in rhetoric that echoes the *Genji ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku*, asserts that poetry can incite the passions of men and women. However, it concludes that through repentance of transgressions born of the six senses before the revered likeness of Fugen, and through the charm of the thirty-one syllables of *waka*, “we” await the sign of the Buddha. The first part closes with a hymn and homage to Fugen. The hymn, made up of four five-character units, is taken from the *Konkōmyōsaishōōkyō* 金光明最勝王經. It promises that if the heavy burden of sin built up over the aeons is repented, it will be extinguished (T 16, no. 665, 412a16–17).²¹

Part two of the *kōshiki* largely abandons the rhetoric of sinfulness and does not mention Fugen until the final hymn, which is again followed by the chanting of the bodhisattva's name. The couplets in that hymn are taken from a hymn in the “Expedient Means” chapter of the *Lotus Sutra* (T 9, no. 262, 9a15–16).²² The

19. This phrase ultimately derives from the *Nirvana Sutra* (Jp. *Nehangyō* 涅槃經), but Zhiyi altered it slightly in the passage that was later employed by Chōken. The phrase in the *Nirvana Sutra* reads 麁語及軟語, repeating the character 語 and including 及 to link the binomes (T 12, no. 374, 485a08 and T 12, no. 375, 728a29). Misumi Yōichi was the first to demonstrate that most Japanese authors relied on the *Fahua wenju* wording (MISUMI 1992, 39). Hirano Tae, who traced the use of the phrase in medieval Japanese literature, saw the version used here as a specifically Tendai rendering of a concept common to various sectarian traditions (HIRANO 2011, 362). In the original context of the *Nirvana Sutra*, the phrase does not refer to poetry, but that is how it was frequently interpreted in medieval Japan.

20. The *ekō* 廻向 (transfer of merit) of a *kōshiki* is sometimes appended to the main body and does not always constitute one of the numbered parts of the body of the text, but in this item it serves as the third section.

21. This hymn had particular resonance for Heian-era monks and lay people as it is found in several other *kōshiki* as well. See Genshin's five-part *Shari kōshiki* (039), Jōkei's three-part *Miroku kōshiki* (101), and Gen'en's *Raibutsu sange sahō* (271 1).

22. Burton Watson translates the hymn as “[O]r if one with a joyful mind / sings a song in praise of the Buddha's virtue, / [E]ven if it is just one small note, / then all who do these things have attained the Buddha way” (WATSON 1993, 40). One character of the hymn in the *kōshiki*

hailing of the name of Fugen contains an epithet derived from the four-character encapsulation of the fourth vow of Fugen from the Prajña 般若 (fl. eighth century) translation of the *Flower Garland Sutra* to “always accommodate and benefit all beings” (*gōjun shujō* 恒順衆生) and asks for benefits in this world and the next (T 10, no. 293, 844).²³

Although the second part of the *kōshiki* does not address Fugen explicitly, it begins with a forceful assertion of the equivalence of the way of Japanese poetry (*waka no michi* 和歌の道) and the Buddhist path (*butsudō* 仏道). It then declares *waka* the national custom and traces the Buddhist roots of its history. It employs several formulations to again ask rhetorically: how could the various forms of literature and learning, of Japanese and Chinese poetry, diverge from the Buddha’s path? (*oyoso kiden myōkyō waka shifu nanzo butsudō o hanaremu ya* 凡記伝明經和化詩賦何隔仏道歟).²⁴ These passages also include a reference to Bai Juyi’s plea for the transformation of the “error of fancy phrases” (*kigo no ayamari* 綺語之誤) into a “condition for turning the wheel of the dharma” (*tenpōrin no en* 轉法輪緣).

The third part of the *kōshiki* expresses the desire that the merit accrued from this performance be spread widely, particularly to the early poets, Hitomaro and Akabito, and mid-Heian poets, such as Ono no Komachi 小野小町 (fl. mid-ninth century) and Kazan Sōjō 花山僧正 (816–890), who may then follow in the steps of enlightened Buddhist figures and be reborn in paradise. Among the poets described in this section is an intriguing reference to those of the *Five Anthologies* and interlineally the *Man’yōshū* along with the cryptic number seven (*Man’yō nana* 万葉七). The meaning of this reference remains ambiguous (as does the adjacent interlinear note). It may indeed be key to dating this *kōshiki* as it appears to be a reference to the first five imperially sanctioned *waka* anthologies and thus suggests a date for the *kōshiki*’s composition, but I will address this point later.

The final *ekōmon* in hymn form reads: “We pray that this merit be extended to all, that we and all sentient beings attain the Buddha’s path together and pay homage for the benefit to ourselves and others in the dharma world (*gan ni shi kudoku / fugyū o issai / ga tō yo shujō / kai gu jō butsudō // Namu jita hokkai byōdō riyaku* 願以此功德 / 普及於一切 / 我等与衆生 / 皆共成仏道 // 南无自他法

varies from that in the sutra, but the meaning is not altered. This hymn was quoted by Genshin in his *Ōjōyōshū* (YAMADA 2012, 282) and appears in the *Waka kōshiki* (YAMADA 2012, 73). A distilled form of the verse, “obtaining Buddhahood in a single sound” (*ichion jōbutsu* 一音成仏), later became emblematic of the Fukeshū 普化宗, a Zen sect that was introduced to Japan during the Kamakura period.

23. This four-character phrase and others used for the ten vows of Fugen in the *Flower Garden Sutra* were used as topics of *waka* by the Daisaiin Senshi 選子 (964–1035) in her *Hosshin wakashū* 発心和歌集 (KAMENS 1990, 86)

24. *Kiden*, the course of study for poetry and history in the Heian university, is generally written 紀伝. *Myōgyō* 明經 was the course of study of the Confucian classics.

界平等利益).²⁵ It precedes a reiteration of the principle, quoted at the end of the opening *hyōbyaku* and ultimately derived from the *Nirvana Sutra*, “whether coarse words or gentle talk, all conforms to the primary truth.”

As this phrase serves as the central theme of the *kōshiki*, I would like to provide examples from medieval Japanese literature in which it was used as an assurance that the literary arts adhered to the basic principle of Buddhism. The following list is chiefly derived from the work of HIRANO (2011, 359–62).

- It was used by Koremune Takatoki (or Noritoki) 惟宗孝時 (1015–?) in his *Record of the Enshrining of a Collection of Waka in the Sutra Depository of the Byōdō-in* (*Wakashū tō Byōdō'in kyōzō ni osameru ki* 納和歌集等於平等院經藏記), a work that influenced Chōken's own writing, including the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*.
- It appears in the concluding lines of the *Hōmon hyakushū* 法門百首 by Chōken's contemporary Jakuzen 寂然 (mid-twelfth century), who used the phrase in a slightly variant form with a nearly identical message to justify secular writings (*sezoku moji* 世俗文字) as not departing from the sea of dharma nature (*hosshō no umi* 法性の海).
- It was used to defend Murasaki Shikibu in the conclusion of the *Imakagami* 今鏡, which is thought to have been composed by Jakuzen's brother Jakuchō 寂超 (also mid-twelfth century). This work contains the contemporary Japanese vernacular reading of the phrase *araki kotoba mo, nayobitaru koto o mo, dai ichi gi toka ni kaeshi iren* (あらきことばもなよびたることをも。第一義とかにもかへしいれん).
- It appears among the songs of the *Ryōjin hishō* 梁塵秘抄 (Songs to make the dust dance), compiled by Chōken's major patron Go-Shirakawa'in 後白河院 (1127–1192), where it is coupled with Bai Juyi's *kyōgen kigo* dictum.
- The *Junji ōjō kōshiki* 順次往生講式 employs it as a justification of music and song. The sole extant manuscript of this work appears to have circulated at Kōfukuji, during the period when Chōken's brother Kakuken was vice-abbot and his nephew Jōkei was in residence there.

In short, there was an established tradition during the Insei period affirming that poetic language was compatible with dharmic truth, and Chōken was associated with many of those involved in propagating this belief.

This reiteration of the theme at the close of the main body of the *kōshiki* is fittingly followed by a *waka*. The poem is difficult to interpret in full. The first three “lines” are clear, but the final two are problematic. The first lines read: *tesusamini* (frivolously in [my] hands) *kakiatsumetaru* (scraped together) *moshiokusa*

25. The single slashes indicate double-space blanks between the five-character phrases of the verse in the original manuscript, and the double slashes indicate a line break in the manuscript. The final eight characters are a single unit.

(seaweed for salt), which according to poetic convention means “the *waka* I have written and collected as a pastime.” The next line appears to read *minori no kumi ni* or *minori no ku mi ni*. *Minori* is clear; it is an honorific reference to the Buddhist law, but the syllables that follow do not scan as poetry.²⁶ The final line presents further difficulties because the grammar is seriously flawed. The poem ends *kaheraramuya*, an interrogative in six syllables with a verb form that is unattested elsewhere. I, therefore, propose that the fourth line was intended to read *minori no umi ni*, a phrase for which there is precedent. This presumes that the copyist (or perhaps the original author) mistakenly wrote 夕 rather than 夕. The puzzle in the last line can be solved by assuming a 夕 was the character dropped from the final verb. The final line would then be *kahezaramuya*, meaning in conjunction with the previous line “will they not be returned to sea of the Law?” Given such an interpretation, the poem is similar to several verses composed by poets associated with the poet-priest Shun^è 俊惠 (1113 to at least 1191) and with the circle of Kamo no Shigeyasu 重保 (1119–1191)—groups of poets concerned with both apotheosis of Hitomaro and the justification of the literary arts—both *waka* and the *Genji monogatari*.²⁷

I will return to a more detailed examination of the content of the *kōshiki* below, but I will first describe the manuscript in which it is found.

A Description of the Manuscript Containing the Fugen kōshiki

The character of the manuscript containing the *Fugen kōshiki* and the information that can be gleaned from the colophon provide clues to the origins of the *Fugen kōshiki*, as well as the manuscript itself. There are in fact two works included in the Tōdaiji Toshokan manuscript: the three-part *Fugen kōshiki* and a five-part *Hana kuyō shiki* 華供養式 (the title used within the booklet).²⁸ Neither of these *kōshiki* is dated nor are they attributed to an author. We do know that

26. I am unable to grasp the meaning of the line, and the phrases *minori no ku* and *minori no kumi* are unprecedented in *waka*.

27. Examples of verses similar in spirit and rhetoric from the poets in these circles associated with Chōken include one by Fujiwara no Nagakata 藤原長方 (1139–1191), who was married to a sister of Chōken. It was composed when Inpumon'in Daiyu 殷富門院大輔 (1130–ca. 1200), a close associate of Shun^è, was recruiting support for a Buddhist service for Hitomaro after a visit to his gravesite. Found in his house collection and no. 2661 in Buddhist poems of the *Gyokuyōshū* 玉葉集, it reads: *kakitsumeshi / kotoba no tsuyu no / kazu goto ni / minori no umi ni wa / kehu ya iruran* (Will it be today that each dewdrop of words that I have collected merges with the sea of the dharma? (SKT 1: 477).

28. The inner title may have been read *Ke kuyō shiki*. The title on the outer cover, in the same hand, differs, appearing as *Hana* (or *Ke*) *kuyō kō shiki* 華供養講私記, a personal record (*shiki* 私記) of the lecture for the flower offering. This discrepancy between the inner and outer titles seems of little significance other than demonstrating the fact that a single work may have multiple titles and that works belonging to the *kōshiki* genre were not necessarily labeled as such.

they must predate Kenchō 4 (1252), the year of the final colophon, but how much earlier they may be is one of the issues that I wish to explore. The fact that the two works were copied together and preserved as a set suggests that they may have been composed by the same author. However, as I have found no other record of their existence nor any indication that they were ever performed, this remains speculation. The colophon reads as follows:

In the first period of the third month of the Kenchō 4 (1252), [I] had Raison 賴尊 Gi-Tokugō 擬得業 [a title signifying Raison's status as a lecturer] copy this. The copied manuscript was that of Daishin Ajari Kōgen 興玄, the abbot of the Jizōdō 地藏堂 on Gojō Bōmon 五條坊門 in the Northern Capital [Kyoto].

On the twenty-third day of the same month, I myself punctuated the manuscript at the Chūdō of the Sonshō'in 尊勝院 at Tōdaiji in order that those who later see it would feel sympathy for this intention.

Descendant of the Kegon tradition Hōin Sōshō 宗性

51 years of age

39 years a priest

We know much about the scholar-monk Sōshō 宗性 (1202–1278) from his many extant writings and the multi-volume study of his life and work written by HIRAOKA Jōkai (1958–1960). At the time of the copying in Kenchō 4 (1252), Sōshō was already of high rank and in a position to have others copy for him. From his youth, Sōshō had been an avid collector and copyist of liturgical (*shōdō* 唱導) literature, including, as noted above, those composed by Chōken of Agui. Sōshō transcribed many other works, becoming one of most prolific copyists of the Kamakura period. Born of a noble family, Sōshō, who had entered the Sonshō'in cloister at Tōdaiji as a boy, rose to head both that cloister and the entire temple in later years. In those positions, he was the leading figure in the Kegon tradition in the Southern Capital. His rise in the governmental clerical hierarchy was predicated in large measure on his participation in *rongi hōe* 論義法会 (assemblies that featured doctrinal debates), ranging from the intramural variety in local temples to imperially sponsored lectures and annual memorial services, generally in the form of the Eight Lectures on the *Lotus Sutra* (*Hokke hakkō* 法華八講) held for aristocrats in the capital. In preparation for the roles of questioner or lecturer in these ritual events, Sōshō frequently copied manuscripts from various sectarian traditions, particularly those of the Tendai and Hossō schools. His manuscripts often contain records of these events along with the contents of the debates, including the *hyōbyaku* and *ganmon* recited there. The most significant of these manuscripts is the *Sanbutsujōshō* 讚仏乘抄, which scholars now attribute to Gedatsubō Jōkei. Sōshō was particularly devoted to the memory of Jōkei. Despite this devotion and his profound scholarship, Sōshō was also vexed by worldly vices and tried mightily to suppress voracious appetites for

wine and sexual adventure. His career as the abbot of Tōdaiji also ended prematurely due to a dispute over the appointment of an official for one of the temple's estates. Despite the fact that Sōshō copied many works of liturgical literature, the manuscript containing the *Fugen kōshiki* is the only one from the *kōshiki* genre (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 1: 535–41).

While it is possible to know much about Sōshō as he has left us an extensive paper trail, other figures mentioned in the colophon remain largely obscure. A brief account of what is known of them may provide hints as to the ultimate source of *kōshiki*. It is clear that Raison 頼尊 (active mid-thirteenth century), the copyist, was frequently Sōshō's amanuensis, but his background is otherwise uncertain. His service to Sōshō spans the years 1236–1261, during which time he copied some part of at least eight manuscripts; thereafter he disappears from the historical record. Sōshō may have selected Raison for such scribal duties as they would have provided training for his protégé whose name appears as lecturer or questioner in several *rongi* assemblies (HIRAOKA 1958–1960).²⁹

The identity of Kōgen 興玄 (dates uncertain), the abbot of the Jizōdō 地藏堂 on Gojō Bōmon 五条坊門 avenue and possessor of the manuscript, is tantalizing because Kōgen was the name of a leading disciple of Jōkei. There is a chance, albeit rather slim, that Jōkei's disciple Kōgen became the abbot of the Jizōdō. This possibility enhances speculation of Jōkei's authorship of the *Fugen kōshiki* as it creates a direct line between Jōkei and Sōshō. However, Jōkei's disciple, Kōgen, was born circa 1161, ceased to be active at the temple after 1210, and appears to have perished prior to 1214.³⁰ The wording of Sōshō's colophons here and elsewhere strongly suggest that Kōgen, whose manuscripts Sōshō received, was alive in the decade of the 1250s.³¹ The conclusion that Kōgen the possessor of the manuscript and Kōgen, the close disciple of Jōkei, were two different monks seems warranted. It is possible, however, that the earlier record of Kōgen's death was mistaken and Kōgen lived on past the first decades of the thirteenth century. Although he would have been an aged figure by mid century, the possibility that Jōkei's disciple Kōgen left Kōfukuji and began a new career cannot be dismissed out of hand.

The Jizōdō on Gojō Bōmon, where Kōgen was abbot, seems to have evolved into the temple known today as Mibudera 壬生寺. The name Kōgen appears in

29. Hiraoka's study of Sōshō's manuscripts reveals that Raison participated in various capacities at debates held at sub-temples of Tōdaiji. Works with colophons mentioning Raison's role as a copyist include the *Tenpōrinshō* 転法輪抄 and *Butsu sanjin* 仏三身 (no. 113.83.1), which is a portion of the voluminous Agui collection of that title (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 2: 521).

30. Colophons with the name Kōgen are not infrequent among the scripture from Kōfukuji. These provide evidence that Kōgen studied with both Jōkei and Jōkei's mentor and uncle, Kakuken, but he is referred to as the late-Kōgen in a colophon dated Kenpō 2 (1214).

31. Sōshō also copied in Kenchō 3 (1251) the *Takakura'in shinpitsu go hakkō shoza keibyaku tō* 高倉院宸筆御八講初座啓白等 (no. 113.103.1), which he had received from Kōgen, then identified as Daishin Ajari (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 2: 373).

the list of abbots in the temple *engi* 縁起, tales of its origins.³² Unfortunately, the early history of Mibudera is also obscure. Nevertheless, Gojō Bōmon Jizōdō appears to have been a center of various religious activities during this era. Several of Sōshō's colophons demonstrate that he sojourned there on more than one occasion when visiting the capital to prepare for doctrinal debates.³³ The Jizōdō is also mentioned in the thirteenth-century *Juhō yōjinshū* 受法用心集, the *locus classicus* for information on the so-called Tachikawaryū 立川流, a Shingon school branded heretical in the fourteenth century for its practice of perverse rites (*jahō* 邪法). The author, Seiganbō Shinjō 誓願房心定 (1214 to at least 1270), reported that in his search for the mysterious *Inner Three-fold Sutras* (*Uchi sanbu kyō* 内三部經), which claimed sexual intercourse with women and the eating of meat were the true means to realize the Shingon tenet of “obtaining Buddhahood in this body” (*sokushin jōbutsu* 即身成仏), he encountered a practitioner of the rites at the Jizōdō.³⁴ The name of the temple is also found in lineages of Buddhist chanting (*shōmyō*),³⁵ and there appears to have been a collection of didactic tales (*setsuwa* 說話) devoted to the miracles of the bodhisattva Jizō 地藏 (Sk. Kṣitigarbha) associated with the place.³⁶ Given the appearance of the name of one of Jōkei's chief disciples and the centrality of faith in Jizō at this temple in the capital, it is tempting to imagine an association with Jizō faith that was flourishing in Nara at the time and with which Jōkei and his associates were involved.

Clearly, we can learn much from the colophon about the circumstances of the copying of the manuscript—specifically, the particulars about those who copied it, where it was copied, and who had possessed it. This knowledge allows us to speculate about the origins of the *Fugen kōshiki*, but it does not provide solid evidence about who composed the original or where and when it was created.

32. The name Kōgen appears in the list of abbots *Mibudera engi* as Daishin Ajari 大進阿闍梨, but there is no indication of the dates of his abbacy (*Mibudera engi* 1960, 47). The extant *engi* is an early modern work so it may not be historically accurate.

33. For example, Sōshō copied the *Tendaishū ichjōgi yōshō* 天台宗一乘義要抄 there in the fifth month of Kenchō 3 (1251) (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 2: 372), two fascicles of the *Hokekyōshō* 法華經抄 in the tenth month of the same year (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 2: 379–80), and part of the *Tendaishū gimon rongi yōishō* 天台宗疑問論義用意抄 in the following year (HIRAOKA 1958–1960, 2: 394–95).

34. Shinjō states that he stayed at the Gojō Bōmon Jizōdō during Kenchō 3 (1251), the same year during which Sōshō was also in residence there (MORIYAMA 1965, 532–33).

35. Arai Kōjun cited three Daigoji-based *shōmyō* lineage documents (*kechimyaku* 血脈) that mention the Gojō Bōmon Jizōdō. They indicate that the temple was led by Chidō Shōnin Ryūga 隆雅 in the late thirteenth century. Arai also points out that Ryūga was the author of the *Kōmyō Shingon kōshiki* 光明真言講式 (ARAI 2006, 13).

36. Makino Kazuo noted that an *Isseidō* catalogue from 1987 (*Isseidō kosho mokuroku* 一誠堂古書目録, no. 64) contained a *Rokugō shoseki mokuroku* 六合書籍目録, thought to be from early Kamakura times, listing a “Gojō Bōmon Jizō genki, nikan, jōge” 五条坊門地藏験記、二卷、上下 (MAKINO 1991, 124, note 2).

Related kōshiki and Evidence from Other Manuscripts

Up to this point, I have highlighted the historical context and the unique character of this *Fugen kōshiki*, but, as noted above, there are other *Fugen kōshiki* that share some of the same conceptions and language found in the Tōdaiji Toshokan manuscript. Niels Guelberg's *Kōshiki Database* demonstrates that there are at least five other *Fugen kōshiki* (though neither the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* nor the *Kekuyō kōshiki* are listed therein). Two of the five have been published so we can readily know their content in full, and Guelberg has published the subtitle of each part and the *kada* for the remainder. One of the published items, composed in Eien 2 (988) by Genshin, is the second oldest of all extant *kōshiki*.³⁷ Known by the title *Fugen kō sahō* 普賢講作法, its chief concern is to explicate the ten vows of Fugen found in the *Kegonkyō*. While it does cover the fourth vow "to repent sin," there is no special emphasis on repentance, nor does it address the issue of the creation of literature.

The second published *Fugen kōshiki* is an undated item from Kōzanji 高山寺. It shares a number of expressions describing Fugen that are found in the Tōdaiji Toshokan manuscript and dwells on the efficacy of repentance, but has nothing to say about literary expression.³⁸ The topics of the sub-sections and their *kada* of items no. 091, a three-part *kōshiki*, no. 092, a five-part *kōshiki*, and no. 093, another five-part *kōshiki* in the *Kōshiki Database*, suggest they devote at least one section to repentance, but there is no evidence that they deal with literature (GUELBERG 1997–2016).

Numerous *kōshiki* advocate repentance, but the objects of worship differ from that of the *Fugen kōshiki*, and these works do not rely on the *Lotus Sutra* or the Tendai "technology" of repentance embodied in the *Hokke senbō* that is dedicated to Fugen. The prime example is the second section of the seminal *Ōjō kōshiki* 往生講式 that explains the basic varieties of *sange* and advocates repentance to Amida.³⁹ Another more contemporary example, the first sections of Jōkei's two differing five-part *Miroku kōshiki* 弥勒講式, are devoted to repentance, but of course the focus is on that deity. Each section of his *Jizō kōshiki* 地藏講式 ends with a hymn of repentance to Jizō. Funata Jun'ichi argued that the idea of repentance within Jōkei's *Hosshin kōshiki* 発心講式 was influenced by the *Kanfugenkyō* 觀普賢經 and Tendai original enlightenment thought and that it

37. This is listed as no. 095 in the *Kōshiki Database*, where the text is also available. A newly discovered manuscript was published in a photographic reproduction last year.

38. This seven-part *kōshiki* was published in *Misshū gakuho*, no. 103 (1922.1), no. 104 (1922.2). It is listed as no. 094 in the *Kōshiki Database*. The author is anonymous, but since the manuscript was found at Kōzanji, it may have been composed by Myōe, the temple founder.

39. The *Ōjō kōshiki* was generally performed on the fifteenth day of each month, the *ennichi* for Amida. Chōken's successors at Agui were reknowned for their regular performances of this *kōshiki*.

reflects Jōkei's knowledge of Gen'en's 玄縁 (1113–1179) *Raibutsu sange sahō* 礼仏懺悔作法, which is also classified as a *kōshiki* (FUNATA 2011, 224).⁴⁰

There is another variety of *kōshiki* closely related to the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki*, at least in spirit. These are *kōshiki* whose topic is the arts rather than a specifically Buddhist topic. Examples of this type include the *Waka kōshiki* (Japanese poetry *kōshiki*) 和歌講式,⁴¹ *Ongaku kōshiki* (music *kōshiki*) 音楽講式,⁴² *Gakkōshiki* (moon *kōshiki*) 月講式,⁴³ and especially the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* 柿本講式 (titled *Hitomaro kōshiki* in at least one manuscript 人丸講式), in praise of the ancient poet. These have a shared ideology in validating the karmic merit of mundane pursuits. The *Kakinomoto kōshiki*, in particular, shares a significant number of phrases with the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki*.⁴⁴ The dating of most of these works is speculative, but the history of the *Gakkōshiki* and its message are clear. The colophon indicates that it indirectly reflects the thought and values of Kamo no Chōmei 鴨長明 (1155–1216) and was composed in the period between the creation of the *hyōbyaku* and the copying of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* (GUELBERG 2006, 30).

In terms of shared language, the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* shares a more significant portion of its language with Chōken's *Waka mandokoro ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku* than any other work.⁴⁵ There are approximately 1,100

40. Funata argued that the *Raibutsu sange sahō* should be understood as a *Butsumyō kōshiki* 仏名講式, a title found in some scriptural catalogues. He also pointed out this conception of the need for repentance is based on the *Metsugōshō bon* 滅業障品, a chapter of the *Konkōmyō saishōkyō* 金光明最勝王經 (FUNATA 2011, 224–27).

41. YAMADA introduced two manuscripts labeled *Waka kōshiki* (2012, 267–93). The earlier of the two, dated Kōan 10 (1287), makes brief mention of the transformation of “error of wild words and fancy phrases” (*kyōgen kigo no ayamari*) and other elements found in the *Fugen kōshiki*, but there is no mention of penitence or Fugen. The second, longer of the two *Waka kōshiki* has a colophon dated Kagen 3 (1305). It deals with the poems in the *Fugen kōshiki*, but again displays no remorse.

42. The *Ongaku kōshiki* has never been published, but Sugano Fumi has argued that it was probably written in the last decade of the twelfth century (SUGANO 1991, 57).

43. GUELBERG's study (2001) of the *Gakkōshiki*, which was inspired by Kamo no Chōmei, speaks of the errors of *kyōgen kigo* and the need for repentance. Chōmei's association with Shun'ei and his circle and similar sentiments with those in the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* require further exploration.

44. The *Kakinomoto kōshiki* contains many couplets that appear in the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, and as they appear in the same order in which they appear in the *hyōbyaku*, these two works could be judged more closely related than the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* is to the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* (YAMADA 2012, 224–66). The *Kakinomoto kōshiki* only obliquely addresses repentance and Fugen and thus the work displays a very different tone. Yamada assumed, not unreasonably, that the author of the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* borrowed from Chōken's effort and posited the authorship of Shun'ei (see YAMADA 2012, 235).

45. As much of that same language is also seen in the *Kakinomoto kōshiki*, ideally the wording of the three works should be compared, but that is beyond the scope of this article.

characters in the prose portion of the *shikimon*, and 384 of them appear in the fifty-six discrete phrases shared with the *hyōbyaku*.⁴⁶ In other words, roughly 30 percent of the wording of the *kōshiki* is shared with the *hyōbyaku*. Most significantly, the verbal overlap is concentrated in passages that form the “rhetorical ground” of the two works: language specific to the liturgical settings and not that borrowed from scripture. Before examining this shared language in detail in the following section, it necessary to consider the nature of the *hyōbyaku* in general and this specific *hyōbyaku* in particular.

Hyōbyaku and the Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku

As I will compare passages from the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* and Chōken’s *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, it is imperative to distinguish the genres involved. The genres of *hyōbyaku* and *kōshiki* are sometimes conflated. The confusion is the result, first and foremost, of the multiple definitions of the word *hyōbyaku* used by Japanese scholars. In the most limited sense, *hyōbyaku* refers to a narrow genre of works composed in parallel *kanbun* prose and recited in Japanese as an introduction to a Buddhist assembly, esoteric rite, or one portion of these rituals. Scholar-bureaucrats collected these brief works beginning in mid-Heian times. References to Chōken’s *hyōbyaku* almost invariably indicate this type of written work or the performance thereof.

Modern scholars also use *hyōbyaku* in a broader sense to refer to all the genres performed by the celebrant (*dōshi* 導師) at an assembly.⁴⁷ In such a synecdochal sense, *hyōbyaku* is used to describe all genres of Buddhist liturgy. If the broad definition of *hyōbyaku* is accepted, then *kōshiki* become a variety of *hyōbyaku*.⁴⁸ This is undoubtedly a cause of some confusion since most *kōshiki* contain an introductory *hyōbyaku*. It is also said that some Buddhist sects call the *shikimon* a *hyōbyaku* (GUELBERG 2006, 37). In English, umbrella terms such as the literature of Buddhist preaching, the literature of Buddhist assemblies, or Buddhist liturgical literature suffice for the broader category; but *hyōbyaku* (and *kōshiki*), or a translation of the terms, must be used when it is necessary to distinguish genres within the broader category.

An additional, but related, problem is that *kōshiki* not only contain *hyōbyaku* but they are said, correctly, to be written in *hyōbyaku*-style (*hyōbyaku-tai* 表白体)

46. A couplet strictly speaking refers to parallel phrases, called *tsuiku* 対句. In Japanese literary tradition 句, read *ku*, often referred to a single phrase or line, which is not necessarily embedded in a parallel structure, for example, the five “lines” of a typical *waka*. In general, I have used the phrase to refer to any series of three or more characters that carry semantic weight.

47. See the “Kikan hōe yōgo kaisetsu” 基幹法会要語解説 section in NINNAJI KONBYŌSHI KOZŌSHI KENKYŪKAI (1995, 85).

48. In his earliest writings on *kōshiki*, the leading scholar on the genre, Yamada Shōzen, called the entire body of the main text, *shikimon*, the *hyōbyaku* (YAMADA 2012, 270).

(GUELBERG 2006, 35). In other words, they are generally composed of parallel phrases. Moreover, one-part *kōshiki* have been dubbed *hyōbyaku*-type *kōshiki* (*hyōbyaku shiki* 表白式). These complications have roots in the history of liturgical genres and the struggle of modern scholars to distinguish them. Kushida Ryōkō suggested that the *kōshiki* of late-Heian and Kamakura times likely grew out of the *hyōbyaku* recited in Japanese in contrast to other recited genres that were sung in Chinese or Sanskrit (KUSHIDA 1964, 471–72). Yamada Shōzen argued that *kōshiki* evolved from *kōkyō*, lectures on scriptures that were aimed at more scholarly and restricted audiences of monks, and he speculated that the lectures were written in *kanbun* and read out in the vernacular (YAMADA 2012, 123–43). Transforming the Chinese syntax of the scriptures into a text that could be performed by a preacher and readily understood by a broader audience was also the task of the authors of *hyōbyaku*.

Although there is only one manuscript of this *Fugen kōshiki*, there are five recensions of the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, marking it as one of the most widely copied of all medieval *hyōbyaku*.⁴⁹ If the two works are to be compared, limitations of space require that one text be chosen from among the various editions. The corrected edition of Yanase Kazuo serves that purpose well.⁵⁰ My choice is also influenced by the fact that in preparing my translation of the passages from the *Fugen kōshiki*, I relied heavily on Ethan Bushelle's translation of the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* (BUSHELLE 2015, 231–48) and to a lesser degree that of Ann COMMONS (2009, 120–21). Bushelle based his translation on the collated text prepared by Yanase, and Commons cites the *Chōken sakumonshū*, which is one of the base texts that Yanase used to create his version.

The Shared Language

As the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* has never been published in any language and the entire *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* has not appeared in full in English, I wish to demonstrate the extent of their rhetorical overlap. In the following

49. On the basis of their colophons, it is clear that the *hyōbyaku* circulated in various sectarian traditions. One is found in the *Jūnikambon Hyōbyakushū* 十二卷本表白集, a collection associated with Ninnaji. See MAKINO (1990) for the location of manuscripts of this collection. A second unpublished version is found in *Sōanshu, fuju, tō*, 草案集諷誦等 at the Shakamon'in 釈迦門院 on Kōyasan. A third version copied by Sōshō is found in *Shonin zatsushuzen* 諸人雜修善. The manuscript owned by Ōkura Seishin Bunka Kenkyūsho 大倉精神文化研究所 was published by YAMAZAKI Makoto (1991, 153–54). A fourth version is found in *Chōken sakumonshū*, published by ŌSONE Shōsuke (1972, 427–28). The fifth version, found in the *Shūjūshō*, is particularly significant because it is the sole dated version of the *hyōbyaku*—the date of the seventh month of Eiman 2 (1166) follows the title (TDZ 20, 142–44).

50. Yanase's collated text was based on the versions in the *Chōken sakumonshū* and the *Shūjūshō* (YANASE 1977, 253–65).

section I describe the shared portions and translated key passages from the *kōshiki*. Variations in wording within the shared passages have been underlined and the characters that appear only in the *kōshiki* have been enclosed. These crucial differences in vocabulary are potential keys to determining the precedence of one work over the other and revealing distinctions in the point of view of the author[s].

There are four fairly lengthy passages in the *hyōbyaku* portion of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* that also appear in the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. The first shared passage begins:

The moon of original enlightenment (*hongaku* 本覺) has suddenly been concealed [from us], and the long nights (*jōya* 長夜) of [the cycles] of birth and death do not dawn. Once risen from our blind sleep (*mumyō* 無明) [of the passions] that has long bound [us] to dreams of vain (*kyomu* 虛夢) delusion, the form of Fugen stretches above us universally, but covered by transgressions, we cannot see.⁵¹

Next, the *kōshiki* asks rhetorically:

How (乎) is it that the way of Akahito 赤人 and Hitomaro 人丸 vainly has dissipated our sensibilities and utterly distanced [us] from the status of Jakushō 寂照 and Shōjaku 照寂?⁵² (YANASE 1977, 257, lines 70–72)

This passage in the *kōshiki* leads into another that is shared not only by the *hyōbyaku* but also by the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* (YAMADA 2012, 232):

Particularly, awaiting the autumn moon that has not yet shone in the black night of [the cycle of] life and death [to appear] over the dark peak, we inquire

51. The *hyōbyaku* uses “vast dream” (*kyomu* 巨夢) rather than the “dreams of vain delusion” of the *kōshiki*, but both terms are found in several scriptures and thus do not provide insight into the precedence of the works (BUSHELLE 2015, 239; see also YANASE 1977, 254, lines 9–10). Similar passages about the sudden concealment of “the moon of original enlightenment” (*hongaku no tsuki* 本覺之月) can be found in various *hyōbyaku* and *ganmon*. Yoshihara Hiroto saw the use of *hongaku no tsuki* and related terms in the *ganmon* of Ōe no Masfusa 大江匡房 (1041–1111) as evidence of the spread of original enlightenment thought, *hongaku shisō* 本覺思想, during the Insei period (YOSHIHARA 1996, 348).

52. Both Commons and Bushelle take the terms *jakushō* 寂照 (tranquil radiance) and *shōjaku* (radiant tranquility) as Buddhist terminology: “abandonment of illusion and attainment of enlightenment” (COMMONS 2009, 120–21) and “peace and tranquility” (BUSHELLE 2015, 243) respectively. Such an interpretation is possible as these terms appear as a synonymous pair in the *Kegonkyō*. However, the parallelism suggests they can also be understood as the names of poets. Jakushō (962–1034) was the Buddhist name of Ōe no Sadamoto 大江定基 (?–1034). Legend of his faith and poetic prowess appear in several Insei-period works and also the *Hosshinshū* 發心集 of Kamo no Chōmei (1155–1216) and the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語. The name Shōjaku is extremely rare, but it does appear in the *Senjūshō* 撰集抄, where a monk of this name serves as an exemplar of filial piety.

of the spring flowers on the old mountain (*kozan* 故山), and [ask] are you not the source root of the tree of realization?⁵³ (YANASE 1977, 257–58, lines 73–77)

The tropes of “awaiting the autumn moon”—used for example by the Tang-dynasty poet Li Bai 李白 (705–762)—and “inquiring of the spring flowers” (a sub-topic in the *Wakanrōeishū* 和漢朗詠集), appear to derive from Chinese verse. The *kōshiki* is, in fact, concerned with poetic practice in general and often makes reference to Chinese poetry as well as *waka*.

In a couplet that does not appear in the *hyōbyaku*, the *kōshiki* next states that Fugen is the central image of worship for repentance of the transgressions of the six senses and that Hitomaro will preside over the gathering as *shōjō* 證誠.⁵⁴ It then alludes to three *waka*. This is a puzzling reference as the verses are not specified. They may very well be three verses often associated with Hitomaro, which appear at the start of the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* and were sung as the opening hymn (*sōrai kada*) by the attendees. These verses may also have been displayed at this ceremony along with an image of Hitomaro.⁵⁵

The *hyōbyaku* of the *kōshiki* concludes, emphasizing the import of the service. We have heard that “whether coarse words or gentle talk (*sogon nango* 麁言軟語) all conforms to the wind of the primary truth of reality (*daiichi gitai* 第一義諦) and that “speaking words to manage worldly affairs (*jise gogen* 治世語源) does not betray the tenets of true reality (*jissō shinnyo* 実相真如).” We hope that the classics (*ten* 典) of wind and clouds, grasses and trees furthermore conform to the fount of the sole true enlightenment *ichijitsu bodai no minamoto* (一実菩提之源) and that the words of longing and love, hatred and alienation, all be conjoined with the tenets that point to [the way] of enlightenment.⁵⁶ (YANASE 1977, 259–60, lines 109–113)

The next shared phrase in the extended passage above “speaking words to manage worldly affairs does not betray the tenets of true reality” is a reference to a passage in the “Benefits of the Teacher of the Law” chapter to the *Lotus Sutra* (T 9, no. 262, 50a24).⁵⁷ Abe Yasurō has pointed out that the phrase “the inspiration of the wind, clouds, grasses and trees” (*fūunsōju no okori* 風雲草樹之興) is

53. All versions of the *hyōbyaku* use “far off mountains” (*enzan* 遠山) which seems preferable (BUSHELLE 2015, 243).

54. *Shōjō* or *shōshō* was used for the high-ranking prelates who served as judges presiding over Buddhist services, particularly debates.

55. Translations of two of these verses can be found in COMMONS (2009, 50 and 98).

56. See also BUSHELLE (2015, 245).

57. Watson translates this four-character phrase *jise gogen* as “speak on matters of government” (WATSON 1993, 263). Bushelle, who translates it as “discourses on matter of governance,” notes that Chōken’s contemporary Shunzei employed the same passage from the *Lotus Sutra* to affirm profane texts in his *Korai futeishō* 古來風体抄, but elided these four characters (BUSHELLE 2015, 241–42).

also found in Chōken's *Kamo kannushi Shigeyasu dō kuyō hyōbyaku* 賀茂神主重保堂供養表白 from the Rekihaku manuscript of the *Tenpōrinshō* (ABE 2014, 38). The phrase is usually written with the character 木 rather than the synonymous 樹 and it appears in the more common form in the preface of the *Wen xuan* 文選 (Jp. *Monzen*), the influential sixth-century Chinese literary anthology. The idea, translated as “poems inspired by wind, clouds, plants, and trees,” had great influence on the understanding of poetry in East Asia (KNECHTGES 2001, 219). As the phrase was clearly well known, the use of the character 典 in the *kōshiki* is then puzzling. It may have simply been a scribal error due to the difficulty in deciphering a complex character in a difficult-to-read manuscript. As noted by Teramoto Naohiko, very similar couplets—the inspiration of wind, clouds, grass and trees, and the words of longing, love, hatred and alienation (*fūunsōmoku no okori, renbōenkō no kotoba* 風雲草木之興、恋慕怨曠之詞)—are also seen in Takatoki's *Record of the Enshrining of a Collection of Waka in Sutra Storehouse of the Byōdō'in* (TERAMOTO 1983, 501).⁵⁸

The greatest discrepancy in the couplets above is between the phrase “the fount of the one true enlightenment” (*ichijitsu bodai no minamoto* 一実菩提之源) in the *kōshiki* as opposed to “the tears of the three grasses and two trees” (*sansō nimoku no namida* 三草二木之淚 (*sic*) in the *hyōbyaku*.⁵⁹ The significance of this difference is not immediately apparent, but the term *ichijitsu bodai* (the sole true enlightenment) appears to have been particularly important to Tendai scholars, reinforcing the possibility of authorship of the *kōshiki* by someone from that tradition. In contrast, the “three grasses and two trees” is a reference to the parable in the Medicinal Herbs chapter of the *Lotus Sutra*.⁶⁰ It was far more widely known in Heian Japan as seen by the fact that the image of the three grasses and two trees was incorporated into several Insei-period *waka*, one of which is thought to have inspired the frontispiece painting for the Kunōjikyō 久能寺経, a *kechien* project from the court of Emperor Toba that involved Chōken's father (KAJITANI 2015, 16–17).

Moving on to part one of the *kōshiki*, which emphasizes the sinfulness of poetry and repentance before Fugen, we see it contains the fewest number of shared couplets. This lack of overlap explains why the role of Fugen in these ritual settings has not been fully appreciated by scholars who, not having access

58. Teramoto reproduced Takatoki's record, which is found in both the eleventh fascicle of *Honchō zoku monzui* 本朝続文粹 and the third fascicle of *Chōya gunsai* 朝野群載.

59. The final character 淚 (*namida*) is surely Yanase's, or his printer's, error. The pertinent manuscripts of the *hyōbyaku* use 源 (*minamoto*).

60. James L. Ford has deftly explained Jōkei's complex understanding of the Hossō interpretation of the “three kinds of trees and two kinds of grasses” (FORD 2006, 61). Chōken's apparently offhand use of the phrase in the *hyōbyaku* suggests an assumption that his audience would be more familiar with the common “Tendai” understanding.

to the *kōshiki*, have focused on the *hyōbyaku*. This part begins with a warning against becoming besotted with poetry, noting that the consequence of such an obsession can be seen in the case of one who so loved blossoms that he was transformed into a butterfly. This is a reference to the story of Ōe no Sukekuni 大江佐国 (active 1034–1086), which also appears in Chōmei's *Hōsshinshū* 発心集, an early thirteenth-century collection of didactic tales. It then gives the example of one who so desired water he changed into a fish (the source for which I am uncertain).

Then the *kōshiki* asks whether our own group of poets is not also prone to delusional attachments growing out of the love for poetry. The first shared passage in this part of the *kōshiki* is rather brief and further asks:

Is it not the case that the beautiful allure of verses between a man and wife disturbs the waves of consciousness (*shikirō* 識浪) with autumnal longings and the words of love and longing between men and women promote sensuous (*shōbo* 性圃) spring dreams?⁶¹

The couplets that follow the above in *kōshiki* are very similar to those in the *hyōbyaku*, but the word order differs.

Together they mutually engender (*shō su* 生) the cause (*in* 因) for the cycle of births and death (*rinne* 輪廻) and separately each is bound with the karma (*gō* 業) of the cosmic flux (*ruten* 流転).⁶²

The second passage in part one of the *kōshiki* shares only the first section of two couplets with the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*.

And, it being thus, we revere (*ki shi* 婦) the sacred likeness of [Fugen of] ten vows and six tusks and repent the transgressions of our six senses [*rokuujō no tsumi o sange su* 懺悔六情之罪]. With (*yoru* 依) the charm of thirty-one characters, we await the aspects of the Buddha (*manji no sō o matan to hossu* 欲待万字之相).⁶³

The *hyōbyaku*, while similar in spirit, varies greatly from the *kōshiki* in wording at this point as it emphasizes the dedication of a newly transcribed *Lotus Sutra*.⁶⁴

Part two of the *Fugen kōshiki* concentrates on the practice of *waka* and contains three fairly lengthy passages that are shared with the *Waka mandokoro*

61. The *hyōbyaku* uses “impure feelings” (*jōjin* 情塵) rather than “sensuous” (BUSHELLE 2015, 244; see also YANASE 1977, 258, lines 84–88).

62. For the alternative wording in the *hyōbyaku*, see BUSHELLE (2015, 244); see also YANASE (1977, 258 lines 90–91).

63. It is tempting to think the author of the *kōshiki* was being playful in choosing the characters 万字 as a parallel expression for 卅字 instead of 卅.

64. For the *hyōbyaku*, see BUSHELLE (2015, 246); see also YANASE (1977, 259 lines 101–105).

hyōbyaku. A nearly verbatim citation of the passage from the Chinese preface, *manajo* 真字序, of the *Kokinshū* 古今集, appears in both works; it reads:

Thus, *waka* is the custom of our country, from its beginning until this day. Since the age of gods down to our profane times, they have animated heaven and earth and impressed demons and spirits; they have become the basis of human relations and ease the ties between man and wife. There is nothing that surpasses *waka*.

This exaltation of *waka* is sandwiched around couplets in the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* that include a reminder that *waka* are not found in the twelve categories of the eighty thousand Buddhist scriptures or in the Confucian classics. Such a description of the number of Buddhist scriptures is commonplace in *hyōbyaku* of the period and appears in the first lines of the *Fugen kōshiki* itself. Similar couplets appear in Koremune Takatoki's "Record of the Enshrining of Collection of *Waka* in Sutra Storehouse of the Byōdō'in" (TERAMOTO 1983, 505).⁶⁵

The next lengthy shared passage is preceded by a passage on the poetry of Prince Shōtoku 聖徳 (574–622) and Gyōki 行基 (668–749) whose phrasing resembles that of the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. The *kōshiki* reads:

Inquiring (*tazune* 尋) about the verse of Kataokayama (*Kataokayama no ei* 片岡山之詠) [where Shōtoku Taishi composed a poem for a dying beggar] and the couplets of Kabiraè (*Kabiraè no ku o omohi* 思迦毘羅會之句) [Kapilavastu where Baramon Sōjō (Bodhisenna) had heard in the distant past the Buddha's sermon with Gyōki whom he likened to Monju], [we see] these are the verses made by World Saving Kannon [Shōtoku Taishi's original form] and Monju, the Mother of the Buddha [an epithet of Mañjuśrī (Monju)] (*Butsumo no Monju no shoei* 佛母之文殊所詠).⁶⁶

The second lengthy shared passage in this part of the *kōshiki* continues on the theme of holy poets:⁶⁷

In addition, Dengyō offered (*yosete* 寄) his words (*kotoba* 詞) "Waga tatsu soma" and Kōbō used his dharma verse in praise (*shōtan* 称嘆) of Prince Takaoka [Shinnyo]. It is known, although [we speak of] the tathāgatas of old (*ōko nyorai* 往古如来), they are bodhisattvas who attained the dharma body, and when they idle (*asobite* 遊) in this land [as local deities], they indulge (*tawamure* 翫) themselves in this custom. Now, our party has deliberated and

65. These parallel phrases from the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku* also appear in the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* (YAMADA 2012, 231).

66. For the corresponding portion of the *hyōbyaku*, see YANASE (1977, 256, lines 52–56).

67. The litany of holy poets and their poems corresponds to those in the "Gonke no hito no uta" 権化の人の歌 (verses of people who were provisional forms) section of the *Fukuro zōshi* 袋草子 from the 1150s.

declares that we shall take pleasure in this way [of poetry] but how could we simply enjoy the food and drink before us, we must pray for the liberation of our ancestors of the distant past and anticipate good works in the near future.⁶⁸

The third passage in part two is brief. It is preceded by couplets that explicate how poets in Japan and China have prevaricated in their verse by, for example, calling flowers snow or chrysanthemums gold. This variety of poetic conceit was common practice and has come to be known as “elegant confusion” in English. It had offended Yoshishige Yasutane, who used the same examples in his condemnation of literary practice in a notice for a repentance service found in *Honchō monzui* (SNKBT 27, 351). Here, however, such transgressions can result in the promotion of Buddhism. The passage explains that poetic talent, such as that seen in the feat of Cao Zhi 曹植 (192–232) in creating a verse in the span of seven paces 七步, and the eight measures 八斗 of talent attributed to him by Xie Lingyun 謝靈運 (385–433), can be the cause of enlightenment (*bodai in* 菩提因). Then, the shared passage venturing to hope that no transformation is required appears. It reads:

Our wish is that the custom of *waka* will, untransformed (*aratamezu shite* 不改), be the equivalent of seeking of the moon of enlightenment.⁶⁹

The third, and final, part of the *kōshiki* contains the lengthiest passage that is shared with the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. These counterparts, which occupy the closing sections of each work, closely resemble one another at the start but gradually begin to diverge. The *kōshiki* passages reads:

First, in particular, we wish to raise Kakinomoto Hitomaro and Yamanobe Akahito to the summit of the mount of awareness [where they may] break off a branch of flowers of the Buddha’s tree. Then, have Sotoori Hime and Ono Komachi tread in the path of the arts (*gei* 藝) of Queen Vimaladatta (Jōtoku bunin 淨德夫人) and follow in the traces of the Dragon Princess (Ryūjo 龍女) who achieved enlightenment. And moreover [we wish to] have Kazan Sōjō [Henjō] and Kisen of Ujijama be arrayed in the company (*tomogara* 倫) of Śāriputra (Shinshi 身子) the wisest, and Maudgalyāyana (Mokuren 目連), the most faithful.⁷⁰

The passage continues but contains several elements that differ markedly from the *hyōbyaku*.

68. For the corresponding passage in the *hyōbyaku*, see BUSHELLE (2015, 243); see also YANASE (1977, 256–57, lines 57–68). Perhaps the most striking discrepancy between the two works here is the lack of the honorific title Great Teacher (*daishi* 大師) for Kūkai and Saichō in the *kōshiki*.

69. For the *hyōbyaku*, see BUSHELLE (2015, 244); see also YANASE (1977, 259 lines 99–100).

70. All recensions of the *hyōbyaku* use *chiri* 塵 rather than *gei* 藝. The use of the character 塵 to mean “legacy” is also found in the Chinese preface to the *Kokinshū* (YAMADA 2012, 265).

And let all in general, have their names arrayed among the company of those in the anthologies of the five reigns (*godaisenshū* 五代撰集), *Man'yōshū* seven, and be considered among those (*hito* 人) who practice the charms of the six poetic principles. Together, let us depart the old abode (*kyūri* 旧里) of the three realms, and all be born in the new land (*shindo* 新土) of the one Buddha. Separately, we bind ourselves into one as like-minded (*dōshin* 同心) monks and laypersons; and collectively, those far and near, noble and mean (*kisen* 貴賤), deserving of praise or of scorn (*sangi* 讚毀), let them all rejoice in the wind of the seven jeweled trees (*shichijūju no kaze* 七重樹之風) and play together in the pool of the eight merits on the moon (*hachikuchi no tsuki* 八功池之月).⁷¹

The interlinear notation in the final portion of this passage is particularly intriguing. First, it should be noted that the meaning of “the anthologies of five reigns” (五代撰集) is ambiguous. At first glance, it appears to be a reference to the first five imperially sanctioned anthologies of *waka*, *chokusenshū* 勅撰集. This term appears in all rescensions of Chōken’s *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, yet the fifth of these anthologies, the *Kin’yō wakashū* 金葉和歌集, had been completed and submitted to the throne in the decade corresponding to the 1120s. However, when Chōken is thought to have composed the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, the sixth imperially-sanctioned anthology, the *Shikashū* 詞花集 (completed circa 1154), and the troubled and eventually aborted seventh *Shoku shikashū* 続詞花集 (completed in Eiman 1 [1165] and rejected by the throne) had already been submitted. Why Chōken counts only five anthologies is curious, and why commentators seldom question this number is even more curious.⁷² The interlinear note “*Man’yō* seven” (万葉七) is also ambiguous. It may mean that the copyist was updating the *kōshiki*, indicating that when it was originally written there had been five anthologies, but “now” there are seven, including, or in addition to, the *Man’yōshū*. Whether or not this note is understood to mean that the *Man’yōshū* was included among the seven, or that there were seven in addition to the *Man’yōshū*, it does suggest that the *kōshiki* was copied and perhaps created after the *hyōbyaku*. This interpretation appears to provide a key to the relative

71. The *hyōbyaku* uses “burning house” (*funrō* 焚籠) rather than “old abode” (*kyūri*) and “Pure Land” (*jōdo* 浄土) rather than “new land” (*shindo*), our association in the “forest of words” (*shirin* 詞林) rather than “like-minded” (*dōshin*). The *hyōbyaku* also employs “opening the teaching of expedient means” (*hōbenmon no kaze o hiraki* 開方便門之風) and “revealing the moon of the true character” (*shinjitsu jissō no tsuki o shimesu* 示真実相之月) rather than the parallel phrases in the *kōshiki* (BUSHELLE 2015, 245; see also YANASE 1977, 259–61, lines 119–36).

72. The *Waka daijiten* notes that “anthologies of five reigns” (*godaishū* 五代集) does not necessarily refer to the first five imperially sanctioned collections. Chōken’s senior Fujiwara no Norikane 範兼 (1107–1165) and his junior Teika 定家 (1162–1241) used similar vocabulary in different senses. Likewise, poets such as Fujiwara no Kiyosuke 清輔 (1104–1177) of the Rokujō school of poets counted the *Man’yōshū* among the *chokusenshū*, from which it is usually excluded (INUKAI 1986, 343).

dating of the two works, but it may simply indicate the circumstances at the time of the copying of the *kōshiki* in the mid-thirteenth century and not those contemporaneous with its creation. We know that the *kōshiki* was copied in the mid-thirteenth century by Raison and Sōshō, but it is unclear when it was originally created and whether and when it had previously been copied. This interpolated note might be the product of an earlier copyist, perhaps Kōgen or even Chōken.⁷³

Comparing Sponsors and Questions of Dating

Although dating of the *Fugen kōshiki* on the basis of internal evidence now appears fruitless, identifying its sponsors from the same evidence can provide clues to date its creation. The scholarly consensus has been to follow the lead of Yanase, who argued convincingly in the 1970s that the sponsors of the service for which Chōken composed the *hyōbyaku* was the Karin'en 歌林苑, a circle of poets led by the poet Shun'è. Yanase's argument was based largely on the description of the sponsors, identified as the *Waka mandokoro*, in the *hyōbyaku*, and the fact that the *Shūjushō* version of the *hyōbyaku* contains the date Eiman 2 (1166).⁷⁴

After carefully demonstrating that the term *Waka mandokoro* was used to describe Shun'è or his residence (YANASE 1977, 265), Yanase analyzed all passages in the *hyōbyaku* referencing the sponsors in order to confirm that the poets involved were indeed the Karin'en group. He noted that the *hyōbyaku* reveals nearly a dozen identifying facts about the group and concluded that these fit Shun'è's circle (YANASE 1977, 267–71). His reasoning seems to be sound and I think it is convincing in terms of the identity of the sponsors. Yanase did not question the validity of the date in the *Shūjushō* manuscript, but the date appears to fit the circumstances of the group at that time.⁷⁵

Comparing the description of the sponsors of the service for which the *hyōbyaku* was composed and the description of the sponsors in Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki*, we see that they are nearly identical. Particularly striking is that

73. I have avoided repeated references to the content of the *Kakinomoto kōshiki*, but the passage in the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* that corresponds to the above reads, “all their names will be arrayed with the anthologies of the seven reigns” (YAMADA 2012, 234). If Yamada's attribution of this *kōshiki* to Shun'è is correct, then he or one in his circle becomes a candidate for authorship of the *Fugen kōshiki*.

74. Yanase's study, done in the 1970s, has served as the basis for the scholarly consensus on the dating of the *hyōbyaku*. HATANAKA has more recently (2004) challenged Yanase's argument, claiming that the *Waka mandokoro* refers to the much more celebrated office of poets charged with creating the *Shin kokinshū* 新古今集, circa 1200–1205.

75. These descriptions do not appear to fit the *Waka mandokoro* used in compiling the *Shinkokinshū*. However, the group of poets there was also known to have been involved in the ritual *Hitomaro eigu* 人丸影供. Yanase's understanding of the character of the Karin'en has been challenged by Nakamura Aya—see BUSHELLE for a concise summary of Nakamura's criticism (2015, 232–33).

the transfer of merit section dedicated to the poets of the ancient past and to those included among the array of poets in imperial anthologies employs nearly verbatim the language of the *ekō* portion of the *hyōbyaku*. The poets who are to be beneficiaries of the two services are identical.

Other descriptions of the sponsors of this *Fugen kō* closely resemble those of the sponsors of the service depicted in Chōken's *hyōbyaku*; in addition to the basic fact that both were organized groups of poets with a special reverence for the ancient traditions and practitioners of their art as well as *Fugen Bosatsu*, they also, for example, met on a monthly basis (*maitzuki* 毎月, a word found in both works) and deliberated collectively in planning these events (*ittō sengi* 一儻僉議 in the *hyōbyaku* and *ikketsu no shū gi* 一結之衆議 in the *kōshiki*). This suggests that the sponsors were one and the same group; in short, the poets of the *Karin'en* were active in the later decades of the twelfth century. Given the apparent identity of the sponsors and the extensive rhetorical overlap of the two works, we may tentatively conclude that Chōken was very likely the author of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki*.

Yet, even assuming Chōken's authorship, major problems remain, particularly that of more precise dating. If Chōken did author this *Fugen kōshiki*, it must have been produced prior to his death in 1203. However, Chōken had been producing a body of work for nearly fifty years. While the copying of the *kōshiki* certainly postdates the creation of the *hyōbyaku*, the relative dates of their creation are still uncertain. The significance of the *Fugen kōshiki* would increase if it could be shown to have been created circa 1160 rather than 1200. The earlier date would mark it as a seminal work in the evolution of an important concept in Japanese literary and religious history, although it is, in any case, important in documenting the Buddhist justification of poetry in medieval Japan. The problem of precedence looms large regarding the issue of shared language. This is not limited to the question of whether the language of the *hyōbyaku* was imported into the *kōshiki*, or vice versa. As the existence of shared language in the *Kakinomoto kōshiki* suggests, the problem is more complex. The possibility that this shared language may have come from an even earlier, now-lost source cannot be dismissed. Given the nature of *kōshiki*, one can easily imagine Chōken borrowing couplets from forerunners such as Sensei or Chūshun 忠春 (1098–1149), who were famously concerned with the sinfulness and the Buddhist justification of poetry. The answers to these thorny issues must await the results of further research in the field and exploration of additional manuscripts.

Conclusion

The discovery and publication of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* is a landmark event in Japanese literary and religious history. Whether this landmark

shall be understood as an outstanding feature within these histories or consigned to a minor place among a series of related items largely depends on its dating. The *kōshiki* is located firmly in the tradition of Japanese literature that seeks to justify the profane arts, Japanese poetry in this case, as not only compatible with Buddhism, but ultimately as a sacred act.

Because there is a great deal of rhetorical overlap between the *kōshiki* and Chōken's *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*, I have concentrated on examining the shared elements in the two works to see if these phrases revealed hints that might confirm authorship or dating of the *kōshiki*. Although the work is undoubtedly one of the earliest statements of the doctrine of the equivalence of the Buddhist Path and the Way of Poetry, the internal evidence does not permit me to verify a specific author or date. Nevertheless, it became apparent through these comparisons that the composition of the *Fugen kōshiki* very likely took place after the creation of the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. More importantly, a close examination of the two works suggests that they were composed for the same group of sponsors, the circle of poets known as the Karin'en. There is no evidence that this group of poets was active after the death of their leader, Shun'e, which occurred circa 1190. This means that the *kōshiki* was surely produced during the lifetime of Chōken. Given the extensive rhetorical overlap in the two works, I believe it is fair to assume that Chōken or someone deeply influenced by his language and ideas composed this *Fugen kōshiki*. At this stage, it is not possible to pinpoint the dating more narrowly than the latter half of the twelfth century so we cannot yet declare that this work should be understood as a prominent feature in the literary or religious landscape of medieval Japan.

In order to make such a judgment, more work on the manuscripts is required. A prerequisite for further study is the publication of the full text of the Tōdaiji Toshokan *Fugen kōshiki* and all known recensions of the *Waka mandokoro hyōbyaku*. Providing access to these texts will allow other researchers to test the accuracy of the tentative conclusions reached above.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- KT *Zōho shintei kokushi taikai* 増補新訂国史大系. 66 vols. Ed. Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1929–1964.
- M *Mikkyō daijiten shukusatsuban* 密教大辭典縮刷版. Mikkyō Daijiten Saihan Iinkai 密教大辭典再版委員会, eds. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1998.
- SKT *Shinpen kokka taikan* 新編国歌大観. Ed. Shinpen Kokka Taikan Henshū Iinkai 新編国歌大観編集委員会. 10 volumes + 10 indices. Tokyo: Kadowa Shoten, 1983–1992.

- SNKBT *Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 新日本古典文学大系. 100 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989–2005.
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. 85 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.
- TDZ *Tendaishū zensho* 天台宗全書. 26 vols. Ed. Tendaishūten Kankōkai 天台宗典刊行会. Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, 1935–1937.
- ZGR *Zoku gunsho ruijū* 續群書類從. 33 vols. Tokyo: Zoku Gunsho Ruijū Kanseikai, 1923–1933.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Fugen kōshiki* 普賢講式. Unpublished in manuscript titled *Fugen kō narabi ke kuyō kō shiki* 普賢講并華供養講私記 at Tōdaiji Toshokan, catalogue no. 113.107.1, Nara.
- Fugen kōshiki, Misshū gakuō* 密宗學報, 103 and 104 (1922): 1–4, 1.
- Honchō bunshū* 本朝文集. ㍻ 9. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1938.
- Honchō monzui* 本朝文粹. SNKBT 27. Ōsone Shōsuke 大曾根章介, Kinbara Tadashi 金原理, and Gotō Akio 後藤昭雄, eds. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1992.
- Mibudera engi* 壬生寺縁起. Kyoto: Mibudera, 1960.
- Shūjushō* 拾珠鈔. In *Hossoku ruijū, kojitsu ruijū* 法則類聚、故実類聚. TDZ 20, 1936. 127–280.
- Waka mandokoro ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku* 和歌政所一品經供養表白. In unpublished manuscript of the fifth fascicle of *Jūnikanbon Hyōbyakushū* 十二卷本表白集, labeled *Hyōbyakushū daigo, Butsu kuyō, Kyō kuyō, Darani kuyō* 表白集第五、佛供養、經供養、陀羅尼供養. In the *Kanrin shūyō* 翰林拾葉 collection at the Ōtani University Library, catalogue no. 外大 1458.21, Kyoto.
- Waka mandokoro kechienkyō hyōbyaku* 和歌政所結縁經表白. Unpublished and uncatalogued manuscript in *Sōanshu, fujū, tō*, 草案集諷誦等 at Shakamon'in 釈迦門院, Kōyasan, Wakayama.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ABE Yasurō 阿部泰郎

- 1998 *Chūsei shūkyō shisō bunken no kenkyū* (11): Sōshō sha Chōken sō “Hokekyō narabi Amidakyō shaku” kaidai to honkoku 中世宗教思想文献の研究 (11) — 宗性写澄憲草『法華經并阿弥陀經釈』解題と翻刻. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu kenkyū ronshū* 130; *Bungaku* 44: 173–96.
- 2013 *Chūsei Nihon no shūkyō tekusuto taikei* 中世日本の宗教テキスト体系. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.
- 2014 *Chūsei shūkyō tekusuto to shite no waka to shōdō*: Kamo Shigeyasu to Chōken 中世宗教テキストとしての和歌と唱導—賀茂重保と澄憲. *Bukyō bungaku* 39: 33–57.

ARAI Kōjun 新井弘順

- 2006 Ueno Gakuen Nihon Ongaku Shiryōshitsu kazō no shōmyō shiryō ni tsuite 上野学園日本音楽資料室架蔵の声明史料について. *Nishōgakusha Daigaku 21 Seiki COE Puroguramu Chūsei Nihon Kanbun Han* 二松学舎大学21世紀COEプログラム中世日本漢文班, ed. *Nihon kanbun shiryō Gakushohen Shōmyō shiryōshū* 日本漢文資料楽書篇声明資料集 (Nishōgakusha Daigaku 21 seiki COE puroguramu “Nihon kanbungaku kenkyū no sekai-teki kyoten no kōchiku” 二松学舎大学21世紀COEプログラム「日本漢文学研究の世界的拠点の構築」2-29. Tokyo: Nishōgakusha Daigaku.

ATKINS, Paul S.

- 2009 A Wisp of Snipes: Translating Medieval Japanese Poetry. *Simply Haiku* 7.3 (Autumn) <http://simplyhaiku.com/SHv7n3/features/Atkins.html> (accessed 13 May 2011).

BUSHELLE, Ethan

- 2015 The Joyous Dharma: Buddhist Ritual and Court Poetry in Early Medieval Japan. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.

COMMONS, Ann

- 2009 *Hitomaro: Poet as God*. Leiden: Brill.

FORD, James L.

- 2006 *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan*. New York: Oxford University Press.

FUNATA Jun'ichi 船田淳一

- 2011 *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* 神仏と儀礼の中世. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

GUELBERG, Niels ニールス・ゲエルベルグ

- 1997-2016 *Kōshiki database* 講式データベース. <http://www.f.waseda.jp/guelberg/koshiki/kdb/main/kousiki.htm> (accessed 12 August 2015).
- 2001 “Gakkōshiki” ni arawareta Zenzaku no shisō 『月講式』にあらわれた禪寂の思想. In *Ishigami Yoshiō kyōju koki kinen ronbunshū, Bukkyō bunka no kichō to tenkai* 石上善応教授古稀記念論部集、仏教文化の基調と展開, ed. Ishigami Yoshiō Kyōju Kokikinen Ronbunshū Kankōkai 石上善応教授古稀記念論部集刊行会, 363-93. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- 2006 *Kōshiki to wa nanika? 講式とは何か*. In *Shōmyō shiryō shū* 声明資料集, ed. *Nishō Gakusha Daigaku 21-Seiki COE Puroguramu Chūsei Nihon Kanbun Han* 二松学舎大学21世紀COEプログラム中世日本漢文班, 30-40. Nishō Gakusha Daigaku 21-Seiki COE Puroguramu.

HATANAKA Sakae 畑中 榮

- 2004 Waka mandokoro kechien kuyō hyōbyaku to kyōgen kigo kan no henkei: Kyōgen kigo kan kara Nehanē ni yoru Jōka ni itaru made 和歌政所結縁供養表白と狂言綺語観の変形—狂言綺語観から涅槃会による浄化に至るまで. *Kokugo kokubun* 29: 17-28.

HIRANO Tae 平野多恵

- 2011 *Myōe: Waka to Bukkyō no sōkoku* 明恵—和歌と仏教の相克. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.

HIRAOKA Jōkai 平岡定海

- 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.

INUKAI Kiyoshi 犬飼 廉 et al., eds.

- 1986 *Waka daijiten* 和歌大辞典 Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

JAMENTZ, Michael E.

- 2015 A dedicatory proclamation for *The Tale of Genji*, by Choken. In *Reading The Tale of Genji: Sources from the First Millennium*, Thomas Harper and Haruo Shirane, eds., 188–203. New York: Columbia University Press.

KAJITANI Ryōji 梶谷亮治

- 2005 Heike nōkyō to Heian bunka 平家納経と平安文化. In *Itsukushima jinja kokuhōten* 厳島神社国宝展, Inamoto Yasuo 稲本泰生, Kajitani Ryōji, Taniguchi Kōsei 谷口耕生, and Miyazaki Mikiko 宮崎幹子, eds., 249–61. Osaka: Yomiuri Shimbun.
- 2015 Kunōjikyō ni tsuite: Kojin zōhon o chūshin ni 久能寺経について—個人蔵本を中心に. *Tokubetsu ten: Maboroshi no Kunōjikyō ni deau Heian kokyō ten* 特別展—まぼろしの久能寺経に出会う平安古経展. Ed. Nara Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 奈良国立博物館, 16–22. Nara: Nara National Museum.

KAMENS, Edward

- 1990 *The Buddhist Poetry of the Great Kamo Priestess: Daisain Senshi and Hosshin wakashū*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan.

KOMINE Kazuaki 小峯和明

- 2009 *Chūsei hōe bungeiron* 中世法会文芸論. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin.

KNECHTGES, David

- 2001 Culling the weeds and selecting prime blossoms: The anthology in early medieval Japan. In *Culture and Power in the Restoration of the Chinese Realm, 200–600*, Scott Pearce, Audrey Spiro, and Patricia Embrey, eds., 200–41, 322–34. Cambridge: Harvard East Asian Monographs.

KUSHIDA Ryōkō 櫛田良洪

- 1964 *Shingon mikkyō seiritsu katei no kenkyū* 真言密教成立過程の研究. Tokyo: Sankibō Busshorin.
- 1967 Agui-ryū no shōdōsho ni tsuite (2) 安居院流の唱導書について (2). *Taishō Daigaku gakuho* 29: 11–18.

MAKINO Kazuo 牧野和夫

- 1990 Chōsa hōkoku Nijūnana 調査報告二十七 Jūnikanbon “Hyōbyakushū” sanshu, eiin (1) 十二卷本『表白集』三種、影印(一). In *Jissen Joshi Daigaku*

- Bungei Shiryō Kenkyūjo*) *Nenpō* 9 (実践女子大学文芸資料研究所) 年報 9: 116–230.
- 1991 Honpō zanzon no “Suteko no sanzō” tan o meguru hitotsu/futatsu no mondai 本邦残存の「捨児ノ三蔵」譚をめぐる一・二の問題. In *Denshō no kosō: Rekishi, gunki, shinwa* 伝承の古層—歴史・軍記・神話, ed. Mizuhara Hajime 水原一, 123–40. Tokyo: Ōfūsha.
- 1995 Jōkei/Chōken no shūhen: “Kasagi Shōnin sō” “Gedatsu Shōnin kore o sakushita” to daishita “Hyōbyakushū” rui ni tsuite 貞慶・澄憲の周辺—「笠置上人草」「解脱上人之作」と題した「表白集」類について. *Bukkyō bungaku* 19: 60–75.
- MISUMI Yōichi 三角洋一
- 1992 Iwayuru kyōgen kigokan ni tsuite いわゆる狂言綺語観について. In *Shin kokinshū to kanbungaku* 新古今集と漢文学, ed. Wakan Hikaku Bungaku-kai 和漢比較文学会, 23–40. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.
- MORIYAMA Shōshin 守山聖真
- 1965 *Tachikawa jakyō to sono shakaiteki haikai no kenkyū* 立川邪教とその社会的背景の研究. Tokyo: Rokuyōn.
- NAGAI Yoshinori 永井義憲 and SHIMIZU Yūshō 清水宥聖
- 1972 *Agui Shōdōshū, jōkan* 安居院唱導集、上巻. Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten.
- NINNAJI KONBYŌSHI KOZŌSHI KENKYŪKAI 仁和寺蔵紺表紙小双紙研究会, eds.
- 1995 *Shukaku hōshinnō no girei sekai: Ninnaji zō konbyōshi kozōshi no kenkyū: Kikan hōe kaisai furoku shiryōshū ronkō sakuin hen* 守覚法親王の儀礼世界—仁和寺蔵紺表紙小双紙の研究、基幹法会解題付録資料集論考索引篇. Tokyo: Benseisha.
- ŌSONE Shōsuke 大曾根章介
- 1972 Chōken sakumonshū 澄憲作文集. In *Chūsei bungaku no kenkyū* 中世文学の研究, ed. Akiyama Ken 秋山 虔, 403–40. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.
- 1998 *Ōsone Shōsuke Nihon kanbungaku ronshū* 大曾根章介日本漢文学論集 1. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.
- SAKAGUCHI Hiroki 坂口博規
- 1988 Saigyō no “mi” to “kokoro” o megutte 西行の「身」と「心」をめぐって. In *Komazawa Tandai kokubun* 28: 38–49.
- SUGANO Fumi 菅野扶美
- 1991 “Ōngaku kōshiki” to seigaku: ‘Hōyō ni wa eikyoku, kada ni wa rōei’ o megutte 『音楽講式』と声楽—「法用ニハ鄙曲 伽陀ニハ朗詠」をめぐって. *Nihon kayō kenkyū* 30: 56–63.
- TERAMOTO Naohiko 寺本直彦.
- 1983 *Genji monogatari juyōshi ronkō, zokuhen* 源氏物語受容史続編. Tokyo: Kasama Shobō.

WATSON, Burton, trans.

1993 *The Lotus Sutra*. New York: Columbia University Press.

YAMADA Shōzen 山田昭全

2012 *Yamada Shōzen zenchoshakushū: Daiikkan Kōe no bungaku* 山田昭全著
作集—第一卷講会の文学. Tokyo: Ōfū.

YAMAZAKI Makoto 山崎 誠

1990 Miidera-ryū shōdō ikyō—“Shūjushō” o megutte 三井寺流唱導遺響—
「捨珠抄」を遡って. *Kokubungaku kenkyū shiryōkan kiyō* 16 (March):
51-132.

1991 *Shonin zatsushuzen* 諸人雑修善. In *Agui shōdō shiryō sanshū* “Shonin
zatsushuzen” kaidai, fu Chōken ryaku nenpu 安居院唱導資料纂輯
『諸人雑修善』解題付澄憲略年譜, Komine Kazuaki 小峯和明 and Yama-
zaki Makoto 山崎誠, eds. *Chōsa kenkyū hōkoku* 12: 147-62.

2006 *Tenseki itsuden kō* 典籍佚伝攷. *Sōkendai Bunka kagaku kenkyū* 2 (March):
41-56.

YANASE Kazuo 築瀬一雄

1977 “Waka mandokoro ippongyō kuyō hyōbyaku” ni tsuite 『和歌政所一品経
供養表白』について. *Shunē kenkyū*, 253-72.

YOSHIHARA Hiroto 吉原浩人

1996 Inseiki ni okeru “Hongakusan” no juyō o megutte: “Shinshō zaifuku
innenshū” to Ōe Masafusa no bungyō o chūshin ni 院政期における<本
覚讚>の受容をめぐる—「心性罪福因縁集」と大江匡房の文業を中心に. In
Shinbutsu shūgō shisō no tenkai 神仏習合思想の展開, ed. Sugawara Shinkai
菅原信海, 325-58. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin.