A Study of Jōkei's Five-Part *Kannon Kōshiki* (1201A)

Alex Dieplam
School of Religious Studies
McGill University, Tiohtià:ke (Montreal)
August 2022

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts

© Alex Dieplam, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction **5**
Motivation and Objectives 5
A Short Biography of Jōkei (1155-1213) 10
A Brief Overview of *Kōshiki* 16
Methodology and Thesis Outline 19
Summary of the *Kannon Kōshiki* 21
Chapter I: Relevant Background Information **26**
The Socio-Political Context between 1155 and 1221 26
Postwar Academic Trends in the Study of Kamakura Buddhism 38
From Nālandā to Kōfukuji: the Transmission and Reception of Yogācāra Teachings in Japan 47
Chapter II: Analysing the *Kannon Kōshiki* alongside the *Miroku* and *Monju Kōshiki* .. **57**
The Different Faces of the *Bodhisattva* Kannon 57
Texts and Lands in the *Kannon Kōshiki* 67
Chapter III: The *Kannon Kōshiki* in the Context of Jōkei's Kasagidera Years **82**
Looking at Rebirth through the Hossō Lens 82
The *Kannon Kōshiki* as a Mirror of Jōkei's Kasagidera Years 95
Conclusion **107**
Works Cited **111**
Appendix A: Translation of the Five-Part *Kannon Kōshiki* (1201A) **118**
Appendix B: *Kōshiki Database* Edition of the Five-Part *Kannon Kōshiki* (no. 67) **138**

ABSTRACT

The present thesis is a study of the five-part *Kannon kōshiki* composed in 1201 by the Hossō monk-scholar Jōkei (1155–1213). It consists of an annotated translation of this *kōshiki*, contextualized within the writings and activities of his Kasagidera years (1193–1208). First, by comparing the text with two other *kōshiki* composed during the same time period but devoted to different deities, this thesis argues that certain motifs recur in all three texts. These similarities in turn suggest that the *Kannon kōshiki* can be better understood by contextualising it within the historical realities of Jōkei's life. Thus, it then examines the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside two non-devotional works dated to the same period, as well as Jōkei's activities at Kasagidera. From this analysis, this thesis suggests interpreting the *Kannon kōshiki* as a form of *kechien* practice.

RÉSUMÉ

Ce mémoire de master porte sur le *Kannon kōshiki en cinq parties* composé en 1201 par Jōkei (1155–1213), un moine érudit de la tradition Hossō. Ce travail propose une traduction annotée dudit *kōshiki*, suivie de sa contextualisation à la lumière d'autres compositions et activités de ce moine lors de son séjour à Kasagidera (1193–1208). D'abord, nous comparerons le *Kannon kōshiki* à deux autres *kōshiki* de la même période, mais dédiés à des déités différentes. Ce faisant, nous montrerons que certains motifs se répètent dans les trois œuvres dévotionnelles—répétitions qui suggèrent l'influence du contexte historique dans lequel Jōkei évoluait. Ainsi, nous juxtaposerons le *Kannon kōshiki* à deux textes non-dévotionnels rédigés par Jōkei durant la même période de sa vie, ainsi qu'à ses activités dans ce complexe religieux. Cette seconde comparaison suggère que le *Kannon kōshiki* peut être interprété comme une pratique du *kechien.*

ACKNOLEDGEMENTS

I would like thank Prof Mikaël Bauer for his guidance and patience throughout the planning and writing of this thesis.

I would also like to thank Prof Rongdao Lai for agreeing to be the examiner, and Mses Samieun Khan, Margaret Lawrence, Francesca Manciani and Stephanie Zazzera for their help in navigating the McGill bureaucracy.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unconditional love and support throughout this degree. To Adrien, Amanda, Anita, Ana, Ayah, Hary, Jean-Baptiste, Jhave, Jill, Jingjing, Lucie, Mathew Birgen, Michael, Mriti, Ollivier, Paulina, Sujata and Tim—thank you for endless advice and camaraderie.

INTRODUCTION

Motivation and Objectives

"His exposition of the Dharma is profound. It is unfortunate that his voice is so soft, but whether he is discussing or expounding, he is clearly of the wise and virtuous men of this degenerate age."

—Kujō Kanezane 九條兼實 in *Gyokuyō* 玉葉

The above passage is from the diary entries of Kujō Kanezane 九條兼實 (1149–1207), the chancellor to Emperors Go-Shirakawa 後白河 (1127–1192) and Go-Toba 鳥羽 (1103–1156), who was one of the most powerful political figures during the second part of the twelfth century.[1] He made these comments regarding Jōkei's 貞慶 (1155–1213) performance at the *Hokke hakkō* 法華八講, a national lecture on the *Lotus Sūtra* (Sk. *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*, Ch. *Fahua jing*, Jp. *Hokke kyō* 法華經; T 262) held at Hōjōji 法成寺 to commemorate the death of his eldest son Yoshimichi 良通 (1167–1188).

Jōkei was a monastic affiliated to the Hossō school (Ch. *Faxiang zong*, Jp. *Hossō shū* 法相宗) who lived at the juncture of the Heian 平安 (794–1185) and Kamakura 鎌倉 (1185–1333) periods.[2] He is mostly remembered for having authored the *Kōfukuji sōjō* 興福寺奏狀, a petition submitted to the imperial court in the tenth month of the second year of Genkyū 元久 (1205) on behalf of the eight established Buddhist schools. This petition

---

1. Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会 eds., *Gyokuyō* 玉葉, vol. 3, (Tōkyō: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1906–1907), 662.

2. Ford notes that Jōkei's *dōgō* 道號 was Gedatsu 解脱 and, following Japanese monastic naming conventions, was often referred to as Gedatsu-bō 解脱房. Jōkei refers to his *azana* 字, the name taken by monks after their coming of age. Blum further notes that these naming conventions were derived from Chinese practices, but if this were to be the case, then Jōkei would also have a "dharma name" corresponding to the Chinese *faming* 法名 or *fahui* 法諱, which somehow has been left out of the annals of history. See James L. Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 18 (footnote 21) and Mark Laurence Blum, *The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: A Study and Translation of Gyōnen's Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), xviii.

requested an imperial edict to halt the teachings of Hōnen 法然 (1133–1212), who preached the exclusive oral recitation of Amida's name (*senju nenbutsu* 専修念佛) as the sole means to attain rebirth in Amida's pure land (and by extension, achieve enlightenment).[3]

As the delegate representing the Buddhist establishment to the imperial court, Jōkei must have carried some degree of importance during his lifetime. Yet there is surprisingly little scholarship available on this figure. In most surveys of Japanese Buddhism, he is either mentioned in passing as an example of the Buddhist establishment's response to new Kamakura religious movements or as a sectarian and political oppressor of Hōnen's teachings.[4] This neglect can partially be explained by the current landscape of Japanese Buddhist studies, which is dominated by Pure Land affiliated institutions that revile him. In fact, Jōkei's petition catalyzed Hōnen's exile and thus, in the eyes of these institutions, cemented his role as an antagonist to their patriarch and its teachings. Several Japanese scholars in the second half of the twentieth century have attempted to present a more complex picture of this monastic figure, but they remain a minority.[5] Nevertheless, with the publishing of a critical edition of Jōkei's *kōshiki* in 2000, interest in in this monastic figure has been gradually renewed.[6]

---

[3] Robert E. Morrell, Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Minority Report, (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1987), 66–88. The eight established schools (or sects, in Morrell's translation) mentioned in Jōkei's petition refer to the six Nara schools (Kusha 俱舍, Jōjitsu 成實, Sanron 三論, Ritsu 律宗, Hossō 法相, and Kegon 華嚴), Tendai 天台 and Shingon 真言.

[4] For examples, see Ōsumi Kazuo 大隅和雄, "Buddhism in the Kamakura Period," trans. Martin Collcutt, in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2—Heian Japan,* eds. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 563–4 and Alicia Matsunaga and Daigan Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism vol. 2*, (Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International, 1974), 275–6.

[5] See for example, Yamazaki Keiki 山崎慶輝, "Hossō yuishiki no kaikakusha Jōkei 法相唯識の改革者貞慶," *Ryūkoku daigaku Bukkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 龍谷大学佛教文化研究所紀要 17 (1978): 137–49 and Fukihara Shōshin 富貴原章信 *Nihon chūsei yuishiki Bukkyōshi* 日本中世唯識佛教史 (Tōkyō: Daitō Shuppansha, 1975).

The present thesis aims to be a modest contribution in the efforts to bridge the gap between the current lack of scholarship on Jōkei and his actual role in shaping early Kamakura Buddhism. Specifically, it studies the five-part *Kannon kōshiki* 観音講式 (hereafter referred to as the *Kannon kōshiki*), a text composed in 1201 while Jōkei was living a semi-reclusive life at Kasagidera 笠置寺. It is addressed to the bodhisattva Kannon (*Kannon bosatsu* 観音菩薩), a figure described by C.N. Tay as "the cult of half-Asia" and the personification of Buddhist compassion *par excellence*.[7] Sometimes referred to as Kanjizai bosatsu 観自在菩薩, these two names respectively mean the bodhisattva "who perceives the sounds" and the bodhisattva who is the "Lord who perceives." These in turn correspond to the Sanskrit Avalokitasvara and Avalokiteśvara—an etymological divergence that is not without controversy.[8] In East Asia, the bodhisattva features notably in the twenty-fifth chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*—the *Universal Gate Chapter* (Ch. *pumen pin,* Jp. *fumon bon* 普門品)—wherein they manifest in thirty-three different forms to deliver all sentient beings

---

6. Yamada Shozen 山田昭全, ed. *Jōkei kōshiki shū* 貞慶講式集 (Tōkyō: Sankibō busshorin, 2000). Examples of works published after the millennium include Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, Funata Jun'ichi 舩田淳一, *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* 神仏と儀礼の中世 (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2011) and Kusunoki Junshō 楠淳證, "Jōkei no Mida shinkō saikō: Hongan nenbutsu rinjū raigō ron to hōke ittai dōsho ron ni yoru "bonnyū hōdo" no tenkai 貞慶の弥陀信仰再考—本願念仏臨終来迎論と報化一体同処論による「凡入報土」の展開," *Nanto bukkyō* 南都佛教 93 (2009): 1–28.

7. C. N. Tay, "Kuan-yin: the Cult of Half-Asia," *History of Religions* 16, no. 2 (1976): 147.

8. Tay, "Kuan-yin," 147–52; Lokesh Chandra, "The Origin of Avalokita-svara/Avalokit-eśvara," *Indologica Taurinenaia XIII* (1985–1986): 187–202.

that call upon them from various types of suffering.[9] Kannon also plays a major role in other Buddhist sūtras, such as the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* (Ch. *Shou lengyan jing*, Jp. *Shu ryōgon kyō* 首楞嚴經; T 945), as well as various literary sources.[10] In the Japanese context, Yoshiko Dykstra points out that literature of the Heian and Kamakura period are abundant stories that recount the benefits of Kannon devotion. For example, in the *Konjaku Monogatari* 今昔物語, a collection of over a thousand tales compiled during the late Heian period, the entire sixteenth volume is dedicated to stories describing miraculous interventions of the bodhisattva.[11] Additionally, Kannon appears regularly as the subject of artistic depictions in Japan. Sherry Fowler's analysis of the cult of Six Kannon conclusively proves the existence of at least six different representations of the bodhisattva in Japan during Heian period, with each form possessing specific physical attributes.[12] Of these documented representations, Sarah Aptilon has shown that the Nyoirin Kannon 如意輪觀音 gradually underwent a feminisation process from the ninth century onwards, but there is no evidence that other forms of Kannon became firmly identified with a single gender.[13] In fact, if we look at the images in Fowler's work, many forms of Kannon appear to be of

---

9. T 262.56c2–58b7. For an English translation of the *Lotus Sūtra,* see Burton Watson, trans., *The Lotus Sūtra* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

10. For a discussion on the various textual sources in which Kannon features, see Tay, "Kuan-yin," 152–74 and chapters 2,3 and 4 in Chün-fang Yü, *Kuan-Yin: the Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 31–91, 93–149, 151–94.

11. Yoshiko Dykstra, "Tales of the Compassionate Kannon: The *Hasedera Kannon Genki*," *Monumenta Nipponica* 31, no. 2 (1971): 113–4.

12. Sherry D. Fowler, *Accounts and Images of Six Kannon in Japan*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 14–48.

13. Sarah Fremerman Aptilon, "Goddess Genealogy: Nyoirin Kannon in the Ono Shingon Tradition," in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, eds. Charles Orzech, Richard Payne, and Henrik Sørensen (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 893–903.

undetermined gender.[14] In any case, we can confidently state that during Jōkei's lifetime, the bodhisattva was visually depicted bearing different physical attributes but was not definitively associated with any gender.[15]

Let us return to the text at hand, the *Kannon kōshiki*, which is representative of one of the more creative genres in Japanese Buddhist literature—the *kōshiki.* These devotional texts were simultaneously the subject of an eponymous ritual and thus "functioned, on at least one important level, to make the Buddhist teachings more accessible to a Japanese-speaking audience."[16] In other words, the *Kannon kōshiki* stood at the intersection of doctrine and praxis, providing us with an aperture to examine how lay and monastic audiences experienced certain aspects of Buddhist teachings. Moreover, our text of interest was composed in times marked by overlapping socio-political and religious changes. On the one hand, the power shifted from the Kyōto court to the military government based in Kamakura. On the other hand, many religious movements centred around devotion, notably Amida Buddha, appeared as a response to the belief that society was entering the final age of the Dharma (*mappō* 末法).

Indeed, during his Kasagidera years (1193–1208), Jōkei wrote multiple devotional pieces addressed to various deities, in which he mentions living in precarious times for the

---

[14] See, for instance, figure 1.6 (dated twelfth century) and figure 2.6, 2.7, 2.10 (dated 1141).

[15] Here, let us note that Yü has shown that "starting with the creation of new iconography such as the Water-moon Kuan-yin (who is androgynous) in the tenth century, Chinese artists increasingly depicted the bodhisattva in a clearly feminine fashion after the Sung (960–1279)"; see Yü, *Kuan-yin*, 14. Older scholarship have treated the Japanese case as an extension of the process, but this approach overly simplifies the evolution of Buddhism in Japan after its transmission from the continent. Fowler's comparison of the cult of Six Kannon in China and Japan (summarised in table 1.1) illustrates this point. On the other hand, for an example of this older style of scholarship, see Rolf-Alfred Stein, "Avalokiteśvara/Kouan-yin, un Exemple de Transformation d'un Dieu en Déesse," *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 2, no. 1 (1986): 17–80.

[16] Barbara R. Ambros, James L. Ford and Michaela Mross, "Editor's Introduction," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016): 2–4.

Buddhadharma. Consequently, the present thesis seeks to answer where and how does the *Kannon kōshiki* fit in the above body of literature and in Jōkei's overall understanding of the Buddhadharma. By contextualizing the text historically, it also aims to examine the relationship between the *Kannon kōshiki* and the reality in which Jōkei lived. More generally, it hopes to shed a little more light on this understudied figure of early medieval Japanese Buddhism and the various tensions present at the beginning of the twelfth century. For this purpose, we turn below to the two main keywords of this thesis—Jōkei and *kōshiki*—and briefly review the available literature.

A Short Biography of Jōkei (1155-1213)[17]

Jōkei was born in 1155 into a Fujiwara family marked by internal conflicts: his grandfather Fujiwara Michinori 藤原通憲 (1106–1160; also known as Shinzei 信西) was an influential retainer of Go-Shirakawa, whose political calculations eventually led to his arrest and execution in 1160.[18] Jōkei's father Fujiwara Sadanori 藤原定則 (n.d.) attempted to avoid punishment by taking the tonsure but ended up exiled in Oki 隠岐 in 1159. Unfortunately, not much else is known about him.[19] Due to the above family issues, Jōkei was sent to Kōfukuji 興福寺, the Fujiwara clan temple (*ujidera* 氏寺), at the age of seven.[20] He began his monastic career in 1165 at the same institution, where his track record

---

17. The most authoritative biography of Jōkei is found in Hiraoka Jōkai 平岡定海, ed., *Tōdaiji Sōshō Shōnin no kenkyū narabini shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人之研究並史料, vol. 3., (Tōkyō: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, 1958–1960), 577–649.

18. Mikael S. Adolphson, *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000), 130.

19. Morrell, *Early Kamakura Buddhism*, 67.

20. Despite the term "clan temple," not all Kōfukuji monks were of Fujiwara stock and not all Fujiwara men were affiliated with Kōfukuji. Jōkei has twelve uncles and four brothers who became monks in at least five different temples, all spread across different ordination lineages. For a detailed enumeration, see Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 19–20.

reflected his prodigy. Between 1183 and 1191, he appeared in at least nine major national lectures and assemblies, including twice at the Yuima-e 維摩會. The Yuima-e was one of the three gatherings (*sanne* 三會) whose lectureship was necessary to advance one's career in the monastic bureaucracy, and Jōkei successfully completed this requirement in 1186, four years after his first appearance as a candidate.[21]

His stay at the Kōfukuji main temple was interrupted by the Genpei war (1180–1185; *Genpei kassen* 源平合戰), during which Taira Shigehira 平重衡 (1158–1185), under orders of his father Kiyomori 清盛 (1118–1181), attacked Nara (1180) and reduced all seven great temples to ashes. The leading monks of Kōfukuji were further prohibited from performing court ceremonies or holding public appointments, and Jōkei retreated to the Anyō'in 安養院 sub-temple for the next decade.[22] Eventually, Kanezane initiated the restoration of Kōfukuji's main structures in 1189, but Jōkei opted to become a recluse (*tonseisō* 遁世僧) four years later (1193) and retreated to Kasagidera 笠置寺, a temple outside of the Nara walls situated roughly twenty kilometres northeast of Kōfukuji.[23]

No explicit reason was given for Jōkei's abrupt departure from his promising career as an official monk (*kansō* 官僧), but James Ford points out that his choice fits in the late-Heian trend of institutional monks joining the ranks of holy men (*hijiri* 聖).[24] Robert Morrell, in agreement with Hiraoka Jōkai, suggests that his relocation can be explained by a desire to be reborn in Miroku's 彌勒 realm, Tosotsuten 兜率天. Two arguments support his hypothesis: first, the main object of worship in Kasagidera is a massive image of Miroku carved in a cliff; and second, Jōkei's wish is explicitly documented in a long list of texts written during this time period, both doctrinal and devotional in nature.[25] David Quinter suggests another possible reason for Jōkei's retreat, namely his desire to fulfil a vow made a decade earlier and complete his copying of the *Great Wisdom Sūtra* (Sk. *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*, Ch. *Da bore boluomiduo jing*, Jp. *Dai hannya haramitta kyō* 大般若波羅蜜多經; T 220).[26]

---

[21] Mikaël Bauer, "The Yuima-e as Theater of the State," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 38, no.1 (2011): 166. For a detailed list of Jōkei's appearances in major lectures and assemblies, see *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 20–1.

[22] Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 165–7.

[23] Morell, *Early Kamakura Buddhism,* 68. The distance was estimated using Google Maps.

[24] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 42.

Jōkei's Kasagidera years were defined by numerous public engagement projects. On the one hand, he led various solicitation campaigns (*kanjin* 勸進) and collaborative projects to fund the expansion of his new residence. On the other hand, he also performed numerous lectures and ceremonies that reinforced his status.[27] This in turn led him to spend more time in the capital region, resulting in the monastic establishment asking him to petition the court on their behalf to censure Hōnen's teaching of exclusive devotion to Amida. Thus, he drew up the *Kōfukuji Petition* in 1205, which indirectly caused the exile of Hōnen and his supporters two years later.[28]

---

[25] These include the *Shin'yō sho* 心要鈔, four *kōshiki* addressed to Miroku and one addressed to its provisional manifestation, the deity Kasuga 春日 (*Kasuga daimyōjin hotsugammon* 春日大明神發願文); see James L. Ford, "Competing with Amida: A Study and Translation of Jōkei's Miroku Kōshiki*,*" *Monumenta Nipponica* 60, no. 1 (2005): 53.

[26] David Quinter, "Materializing and Performing *Prajñā*: Jōkei's Mañjuśrī Faith and the Kasagidera Restoration," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016): 20–1.

[27] For a detailed list of campaigns, lectures, and ceremonies led by Jōkei, see Ford in *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 24–5.

[28] A complete translation of the petition is available in Morrell, *Early Kamakura Buddhism*, 75–88.

In 1207, Jōkei began restoring Fudaraku Kannonji 補陀落觀音寺, a more remote mountain temple dedicated to Kannon that he later renamed Kaijūsenji 海住山寺. Again, for unexplained reasons, he left Kasagidera the following year and retired to the abovementioned temple. Ford conjectures that Jōkei's more explicit devotion to Kannon is an extension of earlier trends in his Kasagidera years. Indeed, in 1202, Jōkei appeared to have relocated to a sub-temple on the east side of Mount Kasagi called Kannon'in 觀音院.[29] Yet, despite moving further away from both socio-political centres of the early Kamakura period, Jōkei remained active during his twilight years. Historical records attest to his sustained involvement with influential political actors as well as a continuous outflow of authored texts.[30] However, the contents of his works produced during his time at Kaijūsenji suggest a shift in the way he interacted with society. Notably, there was a simultaneous decrease in *kōshiki* and an increase in texts concerned with the formal study of both monastic precepts and Hossō doctrine. In fact, Morell notes that Jōkei was the first of many distinguished thinkers who created a minor Hossō revival during the Kamakura period.[31] Ford agrees with this assessment, adding that Jōkei treatises systematised Hossō teachings and attempted to reconcile them with other schools, notably the Tendai.[32] Jōkei passed away in 1213, and according to the *Gedatsu shōnin okeijōki* 解脱上人御形狀記, he departed our world seated in the lotus posture facing southwest—the canonical direction associated with Kannon's Mount Fudaraku.[33]

---

[29] James L. Ford, "Jōkei and Kannon: Defending Buddhist Pluralism in Medieval Japan," *The Eastern Buddhist* 39, no.1 (2008): 16.

[30] For a detailed list of visits and works published, see Ford *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 26–7.

[31] Morrell, *Early Kamakura Buddhism,* 71.

[32] Ford, *Competing with Amida,* 49.

As Robert Rhodes noted in his review of James Ford's *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* Jōkei "remains woefully neglected by religious studies specialists in Japan—and all but ignored in the West."[34] Some fifteen years later, Rhodes' comments remain unfortunately pertinent, as Ford's work is still the only available monograph dedicated to Jōkei across both Japanese and non-Japanese scholarship. Hence, we will briefly summarise its contents below. The book is divided into three parts. The first part begins by situating Jōkei's life and his corpus against the socio-historical backdrop of the late Heian and early Kamakura periods. Then, Ford summarises Jōkei's presentation of Hossō key concepts and discusses his efforts to reformulate Hossō doctrine by "reclaiming the middle way."[35] The second part presents Jōkei's pluralistic approach to devotion and praxis, with a substantive discussion on *kōshiki* and their role in offering a view into Jōkei's religious life. Here, Ford argues that a traditional understanding of Buddhist doctrine underpins this apparent diversity and identifies three underlying themes—the influence esoteric Buddhist principles; the use of skillful means (*hōben* 方便) as a rhetorical device; and the importance of (physical) place. He further suggests interpreting Jōkei's positions not solely as responses to Hōnen's Pure Land movement but also as reactions to the lasting influence of the late Heian period. In the last part, Ford re-examines the relationship between Jōkei, Hōnen and Kamakura Buddhism, arguing against the prevalent characterization of the *Kōfukuji sōjō* as a political document and the neglect of the petition's doctrinal critiques.

---

[33] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 27.

[34] Robert F. Rhodes, review of *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* by James L. Ford, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 34, no. 2 (2007): 448.

[35] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 56.

In fact, Ford contends that modern academic approaches to the study of Kamakura Buddhism—based on either the founder-centric approach or Kuroda Toshio's 黒田俊雄 sociopolitical paradigm—cannot provide a full-picture of Jōkei's thoughts and practices. He proposes instead to view Jōkei as an "ideal window through which to peer into what was perhaps the most dynamic historical period of Japanese Buddhism."[36] Thus, he formulates four trends that characterise Buddhism during this historical juncture, namely, the relationship between monastics and the (Buddhist) "Institution"; the emergence new paradigm of liberation; the rhetoric of self- and other-power in the pursuit of salvation; and the role of physical and social space in Buddhist practice. As such, Ford offers a softer alternative to the dichotomy between New and Old Buddhism and views Jōkei and Hōnen as "two different [albeit at times competing] trajectories in adapting Buddhism to the contingencies of the times."[37]

The remaining scholarship on Jōkei consists of shorter pieces on specific facets of his life, and we will highlight below those that are directly relevant to his Kasagidera years. Some scholars, such as Janet Goodwin and Luke Thompson, have used Jōkei as a case study for illustrating certain trends in the twelfth century. Goodwin, for one, examines his involvement in the Kasagidera *kanjin* campaigns as an example of how Buddhist institutions solicited funds for their development during the Heian and Kamakura periods.[38] Similarly, Thompson frames his study of Jōkei's *Gongu ryōzen kōshiki* 欣求靈山講式 (1196) as an instance of the renewal of Shakamuni devotion in Japan between the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.[39] Conversely, other scholars have treated Jōkei and his writings as a starting point to study various aspects of the Heian and Kamakura periods. Ford, for example, addresses the sectarian, economic and soteriological functions of the five-part *Miroku kōshiki* (1196) in order to better understand the religious developments at the institutional and popular level during Jōkei's lifetime.[40] Likewise, Quinter analyses Jōkei's synthesising of material, textual and ritual culture in the five-part *Monju kōshiki* 文殊講式 (1196) in the context of the Kasagidera restoration to illustrate how "lived religion" were integral to the concerns of scholar-monks associated the Nara schools.[41]

---

[36] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, 194.

[37] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, 205–6.

A Brief Overview of *Kōshiki*

As noted in the "*Introduction to the JJRS Special Edition on* Kōshiki *in Japanese Buddhism,"* there is no English translation that fully captures the meaning of the compound *kōshiki*.[42] The various scholars working on *kōshiki* have adopted different terminologies to translate this term, but if taken literally, there are two main meanings contained within the compound. On the one hand, there is what Guelberg calls a "narrow" sense to the term, where *kōshiki* designates a specific genre of liturgical text (also called *shikimon* 式文) that explains something related to Buddhism. On the other hand, there is also a "broad" definition that considers all the elements present in the ritual performance of the liturgy itself. This second meaning includes the other texts recited along the *shikimon* and can be extended to include the participants of the ritual.[43]

---

[38] Janet R. Goodwin, *Alms and Vagabonds: Buddhist Temples and Popular Patronage in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), 46–66 and Janet R. Goodwin, "Alms for Kasagi Temple," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 4 (1987): 827–41.

[39] Luke Noel Thompson, "Returning to the Founder: Śākyamuni Devotion in Early Medieval Japan and Japanese Buddhist Conceptions of History," (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2017).

[40] Ford, "Competing with Amida," 43–79.

[41] Quinter, "Materializing and Performing *Prajñā*," 17–54.

[42] Barbara R. Ambros, James L. Ford and Michaela Mross, "Editor's Introduction to the Special Issue on Kōshiki in Japanese Buddhism*,"* special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016): 2.

The earliest known example of the *kōshiki* genre is the *Ninjūgo zanmai shiki* 二十五三昧式 (986) by the monk Genshin 源信 (942–1017), which was composed in the context of Pure Land aspirations within the Tendai tradition. The precise origins of the *kōshiki* remain elusive, but there is no doubt surrounding the versatility of this genre. It is simultaneously a Buddhist liturgy, a type of Japanese Buddhist vocal music and a style of localised vernacular preaching literature. In fact, between Genshin's time and the Kamakura era, the *kōshiki* molded itself according to the various requirements of its surrounding environment. For instance, up until the eight and ninth centuries, Buddhist liturgy was mainly conducted in Chinese, making it incomprehensible to the majority of the laity. Thus, one of the *kōshiki's* main functions was to render Buddhist teachings more accessible to a Japanese-speaking audience.[44] However, as the power shifted from the court to the shogunate during the Kamakura era, the *kōshiki* became a sociopolitical tool used to propagate doctrine and securing patronage across a larger social base.[45]

Similar to the current state of scholarship on Jōkei, the study of *kōshiki* remains a relatively recent and understudied subfield within Buddhist studies. It emerged during the

---

43. Ambros, Ford and Mross, "Introduction," 6.

44. Ambros, Ford and Mross, "Introduction," 2.

45. James L. Ford, "Buddhist Ceremonials (*kōshiki*) and the Ideological Discourse of Established Buddhism in Early Medieval Japan," in *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism,* eds. Richard K. Payne and Taigen Daniel Leighton (New York: Routledge, 2006), 98–9.

nineties from Yamada's research group at Taishō University, which edited several compilations of *kōshiki,* including one devoted to works written by Jōkei.[46] These texts were later digitised and transferred to an online database created by Niels Guelberg, who also authored the first Western monograph on *kōshiki* in which he surveys (in German) its historical development and influence on Japanese literature.[47] More recently, a collection of articles was published in a special volume of the *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* (mentioned above), and they reflect the overall interdisciplinarity of contemporary *kōshiki* studies.[48] For example, Michael Jamentz uses textual analysis to identify Chōken 澄憲 (1126–1203) as the author of the *Fugen kōshiki* 普賢講式, a text he describes as "one of the earliest statements of the doctrine of the equivalence of the Buddhist Path and the Way of Poetry."[49] On the other hand, Barbara Ambros' presents a history of the *Anan kōshiki* 阿難講式 across medieval, modern and contemporary times. This *kōshiki* was and is performed exclusively by nuns, and in the contemporary context, Ambros suggests that the "nuns perceive the ritual as affirming their identity as female monastics."[50] Considered together, the articles in this special edition thus depict the *kōshiki* as a flexible medium that encouraged creativity and allowed for new forms of Buddhism to emerge during the

---

[46] See footnote 6.

[47] Niels Guelberg, *Buddhistische Zeremoniale (kōshiki) und ihre Bedeutung für die Literatur des japanischen Mittelalters* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999).

[48] Barbara R. Ambros, James L. Ford and Michaela Mross, eds., special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016); see pp. 10–1 for a list of works published between Guelberg's monograph and this special issue.

[49] Michael E. Jamentz, "The Buddhist Affirmation of Poetry and Locating a Thirteenth-century *Fugen kōshiki* in Liturgical Literature," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016): 55–88. The citation is from p. 83.

[50] Barbara R. Ambros, "A Rite of Their Own: Japanese Buddhist Nuns and the *Anan kōshiki*," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016): 207–50. The citation is from p. 245.

Kamakura era. Finally, at the time of writing this thesis, Michaela Mross has a forthcoming (2022) monograph on *kōshiki* titled *Memory, Music, Manuscripts.* The publisher's website summarises it as a study that brings together "premodern manuscripts and woodblock prints with ethnographic fieldwork to illuminate the historical development of the highly musical *kōshiki* rituals performed by Sōtō Zen clerics," with an emphasis on the "sonic dimension in rituals."[51]

Methodology and Thesis Outline

In light of the available literature on both Jōkei and the *kōshiki*, the present thesis aims to build upon Ford's idea of using this figure as a window to peer into this period of Japanese Buddhism. However, my objective is more modest and consists of analysing the available scholarship on Jōkei through the lens of the *Kannon kōshiki* with the hopes of shedding some light on this monk-scholar, his thoughts and his practices. More specifically, I propose to look beyond Ford's conceptualisation of Jōkei's devotional practices as being centred around the "temporal triumvirate" of Shakamuni, Kannon and Miroku.[52] To do so, I will engage with Quinter's study of Jōkei's Monju faith during his Kasagidera years. I will also consider Goodwin's treatment of his *kanjin* activities at Kasagidera and inquire on whether there are any links between his devotional practices and the physical space in which he resided. At the same time, by placing the *Kannon kōshiki* at the intersection of devotional texts, non-devotional texts and historical realities, I hope to illustrate the malleability of the *kōshiki* genre and contribute to our better understanding of how it encouraged creativity and shaped late Heian-early Kamakura Buddhism.

---

[51] "About the Book," University of Hawai'i Press, accessed 23 June, 2022, https://uhpress.hawaii.edu/title/memory-music-manuscripts-the-ritual-dynamics-of-koshiki-in-japanese-soto-zen/

[52] Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 78.

In this endeavour, I have adopted a textual approach in my study of the *Kannon kōshiki* and, given the questions that motivate the present thesis, (mostly) focussed my analysis on primary sources composed by Jōkei during his Kasagidera years. Due to the multiple constraints related to the ongoing pandemic, I have opted to limit the scope of my research to materials that were available electronically. Thus, the basis of my translation is the digitised text found in Guelberg's *Kōshiki Database.*[53] Nevertheless, despite its convenience, the database does at time contain unavoidable errors related to digitization, such missing or wrong characters. To troubleshoot these issues, I have followed the following four steps throughout the translation process. First, I have cross-checked the five-part *Kannon kōshiki* with the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* and verified if the problematic passage appeared clearly in the latter. Indeed, both texts were composed just a few days apart and overlap at times in content. Second, when the problematic passage was directly quoted from an older text, I have consulted the source text in both the SAT Daizōkyō Text Database and the CBETA Online Reader. Third, I have relied on Jōkei's other *kōshiki* composed during his stay at Kasagidera to identify common phrasing and stylistic devices characteristic of his writings of this time. In particular, I have relied on those composed in 1201, namely the three-part *Kannon kōshiki*, which overlaps at times with the present text; the *Hokke kōshiki* 法華講式; and the three-part *Miroku kōshiki* 彌勒講式. Last, in the rare case where all the above steps failed, I have left the passage untranslated and provided a footnote with the most plausible interpretation given the overall context.

Concretely, this thesis consists of three chapters. The first chapter provides the background information necessary for the study of the *Kannon kōshiki* in the context of

---

[53] A note on the use of *kanji*: all premodern sources, names and concepts are transcribed in *kyūjitai* and all modern/contemporary ones in *shinjitai.* Hence, *nenbutsu* is rendered as 念佛 and *kyū bukkyō* as 旧仏教.

Jōkei's life and his thoughts. It summarises the socio-political events that took place during his lifetime; presents the evolution academic trends in the study of Kamakura Buddhism since the post-war period; and overviews the reception of Yogācāra on the Japanese archipelago as well as the development of Kōfukuji. The second chapter analyses the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside two pieces of similar length that were composed during Jōkei's stay at Kasagidera—the five-part *Monju* and *Miroku kōshiki*. This analysis shows that the *Kannon kōshiki* can be better understood by considering it alongside the ideas of exo-esoteric Buddhism and *mappō* consciousness. Moreover, it also illustrates that certain patterns, such as the multiplicity of identities, textual and geographical spaces, recur in *kōshiki* Jōkei penned during this time period. The third chapter extends the above analysis by examining the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside Jōkei's non-devotional works composed during the same period of his life. It first discusses how Jōkei addresses the central theme of rebirth through the lens of traditional Hossō thought. Then, it argues that the *Kannon kōshiki* reflects a form of *kechien* 結縁 (karmic connection) practice, whose aim is to link the audience of the *kōshiki* with Kannon in order to improve their conditions for enlightenment. The conclusion attempts to situate the entire thesis to the greater discussion on early Kamakura Buddhism. It also sketches possible avenues for future research topics. Finally, an original translation of the *Kannon kōshiki* is appended to this thesis.

Summary of the *Kannon Kōshiki*

Let us wrap up the introduction with a summary of the *Kannon kōshiki* itself. The present text is organised into an introduction, five sections and a colophon. Each body section is in turn divided into a main prose subsection, a shorter subsection in verse and one-line homage to Kannon. A technical note under the title indicates that the ceremony is performed "as usual," although the exact meaning of "usual" remains unclear.[54] The introduction begins with an homage to various deities, after which Jōkei motivates the composition of the *kōshiki* by rhetorically asking who would not take refuge in Kannon. He explains that the bodhisattva shares deep karmic bonds with the world and that their powers facilitate the practitioner's path to take refuge in them. Jōkei then outlines the contents of the *kōshiki*, where each section praising a specific power of the bodhisattva.

The first section is entitled "praising the removal of hardships" and opens with a paraphrase of Kannon's original vow, supported by a passage from the *Universal Gate Chapter* of the *Lotus Sūtra* and illustrated by an extensive amalgam of verse and prose sections from the same chapter.[55] Jōkei explains how Kannon can protect one from various forms of danger and compares the bodhisattva to the king of medicine trees. He encourages one to entrust oneself in Kannon—a plea that is repeated again in the verse form, as Jōkei quotes directly from the *kada* (verse 伽陀) section *Universal Gate Chapter.* The section ends with a single-line homage to the bodhisattva: "We pay homage to the great merciful and compassionate one, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled."

---

[54] Jōkei is not consistent in his listing of ceremonial proceedings, and numerous variations exist throughout his works. Consider, for instance, the *Hokke kōshiki* and the three-part *Miroku kōshiki*, both composed in 1201 (*Kōshiki Database* no. 280, 102). The former provides a detailed "communal obeisance (*sōrai* 惣禮)"—namely four verses followed by *namu* 南無—which is then followed by the "essential dharma rites (*hōyō* 法用), the petition to the *kami* (*jibun* 神分), and the pronouncement of intentions (*hyōbyaku* 表白)." The latter lists "first, the three homages (*sanrai* 三禮); next the petition the *kami*; next the pronouncement of intentions (*hyōbyaku* 表白). Unfortunately, the two other *kōshiki* addressed to Kannon (1201A and 1209) both read "performed as usual," so it is impossible to infer anything else (*Kōshiki Database* no. 65, 70).

[55] This chapter is commonly used liturgically as a stand-alone text and, as such, is sometimes called the *Kannon Sūtra* (Ch. *Kuanyin jing,* Jp. *Kannon kyō* 觀音經).

The second section praises the "bestowal of blessings and longevity"; compares Kannon to a wish-granting jewel that is able to fulfil one's material needs; and presents the merits of reciting the Juntei 准胝 and Nyoirin 如意輪 *dhāraṇī*. Jōkei then paraphrases another passage from the *Universal Gate Chapter,* where he states that Kannon will bless one's offspring, before (re)encouraging people to entrust themselves to Kannon's virtues. Once again, four verses follow the prose. They praise Kannon's immeasurable accumulation of merits and blessings and are a direct continuation of the passage cited at the end of the previous section. The same one-line homage to Kannon caps off the second section.

The third section is entitled "praising the salvation in the next rebirth" and explains the connection between one's rebirths and the theory of cause and effect. Jōkei elaborates on how calling upon Kannon remains the unsurpassed way to eliminate one's karmic hindrances—even for transgressions that cannot be extinguished through repentance, namely, the four grave offences and the five heinous acts. Jōkei then describes the various ways in which the bodhisattva goes into the evil rebirths to save beings, including in the destinies of hell, hungry ghosts and animals. Finally, he quotes the Kannon themselves, listing the benefits that they grant to a person on their deathbed. Again, the prose is followed by four verses from the *Universal Gate Chapter,* which mention the bodhisattva extinguishing sufferings across the various evil destinies. The same single-line homage caps off the section.

The fourth section calls for praising the "depth of karmic opportunities" to connect with Kannon and begins by presenting various identities of the bodhisattva, such as their epithets (Bestower of Fearlessness and Kanjizai 觀自在) and transformation bodies (the Sun-god and Shōtoku Taishi 聖德太子). Jōkei also expounds on the universal depth of this karmic opportunity and mentions the wondrous presence of Shakamuni inside the womb of Kannon. He then provides a lengthy list of underprivileged individuals who bow down to the bodhisattva, followed by a second one that describes geographic span of their presence in this world and the diversity amongst their followers. From the latter, Jōkei infers that Kannon's spiritual efficacies will not disappear as long as people exist. He adds that the bodhisattva establishes both shallow and deep connections with sentient beings and that their original vow carries across the present and the next rebirths, with the present one being superior. A (cryptic) reference to assisting Enma 閻魔 in hell concludes the section, followed by four verses from the *Dacheng zhuangyan jing lun* (Sk. *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra*, Jp. *Daijō sōgon kyō ron* 大乘莊嚴經論; T 1604) that portray Kannon as a mindful and caring being. Again, the verses are followed by the same single-line homage.

The fifth section, entitled "praising the vow of meeting [beings at death]," starts with another paraphrasing of Kannon's original vow. Jōkei then builds on this vow and argues for its validity by noting that Kannon was also once a deluded being alongside us. Now, illuminating the present realm, the bodhisattva announces to the practitioner the possibility of a future rebirth in their pure land, situated in the vicinity of Mount Fudaraku. This is followed by a description of the marvels in that land, which is situated in the liminal space between Shaba and non-Shaba, pure land and non-pure land. Jōkei explains the possibility of cultivating the practices of great compassion there, but he also notes that the recitation of the *Nyoirin dhāraṇī* can achieve similar effects. Then, returning to the benefits of Kannon's abode, Jōkei states that one can see other pure lands without leaving one's body and adds that Kannon is the Buddha-to-be in Amida's Land of Ultimate Bliss. Thus, he pleads to be able to mount Kannon's lotus dais at death and attain rebirth in Amida's pure land. As a reassurance, Jōkei adds that all can be reborn on Mount Fudaraku, regardless of one's karma. The prose of fifth section ends with a vow to become like Kannon. Four verses from the forty-fascicle *Flower Garland Sūtra* (Sk. *Avataṃsaka-sūtra*, Ch. *Huayan jing*, Jp. *Kegon kyō* 華嚴經; T 293) follow, where a vow to bring all that cultivate bodhisattva practices to achieve enlightenment is made. Four other verses follow, forming the merit dedication. The same one-line homage closes the section.

The colophon of the *kōshiki* indicates that the draft was completed on the eighteenth day of the fifth month of the first year of Kennin 建仁. It also indicates that the work is dedicated to all women and wishes all people who have established karmic connections with Kannon to meet the bodhisattva together. Finally, Jōkei mentions that the *kōshiki* was composed in gratefulness to the affection of all compassionate mothers.

CHAPTER I: RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This chapter aims to provide the relevant background information for the study of the *Kannon kōshiki* in the context of Jōkei's life and his thoughts. Thus, we will first summarise the socio-political events that took place during his lifetime, with an emphasis on those that occurred before 1201. We will then discuss how the academic trends in the study of Kamakura Buddhism have evolved over the last eighty years. Finally, we will overview the reception of Yogācāra on the Japanese archipelago and the development of its main centre, Kōfukuji.

The Socio-Political Context between 1155 and 1221

Let us begin in 1155, which marks both the birth of Jōkei and the beginning of Go-Shirakawa's 後白河 (1127–1192) reign. Go-Shirakawa was enthroned by his father Toba 鳥羽 (1103–1156), whose position as senior retired emperor allowed him to remain active in court politics as part of the *insei* system (cloistered rule 院政).[56] This system goes back to the reign of Uda 宇多 (866–931), during which the monastic and imperial lineages were gradually joined together, placing the retired emperor at centre of a state network.[57] By the time of Toba's grandfather Shirakawa 白河 (1053–1129), the *insei* system was an "almost formalized political norm," in which the imperial household, led by retired sovereigns, competed as a kinship bloc with other factions for political power.[58]

---

[56] Toba was forced to abdicate by his grandfather in 1123, in favour of his own son, who became Emperor Sutoku 崇德 (1119–1164). He spent six years as the junior retired emperor, holding minimal influence until the passing of Shirakawa in 1129. For the events during Toba's time as senior retired emperor, see G. Cameron Hurst III, "*Insei*," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2—Heian Japan*, eds. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 608–18.

[57] Mikaël Bauer, "Conflating Monastic and Imperial Lineage: The Retired Emperors' Period Reformulated," *Monumenta Nipponica* 67, no. 2 (2012): 240–1.

Like his grandfather, Toba was quite active after his abdication. For instance, he was the patron of Taira no Tadamori 平忠盛 (1096–1153), a man whose forces acted as a "central government mercenary army" and whose successes on the battlefield and at court would pave the way for the Taira's rise as one of the two main warrior factions during the twelfth century.[59] Toba's post-regnal years also saw the (re)formation of conflicts within the major political families of his era. In 1150, the reinstated regent Fujiwara no Tadezane 藤原忠實 (1078–1162), who later passed the regency and headship of the clan to his younger son Yorinaga 頼長 (1120–1156), bypassing the elder Tadamichi 忠通 (1097–1164).[60] Similar frictions existed within the Minamoto 源 clan, the other main warrior faction during the twelfth century, where a power struggle developed between Yoshitomo 義朝 (1123–1160) and his father Tameyoshi 為義 (1096–1156). Finally, within his own family, Toba was at odds with his elder son Sutoku. Indeed, the latter was not only forced to vacate the throne in 1142 for his half-brother Konoe 近衛 (1139–1155), but he became even more sidelined from power with the enthronement of Go-Shirakawa and the naming the Go-Shirakawa's son as crown prince.

---

[58] Hurst, "*Insei*," 595. See pp. 637–43 for a summary of Japanese and Western scholarly perspectives on *insei* and also G. Cameron Hurst III, *Insei Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan 1086–1185* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

[59] Hurst, "*Insei,*" 616.

[60] The Fujiwara regent line, or *sekkanke* 攝關家 provided consorts to the imperial family throughout the Heian period. However, its influence was so reduced by the beginning of the twelfth century that Shirakawa was able strip Tadezane of his position in 1120. In 1130, Go-Shirakawa reinstated Tadezane by removing Tadamichi from the position, which caused friction between father and son. For the ascendency and regency of the Fujiwara clan, see William H. McCullough, "The Heian Court," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 3—Medieval Japan*, ed. Kōzō Yamamura (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 20–96.

Two factions formed along the lines of the above conflicts, and in 1156, right after the death of Toba, they clashed for a few hours in what became known as the Hōgen disturbance (*Hōgen no ran* 保元の亂).[61] Go-Shirakawa's supporters—headed by Tadamichi, Taira no Kiyomori 平清盛 (the son of Tadamori; 1118–1181) and Yoshitomo—defeated the faction led by retired emperor Sutoku, Yorinaga and Tameyoshi.[62] Takeuchi Rizō notes that the "Hōgen Disturbance resolved sharp conflicts within the imperial and Fujiwara leadership . . . but it left unanswered the question of military supremacy as between Go-Shirakawa's two chief warrior leaders, Kiyomori and Yoshitomo."[63]

In 1158, Go-Shirakawa abdicated and became the sole retired emperor. However, his son, now enthroned as Nijō 二條 (1143-1165), was intent on ruling directly. Nijō was supported in this endeavour by two Fujiwara courtiers, Tsunemune 經宗 (1119-1189) and Koretaka 惟方 (1125-n.d.), and opposed by a third one, Michinori. Better known by his Buddhist name Shinzei 信西, Michinori was one of Go-Shirakawa's main advisors, but his political successes also earned him enemies. In particular, he drew the ire of Yoshitomo and Fujiwara no Nobuyori 藤原信頼 (1133-1160), another advisor to Go-Shirakawa), by stalling their progress at court. These rivalries led to a second armed conflict in 1160—the Heiji disturbance (*Heiji no ran* 平治の亂).[64] Nobuyori and Yoshimoto enacted a coup while Kiyomori was out of the capital, and with the backing of (mainly) Minamoto forces, they killed Shinzei and kidnapped both Nijō and Go-Shirakawa. The emperor and retired emperor ultimately escaped; Kiyomori returned to the capital with reinforcements; and the conspirators were eliminated in what appeared to be a total victory.[65]

---

[61] The events are recounted in the *Hōgen monogatari* 保元物語. In English, see William Ritchie Wilson, *Hōgen Monogatari: Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen* (Ithaca: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2001).

[62] Takeuchi Rizō, "The Rise of the Warriors," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 2—Heian Japan*, eds. Donald H. Shively and William H. McCullough (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 688–91. Incidentally, Rizō notes that Sutoku called upon the warrior-monks from Kōfukuji, who never arrived on the battlefield (p.690). See also, Hurst, "*Insei*," 619–20.

[63] Rizō, "Rise of the Warriors," 691. However, as Jeffrey Mass notes, the Taira and Minamoto "were not, as they are usually depicted, regional chieftains chafing under courtier dominance. Rather, they were bridging figures—military nobles in the truest sense—between the great central aristocrats, who were their patrons, and the great provincial warriors, who were their followers. The leaders' dual character, born out of service to two constituencies, is essential to an understanding of the slow progress of warrior development in its initial phase"; see Jeffrey P. Mass, "The Kamakura *bakufu*," in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 3—Medieval Japan*, ed. Kōzō Yamamura (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 49.

However, Go-Shirakawa did not immediately gain a political upper hand after these events because he was opposed by Kiyomori, who supported a direct rule by Nijō. In fact, the next two decades were characterised by the hegemony of the Taira. Kiyomori's victories allowed him to expand their land holdings across both eastern and western regions, which, in turn, consolidated his military and economic positions. Indeed, foreign trade only provided him with an opportunity to demonstrate his cultural assets, for his main source of wealth and influence remained anchored in his land holdings.[66] At the same time, Kiyomori strengthened his influence in the capital by climbing the court hierarchy. In 1167, he reached the top echelons of the senior nobility (*kugyō* 公卿), which allowed him to place his allies in key political positions.[67] He further advanced his interests by intermarrying the Taira with both the imperial and Fujiwara families. For example, his daughter, Kenreimon'in 建禮門院 (née Tokuko 德子; 1155–1223) was the most powerful woman in the Japanese isles before the Genpei war. She was married to emperor Takakura 高倉 (1161–1181), and after the enthronement of their son Antoku, simultaneously held the status of retired imperial consort and "mother of the realm" (*kokumo* 國母), which allowed her to exercise a certain degree of authority in the management of the Taira's public affairs.[68]

---

[64] See the *Heiji monogatari* 平治物語, translated in English in Marisa Chalitpatanangune*, "Heiji Monogatari: a Study and Annotated Translation of the Oldest Text,*" (PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1987).

[65] For events between the disturbances, see Hurst, "*Insei,*" 621–3 and Rizō, "Rise of Warriors," 691–4.

[66] Charlotte von Verschuer, "Heike Trade and the Meaning of Wealth," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 40–2; in the same volume, see also Mikael S. Adolphson, "Fukuhara: Kiyomori's Lost Capital," 29–34.

[67] Kiyomori was promoted to the First Rank and to Chancellorship (*daijō daijin* 太政大臣). The rise of the Taira clan is described (romantically) in the *Heike monogatari* 平家物語*.* There are five English translations of the text, and Tyler's rendition is the most recent one; see Royall Tyler, *The Tale of the Heike,* (New York: Penguin Books, 2014).

In the process of improving his economic, military and political positions, Kiyomori also strengthened his social and cultural prestige by emulating previous eminent courtiers, such as Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966–1028). As mentioned above, he acquired luxury items from the continent through trade, but he also sponsored various religious projects like the elaborately decorated *Heike nōkyō* 平家納經 and established his own distinctive rites in two new sites—Itsukushima 嚴島 and Fukuhara 福原.[69] In the words of Heather Blair, Kiyomori followed precedents set by the Heian court established a new "ritual regime" to justify his right to rule.[70]

---

[68] Lori Meeks, "Survival and Salvation in the *Heike monogatari*: Reassessing the Legacy of Kenreimon'in," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 142, 147.

[69] Regarding the trade and import of luxury goods from the continent, see von Verschuer, "Heike Trade," 49–53; see also pp. 47–9 for Kiyomori's sponsoring of religious projects.

For a study of the *Heike nōkyō,* one of Japan's national treasures, see Monika Dix, "Heike Nōkyō as Repertoire: Contextualizing Kiyomori's Devotional Practice of Copying Sutras," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 99–124. Dix notes that beyond emulating Michinaga, Kiyomori aimed to establish karmic affinity with various deities in order to secure divine protection and merit for his lineage (p.115).

[70] Heather Blair, "Kiyomori, Itsukushima, and Fukuhara," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 72–3. Blair's framework of ritual regime is explained in pp. 58–61.

Kiyomori cooperated with Go-Shirakawa for their mutual benefit until he was powerful enough to dominate his former patron.[71] Indeed, tensions escalated from the mid-1170s onwards. In the eleventh month of 1179, Kiyomori himself staged a coup and put Go-Shirakawa under house arrest. Three months later, he placed his own grandson on the throne, who became Emperor Antoku 安德 (1178–1185).[72] By looking at the means through which the Taira have attained the highest position in the Heian court, some scholars have recently described them as warrior-aristocrats, challenging the clean divide between these two categories.[73] Takahashi Masaaki 高橋昌明, for one, contends that the "warrior class first emerged not as an independent entity, free from court influence, but rather from within the capital, immediately around the emperor—in short, from within courtier society itself."[74] Another example illustrating the Taira's warrior-aristocrat duality is their participation in poetry composition, and especially in the composition of *waka* 和歌. This form of Japanese poetry was considered to be the most admired form of courtly pursuit, but it also served as a channel for them to exercise soft-power and legitimise their position within the social elite.[75]

---

[71] Hurst, "*Insei*," 624. Examples of collaboration include the arrangement of Rokujō's 六條 (1164–1176) abdication in 1168. In his place, Go-Shirakawa's fourth son, whose mother was from the Taira clan, became emperor under the name Takakura.

[72] The ascendency of the Taira clan between the Heiji disturbance and the Genpei war is given in Rizō, "The Rise of Warriors," 695–700 and Hurst, "*Insei*," 623–29.

[73] Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons, "Blurring the Lines: Repositioning the Heike," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 2–6.

[74] Takahashi Masaaki, "Fact and Fiction in the *Heike monogatari*," trans. Eiji Okawa, in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 134. Takahashi actually makes a stronger claim, saying that the "Heike regime, centred in Rokuhara (in modern-day Kyōto), represented the first *bakufu* to emerge in Japanese history . . . Yoritomo's historical significance does not lie in founding the *bakufu*; rather, his true innovations should be located in his *development and refinement* of a model first created by the Heike" (pp. 134–5).

Despite these efforts, the Taira hegemony was short-lived. Minamoto no Yorimasa 源頼政 (1106–1180) convinced Mochihito 以仁 (1151–1180), one of Go-Shirakawa's sons, to call for the Taira's overthrow. However, this first opposition was brief. The anti-Taira forces were quashed at the first Battle of Uji 宇治 (1180), which marked the beginning of the Genpei war.[76] After Uji, Kiyomori moved the imperial court to his own stronghold in Fukuhara. This decision, according to Mikael Adolphson, cannot solely be explained as a reactionary decision to political tensions in Kyōto. Instead, it also appeared to reflect Kiyomori's desire to establish a new political and ritual centre to provide stability for his own descendants.[77] However, he reversed course later that year and returned to the capital region, whereupon he acted against shrine-temple complexes he perceived as a threat.[78] Kōfukuji 興福寺 and Tōdaiji 東大寺 were burnt to the ground, an event narrated in the *Heike Monogatari* as follows,

> "Smoke filled the heavens. The sky was flame. // Eyewitnesses could not bear to look, // and those told the story fainted with horror. // The Hossō and Sanron holy scriptures, // down to the very last scroll, were gone. // In this land of ours,

---

[75] On the composition of courtly poetry, see Anne Commons, "The Heike Poets," in *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory,* eds. Mikael S. Adolphson and Anne Commons (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015), 78–98; the quoted passage is from p. 79. The idea of good poetry reflecting good governance is found in Confucian texts from the continent (see the *Classic of Poetry* 詩經; Ch. Shijing), but by the Heian period, it was already well-entrenched in the Japanese context.

[76] Rizō, "The Rise of Warriors," 697–700.

[77] See Adolphson, "Fukuhara," 24–5; the move and its aftermath is described in pp. 19–21. The foundation of a new capital to mark the beginning of a dynasty or lineage was a regular occurrence in Japanese history: Heian-kyō 平安京, for instance, was itself established by Kanmu 桓武 (735–806) in 794. On Fukuhara becoming a new ritual centre, see Blair, "Kiyomori, Itsukushima, and Fukuhara," 65–9.

[78] Adolphson notes that Kiyomori took on the temples before moving against the Minamoto, leaving no doubts regarding whom he considered the bigger threat. See Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 165–6.

> needless to say, // but equally in India or China, // no disaster approaching this one // can every before have struck the teaching."[79]

Kiyomori's decision deeply shocked and alienated court society, given that both institutions had strong ties to the political blocs of the time: the former was the clan temple of the Fujiwara, and the latter was considered by the imperial family to be a symbol of state protection.[80] Kiyomori passed away a year after these events.

In the meantime, two Minamoto cousins responded to Mochihito's call. In the Kantō 關東 region, Yoritomo 頼朝 (1147–1199), the son of Yoshitomo, rallied troops that included both Taira and Minamoto men. As Jeffrey Mass points out, "far from being a dispute between two great warrior clans, as it is so often depicted, the Gempei conflict was a national civil war involving substantial intraclan fighting and also pitting local against central interests."[81] In the Shinano 信濃 region, Yoshinaka 義仲 (1154–1184) raised forces and won a series of victories against the Taira that led him to enter the capital in 1183. Go-Shirakawa, having now sided with the Minamoto, put his grandson Go-Toba 後鳥羽 (1180–1239) on the throne after the Taira had fled the capital with Antoku. More importantly, he negotiated an agreement with Yoritomo to counter the increasingly despotic Yoshinaka.

---

79. Tyler, *The Tale of the Heike,* 302–3. Hossō and Sanron scriptures here allude respectively to Kōfukuji and Tōdaiji. There is no doubt that the burning of Nara did take place and that it sent shockwaves across the capital. However, as Takashi notes, it is important to keep in mind that the *Heike monogatari* is a work of literature, and every single detail cannot be taken at face value. For instance, the "portrayals of Kiyomori as a tyrant and Shigemori as a sagely gentleman seem to be at odds with their actual personalities as reflected in contemporary sources, being images constructed by the authors of the *Heike monogatari*"; see Takahashi Masaaki, "Fact and Fiction," 217–9.

80. The events of the Gempei war are described in Rizō, "The Rise of Warriors," 700–9. See also, Mass, "The Kamakura *bakufu*," 52–9.

81. Mass, "Kamakura *bakufu*," 47. For a summary of Yoritomo's consolidation, see pp. 52–5. Takeuchi Rizō's analysis concurs with Mass. He describes the conflict as a "struggle between the military usurpers of that regime, the Taira, and warriors striving to gain secure access to the management of land resources, rallying to the Minamoto"; see Rizō, "The Rise of Warriors," 702.

This agreement granted his Kamakura-based government a permanent status, which saw the court recognise both his military and judicial authority in the east.[82] Yoritomo then dispatched his brothers Noriyori 範頼 (1150–1193) and Yoshitsune 義經 (1159–1189) to eliminate Yoshinaka. The following year, the two siblings decisively defeated the Taira at Dan-no-ura 壇ノ浦, putting an end to the Genpei war in 1185.

Yoritomo then turned his attention towards Yoshitsune, whom he began to see as a rival. Now back in power, Go-Shirakawa batted for both sides and conferred, for example, court offices upon Yoshitsune against Yoritomo's wishes. Eventually, Yoshitsune was chased out of the capital and sought refuge with the Ōshū 奥州 branch of the Fujiwara in the northeast, who had remained neutral during the Genpei war. In response, Yoritomo launched a campaign against both and emerged victorious in 1189.[83] The 1180s and 1190s also saw Yoritomo establish the administrative roles of *jitō* (military estate steward 地頭), *shugo* (military governor 守護) and *gokenin* (vassal 御家人) to reward loyal retainers and impose a structure of control over his allies.[84] Throughout this period, the new military government gradually took shape, and in the process, the power dynamics between Kamakura and Kyōto oscillated. Hurst describes the relationship between the two centres of power as a “symbiotic” one, governed at its core by a joint court-*bakufu* (*kōbu*) polity guided by common interests.[85]

---

[82] G. Cameron Hurst III, "The Kōbu Polity: Court-Bakufu Relations in Kamakura Japan," in *Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History,* ed. Jeffrey P. Mass (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982), 7–10. See also, Mass, "Kamakura *bakufu*," 56–8. Some scholars argue that this agreement marks the beginning of the Kamakura period; see footnote 77 above for further sources.

[83] Rizō, "Rise of Warriors," 707–8.

[84] The term *jitō* first appeared during the ninth century but was repurposed by Yoritomo as a means to reward his allies in the aftermath of the Genpei war. Similarly, he institutionalised the terms *shugo* and *gokenin* after the Northern Fujiwara campaign to manage his vassals, even if the term vassalage was an amorphous concept at the time. Takahashi writes that prior to the establishment of the *bakufu,* kinsmen serving the Taira were also referred to as *gokenin,* where the prefix *go* was added around the 1170s to the pre-existing term *kenin*—a household vassal; see Takahashi, "Fact and Fiction," 132–3. For the developments of *jitō* and *shugo*, including an analysis of the account given in the *Azuma kagami* 吾妻鏡 (1266), see Mass, "Kamakura *bakufu,*" 59–64.

In 1192, Go-Shirakawa passed away. Kujō Kanezane, a Fujiwara ally, was now Chancellor and persuaded Go-Toba to appoint Yoritomo to the position of *shōgun* 將軍*.* However, Mass argues that the fame in this event is misplaced, as its significance was only established after Yoritomo’s death.[86] Nevertheless, the next three years saw harmonious relationships between both capitals, as well as Kanezane achieving the height of his powers.[87] In 1195, a conflict of interest between the two former allies developed, revolving around Yoritomo’s ambition to see his daughter Ōhime 大姫 (1178–1197) become an imperial consort. His desire did materialise, but he did not gain much from it, for Ōhime passed away shortly after. Instead, it led to Kanezane falling out of power in 1196, which reduced Yoritomo’s own influence in Kyōto. Consequently, interactions between court and *bakufu* 幕府 were kept at a minimum until his own death in 1199.

The two decades following the passing of Yoritomo were characterised by what Hurst describes as a “strengthened *kōbu* unity,” as well as a consolidation of power in both capitals. In Kyōto, Go-Toba, who retired from the position of emperor in 1198, successfully neutralised his opponents by 1202 and envisioned a “new age of cooperation between the two sides of the *kōbu* polity, under an unassailable ex-emperor.”[88] On the other hand, there was a power vacuum in Kamakura. The Hōjō 北條 and Hiki 比企 families competed for control, with the former eliminating the latter, but infighting continued amongst the Hōjō until 1219.[89] That year, the *shōgun* Minamoto no Sanetomo 源實朝 (1192–1219) was assassinated, and a disagreement over his successor ensued. According to Mass, this dispute was at the source of the Jōkyū Disturbance (*jōkyū no ran* 承久の亂) of 1221, in which the Hōjō defeated Go-Toba, causing in turn a "shift, if not a restructuring, in the power alignments between and within the two capitals as well as within the warrior class as a whole."[90]

---

[85] Hurst, “Kōbu Polity," 5, 7-9.

[86] Mass, “Kamakura *bakufu*,” 64. Yoritomo returned the title of *shōgun* in 1195, opting instead for the more prestigious position of *utaishō* 右大將*.*

[87] For events between 1192 and 1199, see Hurst, “Kōbu Polity," 10 and “Kamakura *bakufu*,” 64–6.

[88] Hurst, “Kōbu Polity,” 13.

The above summary of historical events shows that Jōkei lived in an era marked by violent political turmoil. However, as the burning of Kōfukuji and Tōdaiji suggests, these political events did not take place in a vacuum but were often intertwined with religion. Heather Blair, writing about the Heian period, notes that religious culture was "structured by power differentials" and can "fruitfully be understood as political"—a statement which appears to also hold true for the beginning of the Kamakura period.[91] Indeed, the competition for Ategawa 阿氐河 at the end of the Genpei war illustrates how politics and religion overlapped during Jōkei's life. Here, two religious centres, Kōngobuji 金剛峯寺 and Jakurakuji 寂樂寺, claimed ownership of the Ategawa estate. Each forged contractual ties with different members of the Yuasa 湯淺 clan, who were warrior-estate mangers governed by Yoritomo's the *jitō* system, and the contest for land became a three-way dispute that carried on for most of the thirteenth century.[92]

---

[89] For events between 1199 and 1219, see Hurst, "Kōbu Polity," 12-14; see also footnote 90 below.

[90] Mass, "Kamakura *bakufu*," 66. Mass presents the events leading to the Jōkyū disturbance in pp. 66–70 but with the caveat that "sources fall suddenly silent regarding actual movement toward war" (p. 69).

[91] Heather Blair, "Religion and Politics in Heian-Period Japan," *Religion Compass* 7, no. 8 (2013): 284. Here, we draw on Blair's broad definition of religion and politics, respectively defined as a "porous domain of ritual and doctrine" and the "execution of governance but also to the broader question of how men and women negotiated and contested power relations" (p. 284).

The relationship between religious and political centres during the late Heian-early Kamakura period was thus a two-way street. In one direction, the court and *bakufu* tried to maintain close ties with shrine-temple complexes, and in particular, with Mount Hiei 比叡山.[93] They built connections with the top of the *saṃgha* hierarchy by means of kinship or personal ties, an approach which yielded mixed results.[94] In the opposite direction, as the example of Ategawa shows, shrine-temple complexes also took the initiative to build alliances with courtiers and warriors to advance their interests. Besides, different religious organisations used different means of pressure to voice their concerns with either Kyōto or Kamakura: some ceased to perform state rituals, others resorted to military threats. Most famously, the larger complexes (such as Enryakuji and Kōfukuji) developed a ritualised procession called *gōso* (forceful protest 強訴) in which they relied on the spiritual powers of Buddhas and *kami* 神 (and sometimes their own weapons) to appeal against decisions that went against their interests.[95] As Neil McMullin puts it,

---

[92] See Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 171–5. Kōngobuji was (and still is) the head temple of the Kōyasan complex, affiliated to the Shingon school. As for, Jakurakuji, it was affiliated to both Hosshōji 法勝寺 and Onjōji 園城寺. Moreover, the events at Ategawa were not unique. Adolphson observes that "the issues that involved the Kamakura Bakufu and religious institutions in central Japan focussed largely on the possession of land, as the local warrior class, over which the local Kantō held exclusive jurisdiction, was prone to expand its own territories at the expense of the legitimate proprietors" (p.178).

On the medieval *shōen,* see Ōyama Kyōhei 大山喬平, "Medieval *Shōen*," trans. Martin Collcutt, in *The Cambridge History of Japan: Volume 3—Medieval Japan*, ed. Kōzō Yamamura (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 89–127; see also Kuroda Toshio, "Buddhism and Society in the Medieval Estate System," trans. Suzanne Gay, special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996): 287–319.

[93] The Tendai centre Enryakuji 延暦寺 dominated Mount Hiei, but as Grapard's study of the Sannō 山王 cultic system shows, there was no divide between Buddhism and local religions; see Allan G. Grapard, "Linguistic Cubism—A Singularity of Pluralism in the Sannō Cult," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14, vol. 2–3 (1987): 211–34. Neil McMullin puts this point even more strongly, writing that "through the millennium from the middle of the Heian period (794–1185) to the modern age, there was no such a thing in Japan as an exclusively Buddhist institution. All so-called Buddhist institutions were at least partly Shinto, and all so-called Shinto institutions were at least partly Buddhist. In other words, all major religious institutions in Japan combined both Buddhist"; see Neil McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues in the Study of Pre-Modern Japanese Religions," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 8. For a more general discussion, see the second section below.

[94] Examples of successes include Go-Shirakawa's appointment of his uncle Saiun 最雲 (1104–1162) as the Tendai *zasu* 座主 (head abbot) and Kiyomori's close relationship with Myōun 明雲 (1115–1184), who later also became *zasu.* In contrast, the monastic careers of Kaishū 快修 (1100–1172) and Eshin 慧信 (1114–1174) illustrate how monks close to the court were not always accepted by their peers. A detailed treatment of the relationship between elite temples and the two capitals during the life of Go-Shirakawa is presented in Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 125–84.

Finally, we note that the religious establishments did not form a single, cohesive block. Tensions existed between different temples, as the multiple conflicts above illustrate.

> There was no politics-versus-religion dichotomy in pre-modern Japanese societies: all notions about authority were politico-religious. Indeed, in these societies, religion and politics were so commingled that the very use of the terms "religion" and "politics" in reference to them causes an interpretative splitting of them.[96]

With this in mind, let us now examine how academe has approached the study of Buddhism in the Kamakura period since the end of World War II.

Postwar Academic Trends in the Study of Kamakura Buddhism

In the nineties, Satō Hiroo 佐藤弘夫 summarised the trajectory of postwar Japanese scholarship on Kamakura Buddhism in three stages.[97] The first one, which lasted till the mid-sixties, adopted a "founders"-centric approach and focussed on monks who established independent schools, such as Hōnen, Dōgen 道元 (1153–1200) and Nichiren 日蓮 (1222–1282). In doing so, it established the categories of Old Buddhism (*kyū bukkyō* 旧仏教) and New Buddhism (*shin bukkyō* 新仏教). The former designates the six Nara schools alongside the Tendai and Shingon schools, and the latter corresponds to the abovementioned independent schools. Put differently, it is an approach that anchors the beginning of Kamakura Buddhism to a historical point, set usually to either 1185 or 1192. Ryūichi Abé situates this interpretation within the modern "textbook discourse" on Japanese Buddhist history constructed during the Tokugawa 徳川 (1603–1867) and Meiji 明治 periods (1868–1912), which, according to him, continued past the second half of twentieth century "because its two primary objects of legitimization, the emperor system, though eviscerated of power, and the sectarianism underlying Japanese Buddhism, though one no longer sanctioned by the state, survived the war."[98]

---

[95] For a comprehensive treatment of *gōso,* see Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 240–87. As Adolphson notes, the term *gōso* is anachronistic, but we will follow the scholarly consensus in calling these manifestations *gōso.*

[96] McMullin, "Historical and Historiographical Issues," 15. See also, Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 347: "The separation of religion and politics is a distinction that the premodern Japanese never knew."

[97] The three stages are summarised in Ryuichi Abé, *The Weaving of Mantra,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 404–8. See also the summaries in Stone, *Original Enlightenment,* 58–62 and Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 186–92.

Jacqueline Stone observes that the "founders"-centric approach has also led to the enshrinement of various stereotypes that perdure in contemporary Western and Japanese publications, chief among which is the constructed dichotomy between a corrupt, elitist Old Buddhism and a reformist, populist New Buddhism.[99] Two other tropes are worth mentioning here. The first involves the notion of Kamakura Buddhism being the Japanese equivalent of the Protestant Reformation. This idea is generally attributed to Hara Katsurō 原勝郎 but is nonetheless present in Western scholarship, sometimes under the label of a

---

98. Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 416; see pp. 409–16 for a summary of how Tokugawa and Meiji ruling ideologies shaped the modern narrative of Japanese Buddhism.

Abé's treatment of Tokugawa and Meiji revisionism builds on an approach developed by Kuroda Toshio, which aimed to distance itself from "doctrinal and devotional perspectives on history, perspectives related to the two major changes that occurred in Japanese religion subsequent to the medieval period: first, the official recognition of independent Buddhist sects in early modern times and the consequent systematization of sectarian doctrine; and second, the separation of Shinto from Buddhism and the rise of State Shinto in the modern era"; see Kuroda Toshio, "The Development of the *Kenmitsu* System As Japan's Medieval Orthodoxy," trans. James C. Dobbins, special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996): 234. This is a translation of the first thirty-five pages of Kuroda's "Chūsei ni okeru kenmitsu taisei no tenkai" 中世における顕密体制の展開 in *Nihon chūsei no kokka to shūkyō* 日本中世の国家と宗教, (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1975), 413–547.

99. Stone, *Original Enlightenment,* 59 and, in particular, footnote 4.

"lost reformation."[100] The second one invokes the Japanification of Buddhism, which James Foard notes "has passed away in Japanese scholarship only to find eternal life in the West."[101] This division between Old Buddhism and New Buddhism was later refined in a second stage, which Satō places around the late sixties. Scholarship from this period maintained the (constructed) boundary between these two categories, but it also argued that reform movements were simultaneously occurring in both groups.[102] In a sense, the second stage bridges the first one with the third, which was spearheaded by the works of Kuroda Toshio.

In 1963, Kuroda published an essay entitled "Chūsei no kokka to tennō 中世の国家と天皇," wherein he introduced the theory of *kenmon taisei* 權門体制 or "system of ruling elites." This theory advanced that three power blocs—the imperial court (*kuge* 公家), the military government (*buke* 武家) and shrine-temple complexes (*jike* 寺家)—dominated the politics and society of medieval Japan, albeit without any particular party achieving total hegemony. In a way, *kenmon taisei* challenged both the academic received notion that the

---

[100] Hara Katsurō, "Tōzai no shūkyō kaikaku 東西の宗教改革," originally published in 1911; reprinted Hara Katsurō, *Nihon chūsei shi no kenkyū,* (Tōkyō: Dōbunkan, 1929). However, the importance of Hara's paper in the shaping of this comparison has been recently challenged. See the long abstract of Orion Klautau, "Revisiting Religious Reformation: *Shūkyō Kaikaku* in Japanese History and Historiography" (paper presented at the 16th International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies, online, 25 August, 2021), https://nomadit.co.uk/conference/eajs2021/paper/56563.

A summary of the (lost) reformation theory can be found in James H. Foard, "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 7, no. 4 (1980): 261–91. Nevertheless, Foard concludes his article with a clear refutation of this theory, writing that the "notion of Kamakura Buddhism as a lost reformation can no longer serve us" (p. 285).

[101] Foard, "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism," 262.

[102] For examples of scholarship from this stage, see the ideas of Ishida Yoshito 石田善人, Imai Masaharu 今井雅晴, Ōsumi Kazuo and Takagi Yukata 高木豊 in Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 405.

Japanese middle ages were the "age of the samurai" and the imperial historiography of the Meiji era that over-emphasised the role of the imperial family in premodern times.[103]

The essay was republished in *Nihon chūsei no kokka to shūkyō* 日本中世の国家と宗教, a volume put together in 1975 that ended with an article titled "Chūsei ni okeru kenmitsu taisei no tenkai 中世における顕密体制の展開."[104] In the latter, Kuroda presented a theory called *kenmitsu taisei* 顕密体 or "exoteric-esoteric system," which argued that a combination of exoteric and esoteric forms of Buddhism formed the religious orthodoxy from the mid-Heian till the Muromachi period 室町 (1333–1573). Kuroda included the worship of *kami* in this orthodoxy, which by extension meant that he saw no independent "Shintō" tradition in pre-modern times.[105] Moreover, this religious orthodoxy was vested in the institutional structures of the Old Buddhist schools and formed a power bloc whose influence reached across social, economic and political spheres. In other words, *kenmitsu taisei* rejected the idea of New Kamakura Buddhism at its core, placing the newly formed schools outside of the Buddhist mainstream and in the margins of the Kamakura period.

Kuroda's scholarship significantly influenced the field of pre-modern Japanese studies as a whole: in addition to the two above theories, it spanned a variety of topics such as the imperial and Buddhist law, the estate system (*shōen* 莊園) and the "Shintō" tradition.[106] In fact, Abé writes that

---

[103] Kuroda Toshio, "Chūsei no kokka to tennō 中世の国家と天皇," *Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi* 岩波講座日本歴史, eds. Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘 *et al*. (Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1963). See also James C. Dobbins, "Editor's Introduction: Kuroda Toshio and His Scholarship," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996): 217–32 and Blair, "Religion and Politics in Heian-Period Japan," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996): 284–93.

[104] See footnote 98.

[105] See footnotes 93 and 103. A summary of recent scholarship on the *kami* and Buddhas in pre-modern Japan is given on pp. 370–5 in Ruppert's 2013 review; see footnote 116 below.

> of all the alternative theories formulated and applied to Japanese Buddhist history, Kuroda's appears to have provided the most effective conceptual apparatus currently available for identifying the shortcomings of the modern approach to the Buddhism of the Heian [and Kamakura periods].[107]

In its wake, a new generation of scholars began to (re)examine the development of Nara schools during the Heian and Kamakura periods, focussing in particular on monastic figures associated with the so-called revival of Nara schools during the Kamakura period.[108]

Yet, this is not to say that Kuroda's model isn't without its detractors. Matsuo Kenji, for instance, voices the following: "my strongest opposition to [Kuroda's] understanding of Japanese medieval religion concerns his apparent confusion of the religious dimensions with the socio-political dimensions."[109] In Matsuo's opinion, a better way to frame the development of Japanese medieval religions is by looking at official monks (*kansō*) and reclusive monks (*tonseisō*) as "protagonists" for the development of Japanese Buddhism, with reclusive monks being "responsible for producing and propelling Kamakura Buddhism."[110] On the other hand, Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士 shows that Kuroda's model does not fully account for the phenomenon of *hijiri* (holy person), which started from within institutions governed by *kenmitsu taisei* but gradually became independent as they moved away geographically from the major shrine-temple complexes.[111] Finally, both Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫 and Yokouchi Hiroto 横内裕人 have challenged *kenmitsu taisei* as essentialising Japanese Buddhism and over-emphasising its Japanese-ness. Instead, they advocate for situating the development of pre-modern Japanese Buddhism within the greater trans-cultural East Asian context.[112]

---

[106] The breath and depth of Kuroda's scholarship is seen in the eight-volume set of his major writings, of which a representative cross-section has been translated in a special edition of the *Japanese Journal of Religions Studies.* See *Kuroda Toshio chosaku shū* 黒田俊雄著作集, (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 1994–1995) and James C. Dobbins, ed., "The Legacy of Kuroda Toshio," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996).

[107] Ryuichi Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 408. Abé's original comment reads ". . . Buddhism of the Heian period," but from his analysis of Kuroda (pp. 405–8), as well as Kuroda's own scholarship, the quoted statement can be extended to the Kamakura period. In fact, Abé writes, "Kuroda's treatment of Exoteric-Esoteric Buddhism as the dominant form of medieval Japanese religion also provided a new perspective from which to approach developments in Kamakura Buddhism that formed a continuum with those in the Buddhism of the Heian, Muromachi, and Tokugawa periods" (p. 407).

[108] For examples of Japanese and English scholarship produced in the wake of Kuroda (up to 2008), see Robert Rhodes, "Introduction," *The Eastern Buddhist* 39, no. 1 (2008): 2–3. A more recent example related to this paradigm is the interpretation of Yōsai 榮西 (alternatively, Eisai), the founder of the Rinzai Zen school 臨濟宗 (*Rinzai shū*), as a monastic who aimed to revive Buddhism as a whole in Japan; see Chūsei zenseki sōkan henshū iinkai 中世禅籍叢刊編集委員会, eds., *Eisai shū* 栄西集 vol. 1 *Chūsei zenseki sōkan* 中世禅籍叢刊 (Kyōto: Rinsen shoten, 2013–2019).

[109] Matsuo Kenji, *A History of Japanese Buddhism,* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 55 and Ryūichi Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 426–7. Here, let us point out how Matsuo's point disagrees with McMullin's comments on the study of pre-modern Japanese religions.

Disagreements on certain points within both abovementioned theories can also be found in English scholarship. For example, on *kenmon taisei*, Adolphson states that while there is no doubt that the "concept of several elites sharing the responsibilities and privileges of government is fundamental in understanding late Heian and Kamakura Japan," Kuroda's model does not account for the "period-defining ties of cooperation and interdependence [that] can be found at the individual level, rather than in formal

---

110. Matsuo Kenji, *History of Japanese Buddhism*, 55.

111. Sueki Fumihiko, *Bukkyō tenkairon* 鎌倉仏教展開論 (Tōkyō: Transview, 2008); a brief summary is given in Ruppert, "Review article," 147–8 (see footnote 116 below).

112. Kamikawa Michio, *Nihon chūsei bukkyō shiryōron* 日本中世仏教史料論 (Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2008) and Yokouchi Hiroto, *Nihon chūsei no Bukkyō to Higashi Ajia* 日本中世の仏教と東アジア (Tōkyō: Hanawa Shobō, 2008); summarised respectively in Ruppert, "Review (Part One)," 143–4, 151–2. Kamikawa makes similar comments regarding the works of Inoue Mitsusada 井上光貞 and Yoshida Kazuhiko 吉田一彦 in *Nihon chūsei Bukkyō keiseishi ron* 日本中世仏教形成史論 (Tōkyō: Azekura Shobō, 2007), which is summarised in Ruppert, "Review (Part Two)," 356–7 (see footnote 116).

agreements between static blocs."[113] On *kenmitsu taisei,* Abé disagrees with Kuroda's portrayal of esoteric Buddhism as the "overarching doctrinal principle that uniformly imposed its integration within each exoteric school . . . On the contrary, it served as a common ground, or meta language, for the schools to achieve their alliance."[114] Nevertheless, to the best of my knowledge, Kuroda's theoretical frameworks remains relevant in contemporary scholarship. This is illustrated by the fact that neither *kenmitsu taisei* nor *kenmon taisei* have been overhauled in their totalities. Indeed, even Uejima Susumu's 上島享 proposal of seeing the exoteric being more important than the esoteric during the development of medieval rule (*chūsei ōken* 王権) retains Kuroda's two categories.[115]

New trends in Kamakura Buddhism have emerged since Sāto's three-stage model, and we will discuss three examples below.[116] The first approach engages with the postmodern notion of discourse, which is mostly wielded as a scalpel to cut across the various established academic categories (such as history and doctrine) before re-arranging them into a new narrative. Stone's study of original enlightenment and Abé's monograph on Kūkai 空海 (774–835)*,* which were both mentioned earlier, are representative of this trend. Indeed, Stone states that her "book represents an attempt to make sense of the original enlightenment discourse, its place in medieval Japanese religion, and the issues involved in its study."[117] Similarly, Abé advances that "at the heart of Kūkai's effort to disseminate Esoteric Buddhism in Japan was not the establishment of a sect but the creation of a new type of religious discourse grounded in his analysis of the ritual language of mantra."[118]

---

[113] Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 353–5.

[114] Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 428.

[115] Uejima Susumu, *Nihon chūsei shakai no keisei to ōken* 日本中世社会の形成と王権 (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku, 2010).

[116] A review of Japanese scholarship since the new millennium is presented in Brian O. Ruppert, "Beyond Big Events, Their Heroes, the Nation, and the Sects: A Review of Recent Books Published in Japanese on Premodern Japanese Religion (Part One)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, vol. 1 (2010): 135–53 and "Constructing Histories, Thinking Ritual Gatherings, and Rereading 'Native' Religion: A Review of Recent Books Published in Japanese on Premodern Japanese Religion (Part Two)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 40, vol. 2 (2013): 355–75.

Conversely, the second approach focusses on specific institutions and examines the physical, social and ritual spaces they occupy. Here, the institution becomes the locus where previous categorisations of Kamakura Buddhism are questioned and re-evaluated. Alain Grapard's study of the Kasuga-Kōfukuji "shrine-temple multiplex" exemplifies this trend by grounding Japanese religiosity in a specific site wherein different beliefs and practices are combined. More precisely, Grapard's premise states that

> Japanese religiosity is neither Shinto nor Buddhist nor sectarian but is essentially combinative . . . [and] those combinative systems, which evolved in specific sites, were indissolubly linked, in their genesis as in their evolution, to social and economic structures and practices as well as to concepts of legitimacy and power, all of which were interrelated and embodied in rituals and institutions marking those sites.[119]

Other examples of this approach include the examination of the Shingon temple Daigoji

---

[117] Stone, *Original Enlightenment,* ix. See also the study of *kike* 記家 (record-writing monks), *kuden* 口傳 (oral transmission) and *gisho* 偽書 (apocryphal works) in Enryakuji, presented in Tanaka Takako 田中貴子, *Keiranshūyōshū no sekai* 渓嵐拾葉集の世界 (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku, 2003).

[118] Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 4.

[119] Allan G. Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 4.

醍醐寺 by Nagamura Makoto's 永村眞 research group with works that address the relationship between esoteric rites, temple sub-divisions and Dharma lineages.[120] In the same way, the three-part *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会 edited by Fukuda Eijirō 福田榮次郎 and Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平 contains a collection of essays that address Enryakuji's internal structure, connection to society and cultural world.[121] Closely related to this institutional approach is the study of texts and rites produced in (or across) specific sites, such as Matsuo Kōichi's 松本公一 study of major performative rites in shrine-temple complexes in the capital region.[122] In a way, they illustrate how pluralism in the pre-modern Japanese religious landscape can be encapsulated in a fixed point—just like how one single jewel in Indra's net reflects all the other ones.

A third and more recent approach looks at Kamakura Buddhism through the lens of feminism and gender studies by considering women's engagement in Buddhist practice.[123]

---

[120] For example, see Fujii Masako 藤井雅子, *Chūsei Daigoji to Shingon mikkyō* 中世醍醐寺と真言密教 (Tōkyō: Benseisha, 2008) and Nishi Yayoi 西弥生, *Chūsei mikkyō jiin to suhō* 中世密教寺院と修法 (Tōkyō: Bensei, 2008).

[121] Fukuda Eijirō and Kawane Yoshiyasu, eds., *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会 (Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2004); see Ruppert, "Review (Part One)," 140–1 for a summary of selected essays within. With respect to temple society in Enryakuji, see also Shimosaka Mamoru下坂守, *Chūsei jiin shakai no kenkyū* 中世寺院社会の研究 (Kyōto: Shibunkaku, 2001).

[122] Matsuo Kōichi*, Ennen no geinōshiteki kenkyū* 延年の芸能史的研究 (Tōkyō: Iwata Shoin, 1997); see also the study of temple life in Tōdaiji, Daigoji and Kōfukuji presented in Nagamura Makoto*, Chūsei jiin shiryō ron* 中世寺院史料論 (Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000).

[123] For example, a comprehensive study of Eshinni 恵信尼 (1182–c. 1268), the wife of Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1231), is given in James C. Dobbins, *Letters of the Nun Eshinni: Images of Pure Land Buddhism in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004). As another example, consider the study of Hokkeji 法華寺, Japan's most famous convent, in Lori Meeks, *Hokkeji and the Reemergence of Female Monasticism in Premodern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010).

I must note, with regret, that my own outline of historical events is rather androcentric. Historical factors are the main explanation for this bias, for to the best of my knowledge, all major temple-shrine complexes were monasteries, not nunneries; and all sovereigns, retired sovereigns and warrior leaders during the Heian and Kamakura periods were male. Yet, this androcentric bias is also partially due to the absence of women in the

In Japanese academe, this perspective first appeared in the mid-seventies, while in English scholarship, gradual and steady progress has been made since the nineties.[124] Presently, the most comprehensive treatment in English can be found in *Engendering Faith,* an anthology edited by Barbara Ruch, which contains an interdisciplinary collection of essays that are the fruit of multiple forms of collaboration between Japanese and non-Japanese scholars. These essays are divided into five sections, covering "Women in Chinese and Japanese Buddhism," "Nuns and Nunneries," "Scriptural Issues in the Salvation of Women," "Deities and Icons" and "Faith and Practice."[125] Put differently, the abovementioned post-Satō trends all involve challenging, in one way or another, the older established categories within the academic study of Kamakura Buddhism. From this broad summary, we now turn to two specific topics, namely the Hossō school and the Kōfukuji complex, for both played a role in shaping Jōkei's thoughts.

From Nālandā to Kōfukuji: the Transmission and Reception of Yogācāra Teachings in Japan

Hossō traces its origins back to the Yogācāra teachings found on the Indian subcontinent, which according to the Buddhist tradition, were transmitted from Miroku to the monk-scholar Asaṅga (Ch. Wuzhuo, Jp. *Mujaku* 無著; fl. 4th c. CE). Asaṅga then persuaded his half-brother Vasubandhu (Ch. Shiqin, Jp. *Seshin* 世親; fl. 4th–5th c. CE) to adopt them, and together, they systematised the main doctrinal ideas of the school. The

---

majority of secondary sources consulted during the writing of this outline. This only validates Ruch's point on how much more work remains to be done in this subfield.

[124] For an overview of earlier scholarship, see the special issue on "Women and Religion in Japan" in Nakamura Kyōko, ed., special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 10, no. 2–3 (1983).

[125] Barbara Ruch, ed., *Engineering Faith: Women and Buddhism in Premodern Japan* (Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002).

third chapter will further address various Yogācāra ideas, so for now, let us simply note that since its early days, the school has positioned itself as the third turning of the Dharma wheel, teaching the true middle way between the extremes of existence and emptiness.[126]

These teachings were later transmitted across the Himalayas in three main waves but not without competition amongst them.[127] The first wave was driven by Bodhiruci (Ch. Putiliuzhi Jp. Bodairushi 菩提流支; fl. 5th–6th c. CE) and Ratnamati (Ch. Lenamoti, Jp. Rokunamadai 勒那摩提; fl. 5th–6th c. CE), whose diverging interpretations of Vasubandhu's *Daśabhūmikasūtra-śāstra* (Ch. *Shiti jing lun*, Jp. *Jūji kyō ron* 十地經論; T 1522) led them to split respectively into the Northern and Southern Ti-lun schools (*Xiangzhou nandao pai* 相州南道派 and *Xiangzhou beidao pai* 相州北道派).[128] The second wave centred around Paramārtha's (Ch. Zhenti, Jp. *Shindai* 真諦; 499–569) texts, which included influential translations of Asaṅga and Vasubandhu's works. Notably, Paramārtha introduced the concept of an untainted, ninth-consciousness (Sk. *amalavijñāna,* Ch. *amoluoshi*, Jp. *amara shiki* 阿摩羅識), which entered in conflict with both of the Ti-lun schools.[129] The third wave can be attributed to Xuanzang 玄奘 (Jp. Genjō; c. 600–664), who travelled to the Indian subcontinent in 629 in search for answers to the various contradictions present within the texts he studied.[130] In 645, he returned with six hundred fifty-seven texts to Chang'an 長安, the capital of the Tang 唐, and under imperial auspices, translated no fewer than seventy-five of them.[131] The prestige of the imperial sponsorship; the perceived authenticity of the works he brought back; and the amount of material he produced made him the most influential East Asian Yogācāra scholar of his generation.

---

[126] 126. See for instance, the *Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra* 解深密經 (Ch. *Jie shenmi jing*, Jp. *Gejinmikkyō*), of which there are two complete editions in Chinese, translated respectively by Bodhiruci (T 675) and Xuanzang (T 676). There are also two incomplete translations (T 678 and T 679) by Guṇabhadra (Ch. Qiunabatuoluo Jp. Gunabaddara 求那跋陀羅; 394–468 CE). In Xuanzang's edition, the three turnings of the Dharma wheel are mentioned in T 676.697a23–b9. For a summary of Yogācāra teachings as understood by Jōkei, see Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, 38–46.

[127] 127. Dan Lusthaus, "Yogācāra school," in *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, ed. Robert E. Buswell Jr. (New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004), 915–6.

[128] 128. *Hsiang-chou* corresponds to present-day *Henan* 河南 and cardinal directions northern and southern correspond to the geographical locations where the Bodhiruci and Ratnamati preached.

[129] 129. See Michael Radich, "The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499–569) and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E.," *Zinbun* 41 (2008): 45–174. Sections 2 and 3 of the article present and analyse all the

One text particularly relevant to the development of Japanese Yogācāra is the *Cheng weishi lun* 成唯識論 (Jp. *Jō yuishiki ron*; T 1585), a treatise completed in 659 that brings together ten commentaries on Vasubandhu's *Thirty verses* (Sk. *Triṃśikā*, Ch. *Weishi sanshi lun song*, Jp. *Yuishiki sanjū ron ju* 唯識三十論頌; T 1586) to form a comprehensive exposition of Yogācāra doctrine. As Cook summarises in the preface to his translation,

> Vasubandhu's "Verses" and the prose commentaries may be seen as an attempt to clarify how ignorance (*avidyā*) or delusion (*moha*) take place and how they are removed, since this is the Buddhist task par excellence . . . Xuanzang's text is an attempt to answer the question of the mechanism and nature of ignorance by demonstrating that seemingly real external objects of perception (*dharma*) and the

---

works in Paramārtha's corpus in which the concept of *amalavijñāna* is mentioned. See also Ching Keng, "Yogâcāra Buddhism Transmitted or Transformed? Paramârtha (499–569 CE) and His Chinese Interpreters" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2009), which argues that our received image of Paramārtha is partially erroneous because the Yogācāra transmitted by him was significantly transformed by later Chinese interpreters, such as Tanqian (Jp. Donsen 曇遷; 542–607 CE).

[130] See the preface to the *Da tang xiyu ji* (Jp. *Dai Tō saiiki ki* 大唐西域記) by Duke of Yanguo, Left Premier of the Board of Ministers 尚書左僕射燕國公 (T 2087.868b6–10) and the first fascicle of Xuanzang's own records (T 2087.869c6–9). For an English translation of the above passages, see Lee Jung-hsi 李榮熙, *The Great T'ang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions,* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1996), 9, 15.

[131] The Duke of Yanguo's preface states that Xuanzang translated 657 texts, but the most up to date catalogue of Xuanzang's translations only identifies seventy-five texts; see appendix four in Dan Lusthaus, *Buddhist Phenomenology: a Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Cheng Weishi lun* (Oxford: England, 2002), 554–73. Moreover, as Lusthaus aptly notes, Xuanzang's "works are spread throughout the *Taishō* edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon, which is organized according to literary or sectarian type, demonstrating that he contributed to every genre" (p. 554).

> equally seemingly real self (*ātman*) who perceives these things are mental fabrications that do not exist apart from consciousness itself.[132]

In other words, it is important to bear in mind that the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* is not a mere philosophical exploration of consciousness—it is rather a treatise anchored in Buddhist practice and its concern with attaining Enlightenment. Traditionally, it is said that Ji 基 (Jp. Ki; 632–682) assisted Xuanzang in the compilation and translation of the *Cheng weishi lun*, and his later commentaries on the latter's works contributed to cement his authority within the East Asian Yogācāra tradition. In fact, it is Ji and not Xuanzang who is considered the first patriarch of the Faxiang school.[133] Here, the term Faxiang corresponds to a term coined by the Huayan 華嚴 (Jp. Kegon) exegete Fazang 法藏 (Sk. Dharmākara, Jp. Hōzō; 643–712) to describe (pejoratively) the teachings of Xuanzang and Ji.[134]

Yogācāra was transmitted to the Japanese archipelago in four stages according to the Hossō tradition. The first transmission began with Dōshō 道昭 (629–700 CE), who left for the Tang in 653 and studied under Xuanzang for roughly six years. Upon his return to

---

[132] Frances H. Cook, *Three Texts on Consciousness-only,* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist translation and research, 1999), 2–3.

[133] Ji is also known by his posthumous name Ci'en Dashi (Jp. Jion Daishi 慈恩大師) and, since the Song dynasty, is commonly referred to as Kuiji (Jp. Kiki 窺基). A summary of the debates in modern scholarship surrounding the proper name of this monk is given in He Huanhuan, "Whence Came the Name 'Kuiji' Instead of Just 'Ji'?," *The Eastern Buddhist* 48, vol. 2 (2017): 51–68.

Examples of Chi's commentaries include two of most prominent commentaries on the *Cheng weishi lun,* namely the *Cheng weishi lun shuji* (Jp. *Jō yuishiki ron jukki* 成唯識論述記; T 1830) and the *Cheng weishi lun zhangzhong shuyao* (Jp. *Jō yuishiki ron shōchū sūyō* 成唯識論掌中樞要; T 1831).

[134] The use of the term Hossō/Fazang to designate the entirety of East Asian Yogācāra first appeared in (pre-modern) Japan. Both Xuanzang and Chi definitely did not use this term but likely referred to their position as Dacheng (Jp. Daijō 大乘) or "Great Vehicle." See Sumi Lee, "Redefining the 'Dharma Characteristics School' in East Asian Yogācāra Buddhism," *The Eastern Buddhist* 46, no. 2 (2015): 46–8, and in particular footnotes 21 and 27, which refers to the scholarship of Yoshizu Yoshihide 吉津宜英 and Yoshimura Makoto 吉村誠.

Japan, he (re)settled in Gangōji 元興寺, establishing what became the known as the transmission of the Southern Monastery 南寺 (*nanji*).[135] The second transmission was done by Chitsū 智通 (n.d.) and Chidatsu 智達 (n.d.), two monks who entered the Tang on a Sillan boat in 658 and studied under both Xuanzang and Ji. Unfortunately, not much more is known about these two monks, including their exact date of return date to Japan.[136] The third transmission occurred in 703 and was also led by three Sillan monks, Chihō 智鳳 (n.d.), Chi-ran 智鸞 (n.d.) and Chiyū 智雄 (n.d.), who studied under the third Faxiang patriarch Zhizhou 智周 (678–733) before returning to Japan. Gyōnen comments that some accounts relay that the three have met Xuanzang and Ji, but he thinks it is improbable given the age difference.[137] The fourth and final transmission took place with Genbō 玄昉 (n.d.–746), who entered the Tang in 716 and also studied under Zhizhou. Genbō returned to Japan twenty years later and brought back with him five thousand fascicles of Buddhist scriptures, which included both exoteric and esoteric texts.[138] Settling at Kōfukuji, he established the transmission of the Northern monastery (*hokuji* 北寺), and from this date, the complex became associated with the Hossō tradition.[139] In fact, according to Gyōnen, only scholars from Kōfukuji "followed the footsteps of the previous masters and made their arguments prosper."[140] However, we must here reiterate the fact that Kōfukuji was not an exclusive Hossō institution: whereas it did specialise in Hossō teachings, it also incorporated other aspects of Buddhist doctrine and praxis, as Genbō's imported texts show. The combination between the exoteric and esoteric at Kōfukuji is further illustrated by the continuous presence between the tenth and thirteenth centuries of important monks who were simultaneously associated with the Shingon school.[141]

---

[135] For a list of the four transmissions, see Allan G. Grapard, *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 64–5. For the primary source, see Gyōnen's 凝然 (1240–1321) *Sankoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通縁起 in the *Dainihon bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書 (D.101.112b8–114b3), which was composed a century after Jōkei's time (1311). For a translation in English, see Ronald S. Green and Chanju Mun, *Gyōnen's Transmission of the Buddha Dharma in Three Countries*, (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 125–9.

[136] Green and Mun, *Gyōnen's Transmission*, 126.

[137] Green and Mun, *Gyōnen's Transmission*, 126.

[138] Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 151–2.

[139] Grapard notes ironically that while Genbō did bring Hossō teachings to Kōfukuji, he had extremely bad relations with the Fujiwara clan; see Grapard, *Protocol of the Gods,* 66–7.

Kōfukuji, as we mentioned earlier, was the clan temple of the Fujiwara and the institution where Jōkei trained at.[142] According to its traditional sources, the complex was founded by Fujiwara no Fuhito 藤原不比等 (659–720) in 710, shortly after the capital moved to Heijōkyō 平城京. However, its origins are said to be related to a modest, private temple called Yamashinadera 山階寺.[143] Situated near Ōtsu 大津, Yamashinadera was built in 699 by Kagami no Ōkimi 鏡王女 (n.d.–683) to pray for the recovery of her husband, Nakatomi no Kamatari 藤原鎌足 (614–669), the founder of the Fujiwara clan.[144]

---

[140] Green and Mun, *Gyōnen's Transmission of the Buddha Dharma*, 127.

[141] These include, for instance, Jōshō 定照 (906–983), Kojima Shinkō 子島眞興 (934–1004), Shinpan 眞範 (986-1054) and Shinen 信円 (1153–1224); see the presentation in Mikaël Bauer, "The Power of Ritual: An Integrated History of Medieval Kôfukuji," (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2010), 122–76.

[142] On the development of clan temples (*ujidera* 氏寺) before the Heian period, see Grapard, *Protocol of the Gods,* 20–5.

[143] This version of events is in the *Kōfukuji engi* 興福寺縁起, a ninth-century chronicle composed by the courtier Fujiwara no Yoshiyo 藤原良世 (823–900), and the *Kōfukuji ruki* 興服寺流記, a twelfth-century compilation of older texts. For a summary of scholarship on Kōfukuji, see Bauer, "The Power of Ritual," 5–8.

[144] This narrative is repeated in traditional sources (see footnote 143), but recent scholarship challenges this, noting that there is no archaeological evidence for a temple at Yamashinadera. Some argue that this narrative can be interpreted as a legitimising strategy for Kōfukuji and the Fujiwara clan during the Nara period; see Mikaël Bauer, "Tracing Yamashinadera," *Journal of Asian Humanities at Kyushu University* 5, (2020): 17–28.

Archeological evidence and textual records show that the Kōfukuji complex gradually expanded over the next century, and in the process, it interacted with various forms of religious practice present in the surrounding mountains.[145] For instance, Royall Tyler has shown that Kōfukuji was actively involved during the Heian and Kamakura periods in Tōzan Shugendō 當山修験道, a cult of sacred mountains that was deeply influenced by esoteric Buddhism.[146] More famously, it grew in tandem with the adjacent Kasuga shrine, which was dedicated to four *kami* that form the *ujigami* 氏神 (ancestral and tutelary *kami*) of the Fujiwara clan.[147] Grapard contends that there was no competition, nor conflict, between the two during this phase, for they fulfilled complementary roles and were "two aspects of a single sociocosmic reality."[148] In other words, the early days of Kōfukuji show how a centre of the Hossō tradition co-existed with other forms of Buddhism (especially with the esoteric) and various local religious practices, aptly illustrating the inseparability of Buddhism and local religions in pre-modern Japan.

Parallelly, Kōfukuji was linked to politics since its inception. Its members exerted a great influence on the Office of Monastic Affairs (*sōgō* 僧綱), and the Yuima-e 維摩會, an important religious ceremony that brought together all major religious and political players, was permanently fixed at the complex in 801.[149] In fact, from the year 961 onwards, the judge (*tandai* 探題) of the Yuima-e, in charge of questioning the candidates and validating their answers, was by default the abbot of Kōfukuji.[150] Throughout the ninth and tenth centuries, its close ties with the Fujiwara regents ensured its continuous political and economical growth. Most notably, Kōfukuji gradually extended itself into the Kasuga shrine from the middle of the ninth century onwards, and by the end of the eleventh century, it fully absorbed the shrine and the lands the latter possessed.[151] Adolphson points out that the Kōfukuji-Kasuga complex was likely the third largest landholder during the late Heian period and controlled almost the entirety of the Yamato province.[152] At the same time, its *saṃgha* gradually split into two, as monks of Fujiwara parentage gradually increased in numbers. Tyler describes this phenomenon as the "takeover of Kōfukuji by the sons of the Fujiwara," for these aristocratic monks formed private sub-temples (*inke* 院家) where they lived separately from the rest of the community and slowly monopolised the higher monastic ranks, to the point that all head abbots from 1125 onwards came from the

---

[145] Grapard, *Protocol of the Gods,* 49–55.

[146] Tōzan Shugendō 當山修験道 (or Tōzan-ha 當山派) is one of the two main streams of Shugendō and is associated with the Shingon school. The other stream is called Honzan Shugendō 本山修験道 (or Honzan-ha 本山派) and is affiliated with Tendai. On the relationship between Buddhism, Shugendō and Kōfukuji, see Royall Tyler, "Kōfuku-ji and Shugendō," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, vol. 2–3 (1989): 143–80; Royall Tyler, "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato," *Japan Review* 1 (1990): 153–223; and Sekiguchi Makiko 関口真規子, *Shugendō kyōdan seiritsu shi: Tōzan-ha o tōshite* 修験道教団成立史ー当山派を通して (Tōkyō: Bensei Shuppan, 2009).

[147] The Kasuga shrine is traditionally dated to 768, but, as in the case of Kōfukuji, modern scholarship challenges this dating; see Grapard, *Protocol of the Gods,* 25–9.

[148] Grapard, *Protocol of the Gods,* 50–1. Tyler also shares this opinion, pointing out that the cult of Kasuga was fostered by the monks of Kōfukuji and that the shrine was the "corner stone of Kōfukuji power"; see Tyler, "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato," 156.

---

[149] Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 24–5. The Yuima-e, alongside the Misai-e 御齋會 and the Saishō-e 最勝會, formed the Three Ceremonies (*sanne* 三會). Lectureship at all three was a *de facto* requirement for any monastic wishing to advance their careers within the institution of the *sōgō.* For a treatment of the relationship between ritual and politics, see Mikaël Bauer, "The Yuima-e as Theater of the State," 161–79.

[150] Bauer, "Yuima-e as Theatre of the State," 165. Nevertheless, some abbots, like Ryōhen 良円 (1179–1220) did not always attend the gathering (p. 171).

[151] Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 49–53.

[152] The two largest landholders are the imperial and Fujiwara families. Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 59-63. Interestingly, one particular temple-complex resisted Kōfukuji-Kasuga's hegemony over the Yamato province—Tōnomineji 多武峯寺; see pp. 92–6.

sekkanke.[153] By the second half of the twelfth century, the complex became powerful enough to exert direct pressure on the Taira clan, which in turn led to its destruction in 1180.[154] The period after the Genpei war corresponded to a time of reconstruction for the complex, and due to the weakening of the Fujiwara clan, the project carried over into the thirteenth century.[155] Nevertheless, it did recover from its destruction, as Tyler notes that "during the thirteenth century, Kōfukuji continued as prosperously as before."[156]

Let us wrap up this section with two observations. First, as Sumi Lee observes, the use of term "Hossō school" in modern scholarship to refer to the entirety of pre-modern Japanese Yogācāra is an improper back-construction because it ignores the existence of other strands of Yogācāra, such as the Hosshō school 法性宗.[157] Second, regarding the notion of "school" (*shū*) during the Heian and Kamakura periods, it is impossible to completely avoid this term, for Jōkei himself uses it explicitly in his writings. Indeed, the *Kōfukuji petition* uses the term the *hasshū* 八宗 to refer to the eight established schools of the Kamakura period and the term *hossō daijō shū* 法相大乘宗 to refer to the Hossō school.[158]

---

[153] Tyler, "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato," 159–60 and Adolphson, *Gates of Power,* 69–74.

[154] Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 156, 165.

[155] Adolphson, *Gates of Power*, 175–6.

[156] Tyler, "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato," 159.

[157] Sumi Lee, "Redefining the 'Dharma Characteristics School'," 55.

[158] *Kōfukuji sōjō* 興福寺奏状 in 大日本佛教全書 *Dainihon bukkyō zensho: Kōfukuji sōsho* 大日本仏教全書：興福寺叢書, vol. 2, (Tōkyō: Bussho kankōkai, 1917), 103–12.

In English, see Robert E. Morrell, "Jōkei and the Kōfukuji Petition," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 10, no. 1 (1983): 21, 32. Morell's translation renders *shū* as "sect," but here the term does not refer to the concept

To summarise, the first chapter overviewed the socio-political context of the late Heian-early Kamakura period; the postwar evolution of academic trends in study of Kamakura Buddhism; and the transmission of Yogācāra on the Japanese isles as well as the development of the Kōfukuji complex. As the following chapters will show, this background information will be relevant to our analysis of the *Kannon kōshiki* and help us better understand it in the context of Jōkei's life and thoughts.

---

created during the Tokugawa period; see Kuroda Toshio, *Genjitsu no naka no rekishigaku* 現実のなかの歴史学, (Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1977), 184–5. Translated in Abé, *Weaving of Mantra,* 412.

CHAPTER II: ANALYSING THE *KANNON KŌSHIKI* ALONGSIDE THE *MIROKU* AND *MONJU KŌSHIKI*

We now analyse the contents of the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside two pieces of similar length that were composed during Jōkei's Kasagidera years, the five-part *Monju kōshiki* and *Miroku kōshiki*. More specifically, we will examine the multiple faces of the bodhisattva Kannon and discuss the various geographical and textual spaces mentioned within the *Kannon kōshiki.*

The Different Faces of the *Bodhisattva* Kannon

The *Kannon kōshiki* appears at first glance to be addressed to a single figure, but a more detailed reading reveals a deity who takes on multiple names and manifestations throughout the text. Indeed, the text refers to its object of devotion in a dozen different ways, which can be further organised into three categories. The first consists of names derived from Kannon 觀音 or Kanzeon 觀世音 and accounts approximatively for two-thirds of all references.[159] Here, Kan(ze)on translates to the "one who perceives the sounds (of the world)," which, according to Lokesh Chandra, is an older form of address for the bodhisattva.[160] In particular, it is the name used in Kumārajīva's (Ch. *Jiumoluoshi*, Jp. *Kumarajū* 鳩摩羅什) translation of the *Lotus Sūtra* (T 262), a work Jōkei cites and refers to multiple times in the present *kōshiki.*[161] The second category is comprised of variations on the name Kanjizai, which translates to the "Lord who perceives."[162] This is a more recent nomenclature that first appeared in Xuanzang's works and constitutes roughly one-seventh of the total references to the bodhisattva in the current piece.[163] Specifically, the variations on Kanjizai are only used in the single-line homage that closes each section and in an excerpt from a commentary of the *Heart Sūtra* written by Xuanzang's foremost disciple, Ji. Finally, the last category brings together the remaining epithets of the bodhisattva. These include terms like "Great Sage" (*daishō* 大聖), a generic way to praise bodhisattvas; "Mother of Compassion" (*hibo* 悲母), a specific reference to Kannon's attributes; and Juntei 准胝 , a distinct form of the deity.[164] Nevertheless, let us note that the above divisions are not as hermetic as they look: Jōkei often combines various forms of address, as the compounds "World-saving Kannon" (*Kuze Kannon* 救世觀音) and "Pure Sage Kanzeon" (*Kanzeon jōshō* 觀世音淨聖) show.

---

[159] The first list consists of the following: *Kannon* 觀音 (vv. 6, 10, 18, 25, 27, 32, 54, 56, 57, 61, 76–7, 85, 91, 92, 102, 110, 118, 12, 131, 135, 139, 142, 144, 146, 148–9, colophon v. 3) *Kannon daishi* 觀音大士 (v. 8), *Kanzeon jōshō* 觀世音淨聖 (v. 33), *Kanzeon bosatsu* 觀世音菩薩 (v. 51) and *Kuze Kannon* 救世觀音 (v. 80); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 67.

[160] For a detailed summary of Kannon's other names, and its surrounding controversies, see footnote 8.

[161] Jōkei explicitly mentions the *Lotus Sūtra* in the first section of the *Kannon kōshiki* and presents what appears to be a direct quote from the scripture itself (vv. 19–20). However, this passage is in reality a paraphrase of the *Universal Gate Chapter* (see footnote 307 in the translation). More paraphrases of the same chapter can be found throughout the rest of the first section (vv. 21–8; footnotes 307–311 in the translation)

A comparison of the *Kannon kōshiki* with two other ones from the same time period shows that this diversity in nomenclature is not specific to Kannon. For example, in the *Monju kōshiki*, Jōkei addresses the bodhisattva in eleven different ways. These include the

---

and in the third section (vv. 50–1; footnote 323 in the translation). On the other hand, the *kada* at the end of sections one to three are uncited, direct quotations of the *Lotus Sūtra* (vv. 33–4, 45–6, 66–7; see also footnotes 313, 320 and 329 in the translation).

[162] As explained in Xuanzang's *Datang xiyu ji* (T 2087.883b22–4), *jizai* 自在 renders the Sanskrit *īśvara* (*ishibara* 伊濕伐邏). This is sometimes translated as the "Lord who looks down upon"; see footnote 160 for the Sanskrit etymology.

[163] The second list contains the following: *daihi Kanjizai* 大悲觀自在 (vv. 4, 152), *daiji daihi Kanjizai son* 大慈大悲觀自在尊 (vv. 35, 46, 68, 114, 155) and *Kanjizai bosatsu* 觀自在菩薩 (v. 71); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 67.

[164] The third list consists of the stand-alone terms *bosatsu* 菩薩 (vv. 12, 36, 53, 112, 115), *hibo* 悲母 (v. 82) and *daishō* 大聖 (vv. 26, 103, 121, 136), as well as two specific forms of the bodhisattva—Juntei 准胝 (v. 39) and Nyoi 如意 (v. 40); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 67.

deity's name, Monju 文殊, as well as epithets like the "Honoured One with the five topknots" (*gokei son* 五髻尊), which describe the bodhisattva's physical attributes.[165] Similarly, in the five-part *Miroku kōshiki,* Jōkei refers to the eponymous deity by thirteen different names that vary in complexity, ranging from the simple "bodhisattva" (*bosatsu* 菩薩) to the longer "future teacher Miroku Jison"(*tōrai dōshi Miroku jison* 當來導師彌勒尊).[166] Yet, none of the above *kōshiki* are outliers in the Buddhist tradition—after all, the historical Buddha himself was (and still is) commonly referred to by his ten epithets.[167]

In addition to the multiple names of Kannon, the present *kōshiki* also describes different physical manifestations of the bodhisattva. For instance, the fourth section states that "Nittenshi [*i.e.* the Sun-god] is a transformation body of Kannon," and thus, "when Zemmui Sanzō prayed for rain, Kannon appeared from the centre of the sun-disc."[168] In this passage, Jōkei's identification of the bodhisattva with the solar deity refers to multiple continental and Japanese ideas. On the one hand, the name Nittenshi 日天子 leaves little doubt that Jōkei is referring to a sun-god of Indian origin (*cf*. Sūrya)—a reference that is further echoed by the mentioning of Zemmui 善無畏 (Ch. Shanwuwei, Sk. Śubhakarasiṃha), a prince-turned-monk who was originally from Oḍra.[169] On the other hand, the association between Kannon and the sun is part of a larger Chinese theoretical framework where celestial asters are identified as transformation bodies of bodhisattvas. There is textual evidence that Jōkei was well aware of this theory, for his own commentary on the *Lotus Sūtra*, the *Hokke kaiji shō* 法華開示抄 (T 2195)*,* cites four Chinese commentaries to explain that Kannon Bosatsu, Daiseishi Bosatsu 勢至菩薩 and Kokūzō Bosatsu 虚空藏菩薩 are the respective transformation bodies of the sun, moon and stars.[170]

---

[165] Similarly, the different names of Monju appear in the following order: *sanze kakumo daishō Monjushiri bosatsu* 三世覺母大聖文殊師利菩薩 (vv. 5, 118), *daishō* 大聖 (vv. 45–6, 50, 85, 114), *kakumo* 覺母 (v. 47; an epithet of Monju meaning the "mother of awakening"), *butsumo* 佛母 (vv. 53, 56, 67; another epithet of Monju, meaning the "mother of buddhas"), Monju 文殊 (vv. 57–60, 64–5, 71, 73, 75, 81, 84, 88, 94, 98–9, 103, 111, 119), *Monjushiri daishō son* 文殊師利大聖尊 (v. 70), *sanze butsumo daishō Monjushiri bosatsu* 三世佛母大聖文殊師利菩薩 (vv. 72, 90, 104, 118, 129), *daishō shu* 大聖主 (v. 88; *i.e.* a *buddha*), *gokei son* 五髻尊 (v. 88), Monjushiri 文殊師利 (v. 92), *bosatsu* 菩薩 (v. 105); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 172.

[166] In order of appearance, the different references to Miroku are: *tōrai dōshi Miroku jison* 當來導師彌勒慈尊 (vv. 5–6); *jishi* 慈氏 (v. 16; an epithet meaning "benevolent"), *tōrai dōshi Miroku nyorai* 當來導師彌勒如來 (vv. 54, 78), *jison* 慈尊 (vv. 55, 63, 113, 122, 154, 158, colophon v. 2; another rendering of the epithet "benevolent"), *daishō* 大聖 (v. 56), Miroku 彌勒 (vv. 56, 69, 115, 120, 123, 126, 142, 165, 168), *aitta* 逸多者 (v. 59; an epithet meaning "invincible"); *fusho* 補處 (vv. 59, 72, 94; *i.e.* the buddha that will succeed Shakamuni), *fusho bosatsu* 補處菩薩 (v. 81), *bosatsu* 菩薩 (vv. 83, 145), *Miroku daishō* 彌勒大聖 (vv. 102–3), *Miroku nyorai* 彌勒如來(vv. 127, 152, 174) and *Miroku bosatsu* 彌勒菩薩 (v. 133); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 104.

[167] Namely, the ten epithets are: *nyorai* 如來 , *ōgu* 應供 , *shō henchi* 正遍知 , *myōgyō soku* 明行足, *zenzei* 善逝 , *seken ge* 世間解 , *mujōshi* 無上士 , *jōgo jōbu* 調御丈夫 , *tennin shi* 天人師 , *butsu seson* 佛世尊 .

[168] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 76–8.

At the same time, the amalgamation of Kannon and Nittenshi seems to also fit within the pre-modern Japanese context. In his study of the *Tenshō Daijin giki* 天照大神儀軌 , an initiatory document from the early Kamakura period, Mark Teeuwen notes the existence of multiple Shugendō and Buddhist Shintō rituals from the Kamakura era that worship Kannon as the sun. He further points out that the idea of the bodhisattva manifesting as the Japanese solar deity Amaterasu Ōkami 天照大神 (alternatively, Tenshō Daijin) already existed during the early eleventh century.[171] In fact, Teeuwen argues that the *Tenshō Daijin giki* illustrates this amalgamation by bringing together the sun, Amaterasu and Kannon through the figure of the monk Baozhi 寶誌.[172] Based on Teeuwen's argument, it would then be plausible to interpret the above-cited passage from the *Kannon kōshiki* as another pre-modern Japanese instance of the bodhisattva manifesting as Amaterasu. Adopting this hypothesis could in turn explain why Jōkei mentions Enma at the end of the fourth section.[173] Indeed, Teeuwen also claims that the *Tenshō Daijin giki* portrays Amaterasu as the judge of the dead, an association that was established before and continued throughout the Kamakura period.[174] In other words, there is precedence during Jōkei's lifetime for connecting Amaterasu with Enma, which, by extension, could explain the link we observe between Kannon and Enma in the present *kōshiki.*

---

[169] A biography of Zemmui is given in the *Song gaoseng zhuan* (Jp. *Sō kōsō den* 宋高僧傳; T 2061.714b1–716a17). In English, see Chou Yi-liang, "Tantrism in China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 8, no. 3–4 (1945): 251–72; see also footnote 335. On the presence of a sun-god in Buddhist cosmology, see footnote 334.

[170] The twenty-eight fascicles of the *Hokke kaiji shō* were composed during Jōkei's Kasagidera years and completed in 1208. The four commentaries cited to explain the identification of the Sun-god with Kannon are Zhiyi's (Jp. Chigi 智顗; 538–591) *Fahua wenju* (Jp. *Hokke mongu* 法華文句; T 1718), Jizang's (Jp. Kichizō 吉藏; 549–623) *Fahua yishu* (*Hokke gisho* 法華義疏; T 1721), Ji's *Fahua xuanzan* (Jp. *Hokke gensan* 法華玄贊; T 1723) and the Qifu's (Jp. Seifuku 栖復; fl. 9th c.) *Fahua xuanzan yaoji* (Jp. *Hokke kyō gensan yōshū* 法華經玄贊要集; X 638); see T 2195.272a15–c13.

A different manifestation of the bodhisattva immediately follows the identification of Kannon with Nittenshi. Jōkei writes,

> "Shōtoku Taishi [is also a transformation body of] the World-saving Kannon, and the world praises him appropriately. He spreads the Buddhadharma and guides sentient beings; he is simply an expedient means for the holy spirits [of the departed]."[175]

---

[171] Mark Teeuwen, "The creation of a *honji suijaku* deity: Amaterasu as the Judge of the Dead," in *Buddhas and Kami in Japan:* Honji suijaku *as a combinatory paradigm,* eds. Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli (London: Routledge Curzon, 2004), 140. For issues on dating the *Tenshō Daijin giki,* see pp. 119–22.

In the above source, Teeuwen mainly refers to Amaterasu as a masculine figure, but Dolce's article on the development of medieval Amaterasu iconography in the Shintō context argues that the deity was also portrayed as a feminine, horse-riding figure. See Lucia Dolce, "Duality and the 'Kami': the Ritual Iconography and Visual Constructions of Medieval Shintō," *Cahier d'Extrême-Asie* 16 (2006–2007): 119–50.

[172] Teeuwen, "Creation of a *honji suijaku* deity," 139–41.

[173] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, v. 109.

[174] Teeuwen, "Creation of a *honji suijaku* deity," 144. As evidence, he cites a text called the *Bikisho* 鼻歸書 composed by Chien 智円 (n.d.) in 1324.

[175] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 80–2.

Here, both parts of the comparison are unambiguously derived from Japanese sources. The left-hand side of the equation features Shōtoku Taishi, a Japanese figure described by Kevin Carr as "semilegendary and semihistorical," while the right-hand side mentions the "World-saving Kannon," a form of the bodhisattva that does not appear in any major continental sources.[176] Instead, an early record of the term can be found in the *Hōryū-ji Tō-in engi* 法隆寺東院縁起, wherein a priest named Gyōshin 行信 (fl. c. 750) is reported to be installing an "august image, a statue of the World-saving Kannon" in the Yumedono 夢殿.[177] Lucie Weinstein's study of the Yumedono statue strongly suggests that the "august image" itself was modelled after Shōtoku's physique, hinting thus at a connection between both figures during the Heian period.[178]

---

[176] Kevin Gray Carr, *Plotting the Prince: Shōtoku Cults and the Mapping of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012), 24–5. Carr's monograph approaches the figure of Prince Shōtoku from an art historical perspective, engaging with the visual and material cultures surrounding the Prince. For a text-centric approach, see the works of Como, Lee and Quinter mentioned in footnotes 179–180 and 182.

Modern scholarship (notably Ōyama Seiichi) has at times questioned Shōtoku Taishi historicity. However, to the best of my knowledge, there is no evidence of such questioning during pre-modern times, so it would be reasonable to assume that Jōkei saw Shōtoku as a historical figure. For a concise summary in English of the debates surrounding Prince Shōtoku, see the section titled "Who was 'Shōtoku Taishi'?" in Yoshida Yazuhiko, "Revisioning Religion in Ancient Japan," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 30, no. 1–2 (2003): 4–5.

A search on the CBETA shows that Daoxuan's (Jp. Dōsen 道宣; 596–667) *Guanghong mingji* (Jp. *Kō gumyō shū* 廣弘明集; T 2103.205c4) is the only text of continental origin that predates Jōkei and contains the phrase "Kuze Kannon" 救世觀音. However, I have not found any evidence that Jōkei actually encountered Tao-hsüan's text. Also, this epithet aptly foreshadows the extensive list of beings the bodhisattva responds to in vv. 86–90; see *Kōshiki Database* no. 67.

[177] Carr, *Plotting the Prince,* 31.

[178] Lucie R. Weinstein, "The Yumedono Kannon: Problems in Seventh-Century Sculpture," *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 25–48.

By the tenth century, evidence for this connection becomes unambiguous. For example, the *Shōtoku Taishi denryaku* 聖徳太子傳略 narrates the conception of the prince as follows,

> The princess [Shōtoku's mother] dreamt of a gold-colored monk whose bearing was youthful and charming. He stood before her and said, "I vow to save the world. I hope to reside in your womb for a while." The princess said, "Who are you?" The monk said, "I am the 'bodhisattva who saves the world.' My home is to the west."[179]

Another example of the connection between Shōtoku and Kannon can be found in the hymns (*wasan* 和讃) composed by Shinran 親鸞 (1173–1231), the founder of Jōdo Shinshū 浄土真宗 and a contemporary of Jōkei.[180] For instance, in the *Shōzōmatsu wasan* 正像末和讃 (1258), he writes,

> The world-saving bodhisattva of compassion, *guze* Kannon, who appeared
> And announced himself as Prince Shōtoku
> Is like a father, never deserting us,
> And like a mother, always looking after us.[181]

In fact, regarding the amalgamation of Shōtoku and Kannon, Carr advances a stronger thesis that claims Kuze Kannon as one of the Prince's many identities. He theorises that

---

179. Translated in Carr, *Plotting the Prince,* 32. For a discussion on the dating of the text see, p. 110.

180. Kenneth Doo Young Lee, *The Prince and the Monk: Shōtoku Worship in Shinran's Buddhism,* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007). Lee's thesis argues that "Shinran's thought has been misunderstood among nearly all the major branches of Buddhism he founded precisely because his heirs in the dharma failed to appreciate the central importance of his worship of this historical and legendary figure of Shotoku" (p. 2). An in-depth treatment of the relationship between Shōtoku Taishi, Kuze Kannon and Shinran is given in the first chapter (pp. 9–29).

Another example bringing together Shōtoku Taishi and Kuze Kannon is the *Shōtoku Taishi kōshiki* 聖徳太子講式 (1254), which was composed by Eison 叡尊 (1201–1290), a student of Jōkei. For an analysis of Eison's involvement in the "Shōtoku Taishi cult [*sic*]," see David Quinter, "Localizing Strategies: Eison and the Shōtoku Taishi Cult/Prince Shōtoku Ceremonial: Eison's 'Shōtoku Taishi *kōshiki*'," *Monumenta Nipponica* 69, no. 2 (2014): 153–97, 199–219.

181. Translated by Kenneth Doo Young Lee in *The Prince and the Monk: Shōtoku Worship in Shinran's Buddhism,* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007), 22. *Guze* is an alternative reading of *kuze* 救世. As Lee notes, amongst the 500-plus hymns (*wasan*) Shinran composed, 190 are dedicated to the Prince (p. 2). This number should not be too surprising, for it is said that Shinran reached enlightenment at Rokkakudō 六角堂 after having been visited in a dream by Shōtoku manifested as Kuze Kannon (pp. 12–3).

Shōtoku "posited as 'Japan's Śākyamuni' . . . usher[ing] in renewed age of Buddhism in Japan" during the latter age of the Dharma and becoming a "centre of processes through which different local and regional practices were created and negotiated even as they interacted."[182] Carr's thesis is corroborated by Michael Como's study of the reception and development of the figure of Shōtoku, which argues that from the Heian period onwards, Shōtoku was a "touchstone for a wide variety of political and religious movements as Kūkai, Shinran, Nichiren, and many others were represented by their followers as the spiritual heirs—or even incarnations—of the paradigmatic prince and layman."[183]

The above two examples illustrate how Jōkei's portrayal of the bodhisattva in the *Kannon kōshiki* is representative of the *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹 paradigm. This concept, derived from the Tiantai/Tendai exegetical tradition, has traditionally been treated in older scholarship by constructing a dichotomy between native *kami* and imported Buddhist deities.[184] In this construction, *kami* are defined as manifested "traces" (*suijaku* 垂迹) of Buddhist deities, and conversely, Buddhist deities are labelled as the "original ground" (*honji* 本地) from which *kami* originate. A one-to-one correspondence between a *kami* and a Buddhist deity is then drawn, allowing for the "buddhification" of the *kami*.[185] However, newer research propose a more nuanced understanding of this paradigm. Teeuwen and Rambelli, for one, argue that the "kami-Buddhist amalgamation [was] a more complex and ongoing process that always moved in different directions at the same time. Amalgamation was offset by isolation, and complicated by diversification."[186] Put differently, pre-modern Japanese deities consisted of a combination of multiple identities, and this combination is clearly evident in Jōkei's portrayal of Kannon in the present *kōshiki*, as the bodhisattva diverges from the traditional model of *honji suijaku* and is instead simultaneously tied to an Indian deity, a celestial aster, a semihistorical and semilegendary Japanese Prince. Moreover, Kannon is also possibly connected to a Japanese Sun-deity and a judge of the dead, who represent themselves a combination of multiple continental and Japanese identities.[187] In sum, the bodhisattva adopts a role similar to Carr's characterisation of Shōtoku, functioning a "centre of processes" where different identities interact.

---

[182] Carr, *Plotting the Prince,* 30, 42.

[183] Michael I. Como, *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 152–3. Como's central argument claims that the "roots of the early Shōtoku cult are best understood by considering the "architects of the cultural/religious icon that was Prince Shōtoku" and that the project as a whole "had its roots in the tropes of violence, genealogy, and a legend that constituted the period's rapidly shifting horizons of reception." (p. 155).

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that several scholars have noted major leaps of logic in Como's work; see for example, W. J. Boot, review of *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition,* by Michael I. Como, *Monumenta Nipponica* 65, no. 2 (2010): 397–400.

[184] For a summary of the development of *benji* 本迹 (Jp. *honjaku*) in China, see Alicia Matsunaga, *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation: The Historical Development of the Honji-Suijaku Theory*, (Tōkyō: Sophia University, 1969), 104–20.

Let us conclude this section by noting how other devotional pieces composed by Jōkei during his Kasagidera years bring together multiple identities within a single deity. In the *Monju kōshiki*, the first section lists two different emanations of Monju in the Shaba world, wherein the bodhisattva acts as a source of (aspiration for) enlightenment for sentient beings. Jōkei writes,

---

[185] Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 is representative of this older phase of scholarship. A concise treatment on the development of the *honji suijaku* paradigm is presented in Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli, "Introduction: Combinatory religion and the *honji suijaku* paradigm in pre-modern Japan," in *Buddhas and Kami in Japan:* Honji suijaku *as a combinatory paradigm,* eds. Mark Teeuwen and Fabio Rambelli (London: Routledge Curzon, 2004), 1–53.

[186] Teeuwen and Rambelli, "Introduction," 30.

[187] For an overview of Enma's roles and multiple identities in iconographical and literary sources during the Heian-Kamakura period, see Caroline Hirasawa, "The Inflatable, Collapsible Kingdom of Retribution: A Primer on Japanese Hell Imagery and Imagination," *Monumenta Nipponica* 63, no. 1 (2008): 11–27 and Kwon Ye-Gee, "Embracing Death and the Afterlife: Sculptures of Enma and His Entourage at Rokuharamitsuji" (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2018), 22–7.

> Accordingly, before Cīnasthāna [China] received the buddha-teachings, Mañjuśrī came and persuaded King Mu 穆 of Zhou 周. Before the Land of the Sun (*nichiiki* 日域) heard of the Three Jewels, Mañjuśrī journeyed and urged the Meditation Master Huisi [to spread the teachings in Japan].[188]

The first emanation dates to the tenth century BCE and refers to the Monju's journey to the Zhou court as a companion of Maudgalyāyana (Ch. Mujianlian, Jp. Mokkenren 目犍連), where they introduced the teachings of the historical Buddha to the king.[189] The second one occurs approximatively a thousand five hundred years later and alludes to the bodhisattva's manifestation as Bodhidharma before Hui-ssu (Jp. Eshi 慧思; 515–577). In this episode, Monju is said to have encouraged Huisi to seek rebirth in a land to the east of the sea, where the Buddhadharma had yet to be transmitted. This latter case particularly resonates in the pre-modern Japanese context, as various hagiographies have identified Shōtoku Taishi as the rebirth of the patriarch Huisi based on this exact story.[190] As for the *Miroku kōshiki*, it does not contain any references to Miroku's different physical manifestations, but Jōkei does identify the deity as being both a bodhisattva in the present age and a buddha in the future times. This dual identity is concisely expressed in the following passage from the third section, which reads, "[Miroku] is the bodhisattva who will surely attain supreme enlightenment and become the next buddha of the ten directions and the three worlds. Until then, [they dwell] in Tosotsu heaven."[191]

---

[188] 188. Translated in David Quinter, "Jōkei's *Monju Kōshiki* in Five Parts (c. 1196)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies: Online Supplement* 43, no. 1 (2016): 8. I have reproduced the translated passage as is, including Quinter's use of square brackets, transliteration and kanji.

[189] 189. There are multiple versions of this encounter. Variations include the king travelling West with Maudgalyāyana and Mañjuśrī, as well as Maudgalyāyana and Mañjuśrī being combined into a single figure; see Thomas Jülch, "The Buddhist Re-interpretation of the Legends Surrounding King Mu of Zhou," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130, no. 4 (2010): 625–7 and footnote 29 in Quinter, "*Monju Kōshiki,*" 8.

[190] 190. A summary of the relationship between Huisi and Shōtoku (with reference to the relevant passages in previous work done by Faure and Como) is given in Timothy Hugh Barrett, "Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: a Reconsideration," *Buddhist Studies Review* 26, vol. 1 (2009): 103–9; see also footnote 30 in Quinter "*Monju Kōshiki,*" 8–9.

To summarise, the above section discussed the different ways in which the bodhisattva Kannon is referred to and manifests as in the *Kannon kōshiki*—a motif that recurs in two other devotional pieces composed by Jōkei during his stay at Kasagidera, the *Monju* and *Miroku kōshiki.* This amalgamation of identities, I believe, is not only representative of the *honji suijaku* paradigm, but it also echoes the environment of Kōfukuji, where Jōkei received his monastic training. In a way, they illustrate how the Hossō tradition co-existed with other forms of Buddhism and local religions during the late Heian-early Kamakura period. The next section will further elaborate on two other motifs that are present across the *Kannon*, *Monju* and *Miroku kōshiki.*

Texts and Lands in the *Kannon Kōshiki*

Given that the above-cited passages depict Kannon being present in different textual and geographical spaces, this section will pay a closer look at the various texts and lands in which the bodhisattva appears. As in the previous one, we will draw comparisons with the *Monju* and *Miroku kōshiki* to argue that this multiplicity of spaces is not a unique feature of the *Kannon kōshiki.*

Indeed, throughout the present text, the bodhisattva is mentioned directly and indirectly in multiple sources that can be traced back to different parts of the Buddhist

---

191. Translation by Ford in *Jōkei and Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* 210.

An older article by Joseph Kitagawa discusses the ascending and descending soteriological motifs in Miroku devotion and notes the convergence of Miroku and Shōtoku worship after the latter's passing; see Joseph M. Kitagawa, "The Career of Maitreya, with Special Reference to Japan," *History of Religions* 21, no. 2 (1981): 107–25.

canon.[192] Explicitly, Jōkei associates Kannon with three seemingly unrelated texts, namely the *Lotus Sūtra,* the *Nyoirin Sūtra* and the *Heart Sūtra*. The first text is a sūtra in twenty-eight chapters translated by Kumārajīva (T 262), which was central to the Tendai tradition and important to the overall development of pre-modern Japanese Buddhism.[193] The second text (likely) refers to an esoteric sūtra translated by Yijing (Jp. Gijō 義淨; 635–713) which centres around Nyoirin Kannon, a particular form of the bodhisattva that is associated with the wish-fulfilling jewel (T 1081).[194] According to Bernard Faure, both the jewel and the bodhisattva represented central elements of esoteric Buddhism in the Heian and Kamakura periods. The former lay at the "junction between esoteric Buddhism (mainly Shingon) and imperial power," and the latter was the "quintessential jewel deity of the esoteric pantheon."[195] Finally, the last scripture refers to Xuanzang's translation of the *Heart Sūtra* (Ch. *Xinjing*, Jp. *Shingyō* 心經; T 251), a two hundred sixty-character summary of key Buddhist doctrinal concepts that is commonly recited as a *dhāraṇī* in the general East Asian context.[196]

---

[192] The one conspicuous absence is the lack of Vinaya sources, but this is not exactly surprising in the Buddhist context. To the best of my knowledge, there are very few instances where Vinaya texts are cited in rituals, outside of the rituals that pertain directly to monastic affairs.

[193] For a brief overview of the importance of the *Lotus Sūtra* in the Japanese context, see Nakao Takashi 中尾堯, "The Lotus Sutra in Japan," trans. Wayne Shigeto Yokoyama, *The Eastern Buddhist* 17, no. 1 (1984): 132–7. For an example of the *Lotus Sūtra*'s importance in shaping the development of late Heian-early Kamakura Buddhism, see Jacqueline Stone's work on original enlightenment in Jacqueline I. Stone, *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999).

[194] See footnote 316 in the translation for a discussion on the identification of the text.

[195] Bernard Faure, *The Fluid Pantheon: Gods of Medieval Japan, Volume 1* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016), 235, 285–6. An analysis of the cult of the jewel is given in chapter 6 (pp. 237–70), and one of Nyoirin Kannon and other jewelled deities is presented in chapter 7 (pp. 271–316).

[196] See footnote 315 in the translation for the justification of this identification.

However, more often than not, Kannon features in texts that are not identified. For example, the majority of the prose in the first section is in reality a paraphrase of the *Universal Gate Chapter,* and the four verses that follow are quoted word-for-word quote from the chapter's *kada.*[197] Parsing through the rest of the *kōshiki*, we thus find an eclectic collection of unnamed Buddhist material. For instance, the bodhisattva is mentioned in the *Beihua jing* (Jp. *Hike kyō* 悲華經; T 157), a sūtra in ten fascicles translated by Dharmakṣema narrating the previous rebirth of Amida; the *Betsugyō* 別行 (T 2476), a collection of notes on esoteric materials by Kanjo 寛助; and the *Dabei xin tuoluoni* (Jp. *Daihishin darani* 大悲心陀羅尼; T 1060 or T 1064), a sūtra which contains the *dhāraṇī* of Senshu Kannon 千手觀音. Kannon is also featured in the *Bore boluomiduo xin jing youzan* (Jp. *Hannya haramitsu ta shin kyō yūsan* 般若波羅蜜多心經幽贊; T 1710), a commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* in two fascicles by Ci'en; the *Dacheng zhuangyan jing lun*, a Hossō treatise in thirteen fascicles attributed to Asaṅga; and the *Flower Garland Sūtra* 華嚴經 (T 293) in forty fascicles, a sūtra translated by Prajñā (Ch. Bore, Jp. Hannya 般若; 734–n.d.).[198]

The Buddhist corpus contained within the *Kannon kōshiki* can thus be roughly organised into two lists. The first consists of sources treating Buddhist doctrine and corresponds roughly to what Kuroda Toshio calls the exoteric, a category that "convey[s] the idea of something revealed (*kenji* 顕示), and [is] rational in its orientation." The second one includes texts centred around rituals and can be described by Kuroda's concept of the

---

A comprehensive (and somewhat controversial) exposition of the *Heart Sūtra* with reference to primary sources (especially in the footnotes) is given in Jan Nattier, "The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?" *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15, no. 2 (1992): 153–223.

[197] See footnote 160 above.

[198] See footnotes 305, 316, 328, 332, 350, 353 and 357 in the translation.

esoteric, which "indicate[s] something secret (*himitsu* 秘密), and [is] psychological in its orientation."[199] Thus, by referencing both exoteric and esoteric materials, Jōkei brings the two categories together in a single text—an integration that is also manifested in the performance of the *Kannon kōshiki*. Indeed, Ambros *et al.* highlight that "*kōshiki* were not composed primarily as literary texts for doctrinal study, but rather for a ritual performance."[200] In our case, the note "performed as usual" under the title confirms this observation, for it points to the variable ritual elements that are conducted before the central text of the ceremony (*shikimon* 式文) is read.[201] The ritualistic function of the *Kannon kōshiki* is further illustrated by the participants chanting together the *kada* and the single-line homage at the end of each section, an act that is reminiscent of liturgical practices commonly performed in Dharma assemblies. On the other hand, the longer prose sections of the *kōshiki* are pronounced by a single officiant and resemble the delivery of a Buddhist sermon, a rather exoteric act. To put it in another way, the performance and the structure of the *Kannon kōshiki* constantly transition between exotericism and esotericism. The *kōshiki* is overall an esoteric ritual, in which the exoteric delivery of a text in prose alternates with the esoteric chanting of verses and homages. Additionally, let us note also that the contents of the prose section consist of a juxtaposition of exoteric and esoteric sources, while the verses are passages quoted *verbatim* from exoteric sūtras.[202]

---

[199] Thus, the *Lotus Sūtra,* the *Heart Sūtra,* the *Hike kyō,* the *Daijō sōgon kyō ron,* the *Hannya haramitsu ta shin kyō yūsan* and the *Flower Garland Sūtra* all fall under the first list. The *Nyoirin Sūtra,* the *Betsugyō* and the *Daihishin darani* fall under the second one.

For Kuroda's definition of exo- and esoteric, see Kuroda, "Development of the *Kenmitsu* System," 265. However, as this article shows, different individuals have used these two terms to label various Buddhist categories in the pre-modern Japanese context.

[200] Ambros, Ford, and Mross, "Introduction," 8.

[201] Even if it is impossible to determine with certainty what Jōkei meant by "as usual" (see footnote 54), there is no doubt that this note refers to ritual elements that precede the text at hand.

For examples such rituals pertaining to the performance of the *Monju* and *Miroku kōshiki,* see Quinter, "Materializing and Performing Prajñā," 36–7, as well as footnotes 39 and 40 in the article. See also Ambros et al., "Editors' Introduction," 7–8 and footnote 4 in the article.

In this way, the *Kannon kōshiki* partially exemplifies Kuroda's *kenmitsu* Buddhism framework. Sueki Fumihiko notes that the theory in itself was a continuously evolving process, and its basic concepts shifted in meaning throughout Kuroda's articles. Nevertheless, the framework can be roughly subdivided into the two overlapping branches of exo-esotericism and *kenmitsu taisei.* The first branch refers to the ideological interpretation of Buddhism as a combination of exotericism and esotericism, with the former being ultimately subsumed under the later.[203] The second one denotes the relationship between exo-esoteric Buddhist institutions and the political authorities.[204] With respect to the *Kannon kōshiki,* we have shown that the text does thoroughly combine the categories of exotericism and esotericism, but there is no indication that Jōkei considered the latter to be the superior form of Buddhism. In other words, from the above analysis, there is only enough evidence to claim that the text partially illustrates Kuroda's theory of exo-esotericism.

---

202. The first three *kada* are quoted from the *Universal Gate Chapter* (see footnotes 313, 320 and 329 in the translation); the fourth is from the *Dacheng zhuangyan jing lun* (T 1604; see footnote 350 in the translation) and the fifth is from Prajñā's forty-fascicle translation of the *Flower Garland Sūtra*; see footnotes 357 and 362 in the translation).

203. This summary is based on Sueki's reading of Kuroda; see Sueki Fumihiko, "A Reexamination of the *Kenmitsu Taisei* Theory," special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996): 456–7.

204. In Kuroda's own words, the essential characteristics of the *kenmitsu taisei* system are: "1. the *kenmitsu taisei* unified all religions through esoteric Buddhism on a foundation of thaumaturgic techniques for pacifying spirits; 2. within it arose the respective schools' individual doctrines, esoteric practices, and teachings on the syncretisation of exoteric and esoteric thoughts; 3. the eight schools (*hasshū*), as the institutional embodiment of *kenmitsu,* were recognized by secular society as orthodox, and constituted a type of religious establishment." Note the overlap between the ideological and institutional branches; for further information, see Kuroda, "Development of the *Kenmitsu* System," 265.

Turning to the *Monju kōshiki,* we see that Jōkei also associates Monju with both esoteric and exoteric texts. The bodhisattva is mentioned in the *Xindiguan jing* (Jp. *Shinjikan gyō* 心地觀經; T 159), a sūtra in eight fascicles translated by Prajñā which discusses, amongst other themes, the theory of the four debts of gratitude and esoteric visualisation practices.[205] Jōkei further refers to Monju in quoted passages from the *Fangbo jing* (Jp. *Hōhatsukyō* 放鉢經; T 629) and the *Manshu jing* (Jp. *Manjukyō* 曼殊經).[206] The former is a *sūtra* in one fascicle translated by an unknown author and narrates the events surrounding the placement, loss and finding of an alms bowl. The latter is a text I am unable to identify, but the passage at hand refers to the bodhisattva awakening the aspiration for enlightenment in the esoteric Vairocana and in the buddhas of the four directions.[207] Monju is additionally associated with the *Yuqie shidi lun* (Jp. *Yuga shiji ron* 瑜伽師地論; T 1579), a treatise in a hundred fascicles translated by Xuanzang that is one of the main doctrinal pillars of the Hossō school; the *Wenshushili ban niepan jing* (Jp.

---

[205] The four debts of gratitude are to one's parents, to (all) beings, to the king and to the Three Jewels (T 159.297a14–5); see the preface to Rolf Giebel's translation of the *sūtra* for a summary of its contents in Rolf Giebel, *The Mahayana Sutra of Previous Lives and Contemplation of the Mind-Ground*, (Moraga CA: BDK America, 2021), 4–7.

[206] According to Miyazaki Tenshō 宮崎展昌, the *Hōhatsukyō* is an independent translation of the same material that is found in the third chapter of the *Ājātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana Sūtra*. In the Chinese version translated by Dharmarakṣa 竺法護, the *Wenshuzhili puzhao sanmei jing* (Jp. *Monjushiri fuchō zanmai kyō* 文殊支利普超三昧經; T 627), this corresponds to the *Raising the Bowl Chapter* (Ch. *Jubo pin,* Jp. *Kohatsu bon* 擧鉢品). A summary of Miyazaki monograph on the compilation of the *Ājātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana Sūtra* is presented in Miyazaki Tenshō, *Ajase ō kyō no kenkyū: sono hensan katei no kaimei o chūshin toshite* 阿闍世王経の研究ーその編纂過程の解明を中心としてー A Study of the *Ājātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana*: Focusing on the Compilation Process, (Tōkyō: Sankibo Press, 2012), 199–205.

[207] Quinter points out that the *Dacheng yuqie jingang xinhai manshushili qianbi qianbo dajiaowang jing* (Jp. *Daijō yuga kongō shōkai manjushiri sempi sempatsu daikyōō kyō* 大乘瑜伽金剛性海曼殊室利千臂千鉢大教王經 (T 1177a), an esoteric tantric text attributed to Amoghavajra (Ch. Bukong, Jp. Fukū 不空; 705–774) and Hyecho 慧超 (Jp. Echō; fl. 8th c.), also contains a passage where Vairocana announces to Śākyamuni and other buddhas that Monju was his teacher from the distant past (T 117a.725b14–7). This exact text is referred to again without citation in the fourth section of the *kōshiki*; see Quinter, "*Monju kōshiki*," 8, 12 (and, in particular, the footnotes 27 and 47).

Monjushiri hatsu nehan kyō 文殊師利般涅槃經; T 463), a single-fascicle sūtra translated by Nie Daozhen (Jp. Jō Dōshin 聶道真; fl. c. 3rd c.) to guide sentient beings in their contemplation and worship of Monju's wonders; and the *Tuoluoni ji jing* (Jp. Darani jikkyō 陀羅尼集經; T 901), an esoteric sūtra in twelve fascicles translated by Atikūṭa (Ch. Adijuduo, Jp. Achikuta 阿地瞿多; fl. 7th c.), which contains various ritual texts.[208] David Quinter's analysis of the *Monju kōshiki* remarks that the bodhisattva likely features in two additional sources.[209] They are: the *Jingangding jing yuqie wenshushili pusa fa* (Jp. *Kongō chō kyō yuga monjushiri bosatsu hō* 金剛頂經瑜伽文殊師利菩薩法; T 1171), translated by Vajrabodhi (Ch. Jingkangzhi, Jp. Kongō chi 金剛智; 671–741) , and the *Wenshushili baozang tuoluoni jing* (Jp. *Monjushiri hōzō darani kyō* 文殊師利寶藏陀羅尼經; T 1185), translated by Bodhiruci. Both of these texts are esoteric in nature and explain respectively the five- and eight-syllable mantra/dhāraṇī associated with Monju and their related rituals.

Regarding the *Miroku kōshiki,* the list of texts associated with the eponymous deity is significantly shorter. Jōkei first describes the deity in the act of expounding the five-part

---

[208] For a survey of contemporary academic scholarship on the *Yogācārabhūmi* and the Yogācāra tradition, see Ulrich Timme Kragh, ed., *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*, (Cambridge : Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2013); see also footnote 210 below.

Quinter's analysis of the *Wenshushili pan niepan jing* shows that the text was important in shaping the development of the Monju cult in Japan; see David Quinter, "Visualizing the *Mañjuśrī Parinirvāṇa Sutra* as a Contemplation Sutra," *Asia Major* 23, no. 2 (2010): 97–128.

A very brief overview of *T'o-lo-ni chi ching* is given in Ronald M. Davidson, "Some Observations on an Uṣṇīṣa Abhiṣeka Rite in Atikūṭa's *Dhāraṇīsaṃgraha*," *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond*, ed. István Keul (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012): 79–81.

[209] See footnotes 35 and 42 in Quinter, "*Monju Kōshiki*," 10–1 for the relevant conjectures on identifying the two texts.

Yuqie shiti lun (T 1579), the Hossō doctrinal treatise mentioned earlier.[210] He then refers to the *Foshuo guan mile pusa shangsheng doushuaitian jing* (Jp. *Bussetsu Miroku bosatsu jōshō tosotsuten kyō* 佛說彌勒菩薩上生兜率天經; T 452), a sūtra that details Miroku's ascent to Tosotsu and the benefits of worshipping the deity.[211] Yet, despite the brevity of the list, and despite both sources being exoteric in nature, the *Miroku kōshiki* remains in agreement with Kuroda's exo-esoteric framework, as its structure still weaves these exoteric sources into an overall esoteric ritual. Nevertheless, let us note that neither the *Monju* nor the *Miroku kōshiki* suggest that Jōkei favoured esotericism over exotericism. Instead, like the *Kannon kōshiki*, both texts only partially reflect Kuroda's *kenmitsu taisei* theoretical framework.

Moving from textual spaces into geographical ones, we now examine the lands in which the bodhisattva is present. Kannon first appears in the third section of the *kōshiki* as an image radiating light through the three evil destinies, delivering all who dwell in the "eighteen [levels of] hell," the "city of the thirty-six [classes of] hungry ghosts" and the "four billion different animal ways" from their afflictions.[212] Then, as mentioned above, the fourth section describes the bodhisattva manifesting in Shaba world as the Sun-god and

---

[210] *Kōshiki Database* no. 104, vv. 64–5, translated in Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* 210.

In the East Asian context, the authorship of the *Yuqie shiti lun* is traditionally attributed to Miroku, while its transmission credited to Asaṅga. Kragh points out disagreements existing in both pre-modern and contemporary Tibetan scholarship on whether it was Miroku or Asaṅga who authored the text. However, this debate is not relevant to the thesis at hand, for Jōkei most certainly received Xuanzang's translation of the text. See, in particular, footnote 29 in Ulrich Timme Kragh, "The *Yogācārabhūmi* and its Adaptation: Introductory Essay with a Summary of the Basic Section" in *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet,* ed. Ulrich Timme Kragh (Cambridge : Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2013), 33.

[211] *Kōshiki Database* no. 104, vv. 84–5. There is a translation in the appendix of Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* 210.

[212] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 58–60.

Shōtoku Taishi, where they shine the "light of compassion" and disseminate the Buddhadharma to all sentient beings.[213] More specifically, Jōkei emphasises that Kannon is present in all corners of Japanese isles, as their spiritual efficacy can be detected "from the vicinity of flowery [Kyōto] to the faraway borderlands" and "from the peaks of high mountains to the bottoms of valleys."[214] Finally, in the fifth section, Kannon is shown residing in their "pure land [that is] not a pure land"—Mount Fudaraku.[215] Jōkei places the mountain in a liminal space that is simultaneously inside and outside of the Shaba world and explains that it is a place where one "who takes refuge under Kannon inevitably dwells," even if "one's karma is insufficient [or if the progress] towards one's rebirth stagnates for a short time."[216] Thus, combined with their original vow to save all that call upon them, Kannon's presence across multiple geographical spaces appears to suggest a failproof way for (most) sentient beings to attain enlightenment.[217]

Jōkei's concern with attaining enlightenment can be better understood by examining the concept of *mappō* 末法, an amalgam of Indian and Chinese ideas also known as the latter age of the Dharma. *Mappō* entered the Japanese Buddhist discourse as part of the theory of the three ages formulated in the *Sangyō gisho* 三經義疏 (T 2185), a commentary attributed to Shōtoku Taishi.[218] This theory divides the cycle of time into three periods, beginning with the arrival of a buddha in this world and gradually declining into a depraved age, where the teachings of the buddha are clouded, the practice of the Dharma is abandoned and the realisation of enlightenment reduced to a mere theoretical possibility.[219] However, it was only until around the juncture of the Heian and Kamakura periods that the notion of *mappō* really permeated through the Japanese society at large. Michele Marra places its diffusion to a date after the composition of a short treatise attributed to Saichō 最澄 (767–822), the *Mappō tōmyōki* 末法燈明記 (801), which defended the decline of morality in the monastic community. Saichō's treatise was first cited in the works of Hōnen, but Marra contends that it greatly influenced many of the major thinkers during the Kamakura period.[220]

---

[213] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 78–9.

[214] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 90–1.

[215] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 133–4.

[216] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 134–6, 145–6.

[217] Kannon's original vow is mentioned multiple times in the *kōshiki* at hand: it is cited the first and fifth sections (vv.18–9, 115–6) and also appears to refer to it obliquely in the fourth section (v. 100; see footnote 345 in the translation). However, Jōkei notes that "[of all the above] people, eight or nine in ten can entirely entrust themselves to Kannon's oath," suggesting that not all sentient beings are able to attain enlightenment. This position is consistent with the Hossō concept of *issendai* 一闡提 , which we will further discuss in the next chapter (vv. 89–90).

By the late Heian period, most people, bar a minority of Hossō monks, accepted 1052 CE as beginning the latter age of the Dharma.[221] In the case of Jōkei, Ford remarks that his views about the periodisation of *mappō* are far from consistent: in some texts, he claims to live in the latter age of the Dharma; in others, he affirms to be situated towards the end of the imitation age.[222] Nevertheless, regardless of nomenclature, Ford notes that "Jōkei clearly perceived his era to be a desperate time for the Buddhist Dharma."[223] In the *Kannon kōshiki,* this awareness can be seen through his description of the Shaba world as an "impure world of the latter age" (*jokuse matsudai* 濁世末代) in which there are "families who are poor but subsist . . . orphans who have neither farther nor mother, and people who have many illnesses and sorrows."[224] Because of these unfavourable conditions, Jōkei urges his audience to seek rebirth in Kannon's pure land instead. There, alongside the bodhisattva, they can "arouse unconditional great compassion . . . , be endowed with countless merits" and eventually become enlightened.[225] Jōkei further emphasises his point by contrasting Kannon's abode with his own world: he paints Mount Fudaraku as a wondrous mountain, on which the bodhisattva practises the Buddhadharma surrounded by birds and beasts whose "minds are all endowed with compassion" and alongside other bodhisattvas, "mantra-reciting sages" and "dharma-protecting deities."[226] Therefore, when

---

[218] The *Sangyō gisho* comments on three texts: the *Lotus Sūtra,* the *Shengman jing* (Jp. *Shōmangyō* 勝鬘經; T 353) and *Weimo jing* (Jp. *Yuimakyō* 維摩經; T 475). On the authenticity of the commentary, see Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史, "Sangyō-gisho no shingi mondai ni tsuite," trans. Jamie Hubbard, in *Sōgō kenkyū Asuka bunka*, ed. Ōkura seishin bunka kenkyūjo (Tōkyō: Kokusho kankōkai, 1989): 465–502; for an example of how the text was used during the Kamakura period, see Mark Dennis, "Rethinking Premodern Japanese Buddhist Texts: A Case Study of Prince Shōtoku's 'Sangyō-gisho'," *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 1, no. 1 (2011): 13–35.

[219] The first two ages are the age of the true Dharma (*shōbō* 正法) and the age of the imitation Dharma (*zōhō* 像法). Nevertheless, we must keep in mind that time is cyclical in the Buddhist worldview: the age of latter Dharma will come to an end with the arrival of a future buddha, traditionally said to be Miroku. For an overview of continental models of *mappō,* see Michele Marra, "The Development of Mappō Thought in Japan (I)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15, no.1 (1988): 25–30.

[220] Michele Marra, "The Development of Mappō Thought in Japan (II)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15, no.4 (1988): 287.

[221] Stone explains that the date 1052 CE is obtained by dating the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa* to 949 BCE and by considering both true and imitation ages of the Dharma to last a millennium. However, variations on all three parameters exist. Marra and Ford both note that monks from the Hossō school tend to take 609 BCE as the date of the Buddha's *parinirvāṇa*. Some, like Zan'an 慚安 (fl. 9th c.), considered the combined true and

---

imitation ages of the Dharma to last a thousand five-hundred years. Others like Kakuken 覺憲 (1131–1213), Jōkei's teacher, interpreted both ages as lasting a thousand years each. See Stone, "Seeking Enlightenment (I)," 33; Marra, "Development of Mappō Thought (I)," 40; and Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 128.

[222] For Jōkei's positions on each side of the argument, see Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 129–30.

[223] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 131.

[224] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 30, 86, 88–9. The character *matsu* 末 is also used in v. 9 「利益専盛末也」 to refer to the same idea. Moreover, Jōkei uses the term "polluted" to refer to the Shaba world; for example, see *ehō* 穢方 in v. 72.

[225] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 148–9.

[226] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 124–32. Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* 往生要集 (T 2682) uses a similar rhetorical technique, where the author encourages rebirth in Amida's pure land by vividly depicting the various

considered as a whole, the various geographical spaces mentioned in the *Kannon kōshiki* reflect Jōkei's awareness of the desperate times in which he lived. Yet, at the same time, they also show his belief in the possibility to attain enlightenment in these conditions through the benevolence of Kannon.

In a similar way, the *Monju kōshiki* depicts Monju across different physical spaces. The previous section highlighted the bodhisattva's manifestations in China and Japan, but we can also deduce their presence in India, since Jōkei mentions King Ajātaśastru and the Great King Aśoka worshipping them.[227] As in the case of the *Kannon kōshiki,* studying these three lands alongside the concept of *mappō* allows us to better understand how they fit within Jōkei's devotion to Monju. Indeed, Quinter's analysis of the *kōshiki* argues that the three lands are part of Jōkei's "discourse of Japan as a peripheral land in a latter age," which claims that the capacity for one to attain enlightenment during the Kamakura period was theoretically limited by the spatial-temporal distance between the Japanese islands and the historical source of the Buddhadharma (namely, Shakamuni).[228] However, Quinter does note that the *Monju kōshiki* forcefully rejects "any ultimate status to the limitations suggested by these conditions," as it depicts the possibility to attain enlightenment through one's devotion to Monju, the Mother of Awakening.[229]

---

sufferings one endures in hell. See Robert F. Rhodes, *Genshin's Ōjōyōshū and the Construction of Pure Land Discourse in Heian Japan*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press), 2017.

227. *Kōshiki Database* no. 172, vv. 97–9; see also Quinter, *"Monju kōshiki,"* 11.

228. Quinter, "Materializing and Performing Prajñā," 39–40.

The *Monju kōshiki* uses two terms that are synonymous with *mappō—masse* 末世 and *matsu dai* 末代 ; see *Kōshiki Database* no. 172, vv. 22, 38, 114. Also, note that Quinter's translation renders *masse* as "latter ages" and "latter days"; *matsu dai* as "latter ages"; see "*Monju kōshiki,*" 5–6, 12.

229. Quinter, "Materializing and Performing Prajñā," 39–40. Explicitly, Jōkei proclaims: "Do not protest, "But this land is a peripheral land!": the country of Japan is replete with [those who have] great capacities. Do not

As for the *Miroku kōshiki,* the word *mappō* (or any of its variations) is absent from the text, but the idea of the latter age of the Dharma remains present in the *kōshiki.*[230] Jōkei achieves this by situating Miroku across two lands and by employing a rhetorical strategy similar to the one presented in our analysis of the *Kannon kōshiki.* On the one hand, he describes the Shaba world being populated by "reeking corpses" and bodies like "decaying house barely supported by the pillar of life"; on the other hand, Miroku's Tosotsu heaven is said to be a "pure land within the defiled realm," whose inner and outer palaces are replete with marvelous structures and natural features and whose inhabitants include "great omniscient brahmas" and "all classes of gods."[231] In addition, Jōkei also alludes to the idea of *mappō* by appealing to Miroku's status of buddha-to-be. Indeed, he repeatedly refers to Miroku's future descent to preside over the dragon-flower assembly in the Shaba world, which seems to implicitly suggest that he is situated close enough to the age of the true Dharma in the next cycle, which corresponds to age of the latter Dharma of the present cycle.[232]

Thus, all three *kōshiki* reflect, either explicitly or implicitly, Jōkei's self-awareness of living in precarious times for the Dharma. With respect to this self-awareness, Jacqueline

---

think, "But this time is the latter days!", because the teachings of the Mahayana are spread vigorously"; see *Kōshiki Database* no. 172, vv. 37–8 for the original and Quinter, *"Monju kōshiki,"* 6 the translation.

[230] I have not found any compounds in the *Miroku kōshiki* that include the character *matsu* 末, but Jōkei does refer to the Shaba world as a "defiled realm" (*edo* 穢土); see *Kōshiki Database* no. 104, v. 82 and Ford's translation in *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 210.

[231] Translated by Ford in *Jōkei and Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* 208, 210–12; see *Kōshiki Database* no. 104, vv. 27, 29, 82, 108–9 for the original. Also, the descriptions of the inner and outer courts are given in vv. 86–93 and 93–102, respectively.

[232] When Miroku descends into the Shaba world, it is said that they will attain Buddhahood under the dragon-flower tree and preach at the three dragon-flower assemblies. Jōkei alludes to this in *Kōshiki Database* no. 104, vv. 17, 61, 126, 160.

Stone argues that Jōkei saw the reality of *mappō* as a problem of institutional corruption and monastic laxity, but she also notes that his interpretation must be understood as part of the overall "*mappō* consciousness" of his era.[233] This frame of mind, she writes, derived from the decay of major social institution and the violent political realities of the twelfth century, which in turn led to an "unusually sharp recognition of impermanence" that was compounded by the perception that the Buddhadharma itself was collapsing and would become "obscured and lost."[234] Ford also contends that Jōkei was the product of his age and further suggests that his conflicting views about *mappō* can be seen as a pragmatic effort to adjust to different audiences, some of which have embraced the abovementioned idea of *mappō* consciousness.[235] Indeed, given the events in Jōkei's life, it seems implausible to me that he could have remained unaware of the multiple tensions that marked the twelfth century. As pointed out in the introduction and the first chapter, not only was his immediate family branch impacted by these tensions, but he himself lived through the destruction of Kōfukuji. In fact, he personally interacted with the various centres of power during both his time at Kōfukuji and Kasagidera, as evidenced in various written documents, such as the diary entries of Kujō Kanezane and the Kōfukuji petition.

To summarise, the second section examined the various texts and lands in which the bodhisattva Kannon appears—an examination that revealed how the *Kannon kōshiki* can be better understood by considering it alongside the ideas of exo-esoteric Buddhism and *mappō* consciousness. Moreover, the comparison the present text with *kōshiki* devoted

---

[233] Jacqueline Stone, "Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Age: 'Mappō' Thought in Kamakura Buddhism (Part I)," *The Eastern Buddhist* 18, no. 1 (1985): 52–6.

[234] Jacqueline Stone, "Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Age: 'Mappō' Thought in Kamakura Buddhism (Part II)," *The Eastern Buddhist* 18, no. 2 (1985): 62–3.

[235] Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, 130–2.

Monju and Miroku showed that the multiplicity of textual and geographical spaces is not a unique feature of the *Kannon kōshiki.* Instead, it suggests two things: first, there appears to be certain recurring patterns across the devotional works Jōkei wrote during his time at Kasagidera; and second, the study of the *Kannon kōshiki* is probably better approached by considering it as one dimension of Jōkei's multifaceted expression of faith. This, in turn, leads to the following questions: where does the *Kannon kōshiki* fit in Jōkei's overall understanding of the Buddhadharma? And how does it relate to the historical realities of his lifetime? Thus, the next section will attempt to address these questions.

CHAPTER III: THE *KANNON KŌSHIKI* IN THE CONTEXT OF JŌKEI'S KASAGIDERA YEARS

In this chapter, we begin by examining the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside non-devotional works composed by Jōkei during his Kasagidera years to better comprehend how this piece fits in his overall understanding of the Buddhadharma. Specifically, we will focus on how Jōkei addresses the central theme of rebirth through the lens of traditional Hossō thought. Then, looking at the text as a mirror of Jōkei's activities at Kasagidera, we will argue that the *Kannon kōshiki* reflects a form of *kechien* practice, where Jōkei aims connect the participants of this ritual with the bodhisattva in order to improve their conditions for enlightenment.

Looking at Rebirth through the Hossō Lens

A quick glance at the distribution of each major theme in the *Kannon kōshiki* shows that the most addressed topic in the text is rebirth (38.75%), followed by the establishing of karmic connections with Kannon (28.75%), the powers of the bodhisattva (18.75%) and miscellaneous topics (13.75%).[236] In particular, when we consider the *kōshiki* in its entirety, it appears as a gradual form of path that culminates in one's rebirth in Kannon's pure land, Mount Fudaraku. Indeed, the text begins by mentioning the bodhisattva's ability to remove hardships and to bestow worldly benefits on sentient beings. Then, it discusses their powers to save beings across various destinies and rebirths; praises the depth of the opportunities for one to karmically connect with them; and concludes with an explanation of the Kannon's vow to meet the dying and guide them to Mount Fudaraku. Taken together,

---

236. This measured by counting the number of verses in the *Kōshiki Database* file, where they all have approximatively the same length. Roughly speaking, the topic of rebirth is covered in sections three and five; establishing karmic connections, in section four; and Kannon's powers, in section one and two. The miscellaneous topics consist of the introductory section and the colophon.

these two observations suggest that the theme of rebirth is central to the *kōshiki,* which in turn warrants a more detailed examination of the matter.

The notion of rebirth is first mentioned in the third section of the text, where Jōkei explains how the way of cause and effect links one's transgressions to one's sufferings to form a bond that can be carried over rebirths. Explicitly, he states,

> One who commits transgressions also inevitably experiences suffering as fixed by the way of cause and effect . . . The way of repentance and the plan to extinguish transgressions cannot surpass the calling upon this bodhisattva. Suppose it is hard to quickly end [the cycle of *saṃsāra* in this rebirth], then one can gradually be liberated in the next one.[237]

Put differently, Jōkei understands rebirth as the fruit of the seeds sown by our deeds, words and thoughts—an interpretation that also appears elsewhere in the text. For instance, in the fifth section, we find,

> In their long-gone days of transmigrating through the Shaba [world], Kannon was also a deluded being . . . They built mutual bonds of affection with their spouse, children and relatives. Rebirth after rebirth, how many [times did Kannon come back]? In the last one, they aroused a single thought about the true mind and gradually ascended to the stage of equal enlightenment.[238]

Here, Jōkei shows that the theory of cause and effect does not only apply to ordinary sentient beings but also governs the trajectory of a bodhisattva's rebirths. In fact, further down the same section, he hints that the law of karma extends beyond the human realm and holds true on Mount Fudaraku. He writes,

> We plead: "When facing the end [of this rebirth], may we [maintain] right mindfulness and gratefully mount Kannon's lotus dais; [may we attain] rebirth faultlessly and wander long in Amida's pure land." Suppose, moreover, that one's

---

[237] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 48–9, 52–4.

[238] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 117–20.

> karma is insufficient. [Even if progress] towards one's rebirth stagnates for a short time, one will inevitably be reborn on Mount Fudaraku as a relative of Kannon.[239]

From the above examples, we see that Jōkei conceptualises rebirth as being fundamentally tied to karma, regardless of who one is or where one resides. At the same time, these excerpts also show how he understands the path to enlightenment to be a gradual process that spans multiple rebirths. These two positions are both in line with Hossō doctrine, where the path to Buddhahood is traditionally subdivided into five stages and said to last over three incalculable aeons (*asōgi kō* 阿僧祇劫). As Jōkei explains in the *Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō* 法相宗初心略要, a summary of Hossō thought, a practitioner must successively complete the stages of accumulation (*shiryō i* 資糧位), preparation (*kegyō i*, 加行位), insight (*kendō i* 見道位) and cultivation (*shudō i* 修道位) before attaining the final stage of completion (*kukyō i* 究竟位) and break the cycle of *saṃsāra* and fully realise enlightenment.[240]

Jōkei's view of the inseparability of rebirth and karma leads to the corollary that sentient beings have different capacities for attaining enlightenment, which in turn, justifies the need for different practices. In the *Kannon kōshiki,* the diverse capacities of sentient beings are illustrated in the following two complementary examples. First, Jōkei describes various ways in which one can take refuge in the bodhisattva, with "some [relying] on recited divine spells, and others [practising] according to their capacities." Given that Kannon originally vowed to alleviate the sufferings of all who call upon them, the various ways in which one can take refuge in the bodhisattva reflect by extension their different capacities for enlightenment. Second, Jōkei notes that each being who has taken refuge in Kannon will arrive at different realisations. He paraphrases the bodhisattva's words from various sūtras as follows,

---

[239] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 143–6.

[240] The *Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō* is a short summary of the main points of Hossō doctrine. The five stages are presented in the *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大蔵經, 5th vol., 738–48. (This corresponds to pp. 373–77 on the digitised version found in National Diet Library Digital Collections.) In his summary, Jōkei refers to the third and fourth stages as *kendō i* and *shudō i* (p. 738), which correspond to what Xuanzang calls *tongda wei* (Jp. *tsūdatsu i* 通達位) and *xiuxi wei* (Jp. *shūjū i*, 修習位) in his translation of Vasubandhu's *Weishi sanshi lun song* (Jp. *Yuishiki sanjū ron ju* 唯識三十論頌; T1586). For a selective presentation of the topics covered within, see Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 38–46, 102–4.

Unfortunately, I was not able to find an exact date for this source, but on the first page, Jōkei's name is given as *Kasagidera Shōnin* 笠置上人, an epithet he often used to refer to himself, which was likely coined after having settled at Kasagidera.

> "When facing the end [of this rebirth], some will attain the four benefits, and others will achieve the eight dharmas. Moreover, some will be liberated from the fifteen types of evil deaths and attain the fifteen types of good rebirths. Besides, those desiring to know whether their parents or children have [achieved] an auspicious or inauspicious rebirth will immediately know about it."[241]

This understanding of rebirth and karma as being deeply intertwined can also be found in other works composed during Jōkei's Kasagidera years. In fact, it is consistent with his stance in his most famous piece of writing, the *Kōfukuji sōjō.*

As pointed out in the introduction, Jōkei is often only remembered for being the author of this petition, which he wrote in 1205 on behalf of the eight established Kamakura schools to call for an imperial decree to stop the exclusive *nenbutsu* (*senju nenbutsu* 専修念佛) movement. This movement is delineated in the *Senchaku hongan nenbutsu shū* 選擇本願念佛集 (T2608; often abbreviated as *Senchakushū* 選擇集), a work composed by Hōnen in 1198 upon the request of Kujō Kanezane but only officially published after the former's passing in 1212.[242] In it, Hōnen performs two rhetorical manoeuvres. First, he draws from

---

[241] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 62–4.

[242] The *Senchakushū* is one of the earliest instances where Hōnen refers to his teachings as an independent school, the *Jōdo-shū* 浄土宗 (Pure Land School). For example, in the first chapter, he answers the hypothetical question, "what proof can you offer to justify your references to the 'Pure Land school'?" by citing the works

Daochuo's (Jp. Dōshaku 道綽; 562–645) exegeses and defines "Two Gateways encompassing the whole of the Buddha's message: the Gateway of the Holy Path and the Gateway of the Pure Land."[243] Then, noting that Hōzō, the previous reincarnation of Amida, "chose to cast aside various practices . . . and chose to make his own the wholehearted recitation of the Buddha's Name," he turns to Shantao's (Jp. Zendō 善導; 613–618) writings and argues that the oral recitation of Amida's name is the only means to be reborn in the Pure Land of Gokuraku (Sk. Sukhāvatī, Ch. Jile 極樂) during the latter age of the Dharma.[244]

Nevertheless, it was not the *nenbutsu* in itself that made Hōnen's writings so controversial. Pure Land practices first appeared in the Japanese context during the seventh century on Mount Hiei, when the Tendai monk Ennin 圓仁 (794–864) transmitted to his disciples the meditative practices of *nenbutsu zanmai* (buddha mindfulness meditation 念佛三昧) and *jōgyō zanmai* (constantly walking meditation 常行三昧)—with the latter being practised around a central image of Amida. Various forms of *nenbutsu* gradually grew in popularity throughout the Heian period because it was perceived as an

---

of Yuanxiao 元曉 (Kr. Wonhyo; 617–686), Ci'en and Jiacai 迦才 (n.d.); see Morris J. Augustine and Kondō Tesshō 近藤徹称, trans., *Senchaku Hongan Nembutsu Shū: A Collection of Passages on the Nembutsu Chosen in the Original Vow,* (Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1997), 10.

For an even more concise and direct summary of Hōnen's position, see the *One-sheet Document* (*ichimai kishōmon* 一枚起請文), composed two days before his passing in Inagaki Hisao 稲垣久雄, trans., "Words and Hymns of Japanese Pure Land Masters," in *Sekai bunka to bukkyō: Yamada Meiji kyōju kanreki kinen ronbunshū* 世界文化と佛教：山田明爾教授還暦記念論文集, ed. Yamada Meiji kyōju kanreki kinenkai 山田明爾教授還暦記念会 (Kyōto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 2000), 18–9.

[243] Augustine and Kondō, trans., *Senchakushū*, 9.

[244] Hōzō's choice corresponds to the eighteenth vow of Amida (out of a series of forty-eight) and is often referred to as the original vow (*hongan* 本願); see Augustine and Kondō, trans., *Senchakushū,* 34. Also note that this is not the same Hōzō as the Kegon exegete.

In the *Senchakushū,* Hōnen cites various continental Pure Land masters, including Tanluan (Jp. Donran 曇鸞; 476–542) and the Daochuo, but he mainly relies on Shandao's thoughts to ground his own arguments.

efficient means to pacify the dead and help one attain a favourable rebirth in the Pure Land of Amida.[245] However, as Robert Rhodes emphasises, we must remember that during these times

> devotion to Amida Buddha was often combined with other practices, especially those of esoteric Buddhism . . . Heian monks lived in a complex spiritual universe, populated by a variety of buddhas, bodhisattvas and other spiritual beings, all of whom could be called upon to assist one's spiritual journey.[246]

For example, Kūya 空也 (903–972), who was a central driving force behind the popularisation of the recited *nenbutsu* during his lifetime, is also portrayed in the *Kūyarui* 空也誄 as a renunciant who accomplishes compassionate deeds and a devotee of the bodhisattva Kannon.[247] Similarly, Genshin 源信 (942–1017), whose *Ōjōyōshū* shaped the development of Pure Land Buddhism until the end of the Heian period, was not uniquely devoted to Amida and did not solely advocate for the oral recitation of the Amida's name.[248] As chapters four and five of the *Ōjōyōshū* show, he defined the *nenbutsu* as a five-fold practice that had to be supported by auxiliary ones.[249]

Instead, what made Hōnen's position radical was his designation of the oral *nenbutsu* as the sole and unique orthopraxy for attaining rebirth in Gokuraku. Mark Blum explains that Hōnen represents "*the* pivotal moment when the Pure Land path came into its own in Japan"—a path characterised by a "reversal of viewpoint wherein Buddhism is instead considered from the ground of the unenlightened person" and where fully realised Buddhahood is "essentially removed from the system by postponing it so far into the future that it no longer functioned as a prime means of motivating the believer."[250]

---

[245] Rhodes, *Genshin's* Ōjōyōshū*,* 51–76.

[246] Rhodes, *Genshin*'s Ōjōyōshū, 60.

[247] A glimpse of Kūya's life through a study of the *Kūyarui* 空也誄 is presented in Clark Chilson, "Eulogizing Kūya as More than a Nenbutsu Practitioner: A Study and Translation of the *Kūyarui*," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 34, no. 2 (2007): 305–27; the translation of the *Kūyarui* starts on p. 318. See also Rhodes, *Genshin's* Ōjōyōshū, 64–72.

[248] The influence of the *Ōjōyōshū* was such that Hōnen felt the need to justify his exclusive reading of the *nenbutsu* by referring to Genshin's text; see Rhodes, *Genshin's* Ōjōyōshū, 286–96.

[249] Chapter four, "Proper Practice of the Nenbutsu," and five, "Aids to the Nenbutsu," are summarised in Rhodes, *Genshin's* Ōjōyōshū, 231–62 and 263–28, respectively; see also the overall discussion of practices leading to rebirth in the Pure Land in pp. 226–31.

As a side note, the five-fold practice is based on Vasubandhu's theory of the five gates of mindfulness.

Given the predominance of Pure Land-affiliated institutions in contemporary Japanese Buddhist scholarship, a large number of academic works have labelled the *Kōfukuji sōjō* as a sectarian and political text that is representative of how Old Buddhist institutions responded to the emergence of New Kamakura schools.[251] Concretely, the text consists of nine article of errors (*kyūkajō no shitsu no koto* 九箇條の失の事) and is supplemented by a short statement. At first glance, the petition does appear to politically inclined, for Jōkei claims to represent the voice "all of the [Eight] Sects [who] are of the same mind in desiring that this matter be handled by Imperial Decree."[252] The ninth article, titled the "Error of Bringing Disorder to the Nation," is also explicitly political in nature. Additionally, if we further consider the inseparability of religious and political institutions in pre-modern Japan, then articles five and eight, which address the "Error of Turning One's Back on the Holy Gods of Shintō" and the "Error of Vilifying the Followers of Śākyamuni," can be labelled as political too.[253]

---

[250] 250. Blum, *Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism*, 6, 10. (Italics are Blum's.)

Hirokawa Takatoshi 廣川堯敏 suggests a different interpretation of Hōnen's position and claims that the exclusive *nenbutsu* is only provisional: after establishing one's faith and reaching the Pure Land, the miscellaneous practices are recovered; see Hirokawa Takatoshi, "Introduction," in *Hōnen's Senchakushū: Passages on the Selection of the Nenbutsu in the Original Vow*, trans. and ed. the *Senchakushū* English Translation Project (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998), 38–45. Ford comments that the above interpretation is "highly debatable," but in my opinion, Hirokawa's stance does not diverge from the common Buddhist view that one's understanding of enlightenment might change after reaching it; see Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion*, 174.

We must also remember that Hōnen's own personal practice of Buddhism was not reduced to the oral *nenbutsu*. There is evidence that he still kept the precepts and engaged in rituals, as well as other forms of contemplation. As Machida Soho 町田宗鳳 summarises, "Hōnen surely practiced what he preached but he did not preach all that he practiced. As a pedagogue of salvation, his interest was in ending the pedagogy. To others he recommended, unconditionally, the exclusive practice of vocal *nembutsu.*" See Machida Soho, *Renegade Monk: Hōnen and Japanese Pure Land Buddhism,* Ioannis Mentzas trans. and ed., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 66.

[251] 251. A sample of this line of attack in English and Japanese scholarship can be found in Ford, *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion,* 159–60. Ford remarks that the absence of *bodaishin* (Sk. bodhicitta; Ch. *puti xin* 菩提心; "mind of enlightenment") in the *Kōfukuji sōjō* has led some scholars to consider the petition as a political and utilitarian critique, but he himself suggests that the omission can be explained by the fact that Jōkei probably did not have access to the *Senchakushū* in 1205 (p. 171).

Yet, Ford's quantitative analysis shows that more than half of the contents of the *Kōfukuji sōjō* pertain to issues related to Buddhist doctrine and practice.[254] Summarising the petition in four points—the abandoning of all traditional Buddhist practices; the rejection of karmic causality and moral behaviour; the false appropriation and misinterpretation of the oral *nenbutsu*; and the creation of negative social and political implications—he argues that Jōkei's critique of Hōnen is centred around doctrinal issues and cannot be negated by the petition's political dimensions.[255] A closer look at the critique supports Ford's argument: Jōkei does open the text with a call "to rectify the doctrine of Sole-practice calling upon the Name of the Buddha long advocated by the monk Genkū [i.e., Hōnen]" and ends it with a request to "put a stop to the excesses of the Exclusive Sole-practice (*ikkō senju*) . . . the transgressions that may be performed by Genkū and his disciples, and to the heretical tendencies which have long had to violate the [Buddha's] Law."[256]

---

[252] The translation is from Morrell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 88. (The first set of square brackets is present in Morrell's work; the second one is mine.) For a discussion on the socio-political nature of the petition, see Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion*, 180–3. Here, Ford remarks that because the petition was addressed to the court, one shouldn't be surprised to see political elements present within (p. 181).

[253] Morrell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 79–80, 83–8. Ford presents a slightly different classification of the articles in his analysis of the *Kōfukuji sōjō* and considers the first, fifth and ninth points to be political in nature; see Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 182.

[254] Ford classifies articles three, four, six, seven and eight as being doctrinal-practical in nature. However, even if we opt for a more conservative grouping that excludes the eighth article, the majority of the petition remains non-political.

[255] Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 172–84.

More specifically, Jōkei appears to be appealing against the exclusivity of Hōnen's position because it undermines the intrinsic pluralism within Buddhist teachings. This argument is presented in all nine articles of the petition, with varying degrees of directness. For example, in article four, the "Error of Neglecting the Varieties of Good Deeds," he refers to the fundamental principle of karma, which states that sentient beings have different capacities for attaining enlightenment. We read,

> Numerous sectarian positions arise as occasion demands, and we partake of the good ambrosial medicine [of the Buddha's varying teachings] each according to our karmic predispositions. They are all aspects of the True Law which our great teacher Śākyamuni gained for us by difficult and painful labors over innumerable aeons. Now to be attached to the name of a single Buddha is completely to obstruct the paths essential for deliverance.[257]

A more indirect example of this rhetoric is illustrated in the fifth article, where Jōkei challenges the validity of the exclusive *nenbutsu* by pointing out how past eminent monks from different schools all upheld different forms of practices. He states,

> Dengyō made pilgrimages to the Usa [Hachiman] and Kasuga Shrines, receiving carious miraculous omens. Chishō [Enchin, 814–891] went to Mount Kumano and entreated the god Shinra, praying devoutly for the success of his movement. And on the scarf of [the Sanron] priest Gyōkyō [fl. ca. 859] appeared the shadows of the Three Sacred Ones [the Buddhist deities Amida, Kannon and Seishi, while Gyōkō

---

[256] Translated in Morell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 75, 88. Square and round brackets are Morrell's.

[257] Translated in Morrell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 78. For other examples of Jōkei's appeal against the exclusivity of the *nenbutsu*, see "Although polemics abound . . . the single Western Region" (p. 76) in the first one; "But it is unreasonable . . . truly embrace all" (p. 77) in the second; "What sensible person . . . are uniquely beneficial" (p. 77) in the third; "Thus, from the sect's . . . variety of religious practices" (p. 81) in the sixth; "This exemplifies the depth . . . 'Buddha Amitāyus'" (p. 85) in the seventh; "It is essential . . . in the Pure Land" (p. 86) in the eight; and "But although the various . . . seat with them." (p. 87) in the ninth.

> was praying at the Usa Hachiman Shrine]; and in Kōbō Daishi's picture he drew the likeness of Hachiman. Do none of these measure up to Hōnen?[258]

The implication from this rhetorical question is that should Hōnen's teachings hold, then the accomplishments of these respected figures would be invalidated. At the same time, Jōkei's choice of examples to support his overall critique of the *Senchakushū* also illustrates his reliance on the authority of past Buddhist teachers, be it is the historical Buddha himself or eminent monks.[259] This methodological approach is in line with Hossō's emphasis on its unbroken lineage back to historical Buddha, which is mentioned in the seventh article. Here, Jōkei explains that the "Hossō Mahāyāna sect originated from the heart of the Blessed Śākyamuni and Maitreya (Jison) and is minutely codified in the scriptures comprised of the basic sutras and the basic commentaries (*honkyō honron*)."[260]

Returning to the main focus of the present thesis, we see that Jōkei uses a similar type of reasoning in the *Kannon kōshiki.* For example, in the fourth section, he cites the writings of Ci'en and refers to the practices of Śubhakarasiṃha, who were, respectively, the first patriarch of the Fa-hsiang/Hossō school and one of the eight doctrine-expounding patriarchs (*denji hasso* 傳持八祖) of the Shingon 真言 tradition.[261] Another aspect the *Kannon kōshiki* and the *Kōfukuji sōjō* have in common is how they regard the calling of a deity's name. Both recognise the practice as an efficient aid for sentient beings on their path to enlightenment, but neither makes it the exclusive way for one to achieve progress. Indeed, in the *Kannon kōshiki,* Jōkei cites Kannon's original vow, where the bodhisattva says, "Should suffering sentient beings thrice invoke my name, and should I not go towards those in need of salvation, may I not attain perfect enlightenment."[262] Here, the to-be-invoked deity is introduced as an agent to help one break through the cycle of suffering, but the *kōshiki* also presents two alternative paths to achieve the same goal. The first is mentioned in the fourth section and consists of creating an image of Kannon, whose powers can save those condemned in the three evil destinies by directly extinguishing their sufferings.[263] The second one is found in the *Nyoirin Sūtra*, which states that "should one recite the *dhāraṇī* a [full] hundred times, one will immediately see [Kannon] in person at the centre of this sun . . . and one will see Kanzeon's Palace on Mount Fudaraku."[264] In other words, the *dhāraṇī* will bring one closer to Mount Fudaraku, where one can cultivate bodhisattva practices alongside Kannon and work more efficiently towards their release from the cycle of *saṃsāra.*

---

[258] Translated in Morrell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 79. (Square brackets are Morrell's.) Dengyō 傳教 is the posthumous title of Saichō 最澄 (767–822), the Tendai founder; Chishō 智証 is the posthumous name of Enchin (814–891), the founder of the Jimon faction 寺門派 (*jimon ha*) of the Tendai school and the head abbot of Onjōji 園城寺; Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師 is the posthumous name of Gyōkyō 行教, who was a Sanron priest from Daianji 大安寺, one of the Seven Great Temples of Nara; and Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師 is the posthumous name of the Kūkai, the founder of the Shingon school.

[259] The petition was indeed written on behalf of the Eight Schools, and Jōkei must have secured their approval and/or input before presenting it to the court. However, I believe the text was not collectively written but penned by Jōkei alone.

[260] Translated in Morrell, "Kōfukuji Petition," 85; see also Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion*, 37–8.

[261] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 71–2, 76–8.

Let us conclude this section by addressing one last point regarding the notion of rebirth in the *Kannon kōshiki.* In the fourth section, Jōkei writes that "amongst those who bow down [to the bodhisattva] . . . eight or nine in ten can entirely entrust themselves to Kannon's oath."[265] This suggests that there is one subset of individuals that cannot entrust themselves to the bodhisattva's vow and, therefore, might remain unenlightened. Theoretically, this would correspond to the category of *issendai* (Sk. *icchantika*, Ch. *ichanti* 一闡提) found in the Hossō five-fold classification of sentient beings—a class of individuals said to not possess the prerequisite necessary for attaining enlightenment and condemned to an endless cycle of rebirths.[266] However, in the rest of the piece, Jōkei continually emphasises Kannon's ability to deliver all sentient beings, whether they reside in the human realm or are reborn into one of the three lower realms. In fact, even those who have committed the "four grave or five heinous transgressions can still rely on Kannon's majestic powers [, for] there is nothing they cannot extinguish or eradicate."[267] Put differently, the implied message seems to be that even if one does not have the capacity to achieve enlightenment by their own volition or cannot entrust themselves to Kannon's original vow, the bodhisattva will nonetheless come and deliver them from cycle of *saṃsāra.* This interpretation is supported by Jōkei's own writings presented in the addendum (*zokuhen* 續編) to the *Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō*, where on the last page of the document, he states,

---

[262] 262. Kannon's original vow is actually cited twice, with minor variations. Here, we are referring to first citation, but the argument still holds for the one at the end of the *kōshiki*, even if it mentions invoking Kannon's name a single time instead of three; see *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 18–9, 115–6.

[263] 263. *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 57–61.

[264] 264. *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 136–59.

> The vow common to all Buddhas of the three worlds is the unrestricted vow to save all sentient beings. Those who enter the Buddhist path, from the first stage of arousing the aspiration for enlightenment, will surely embrace this vow. They seek enlightenment for the benefit of all sentient beings. And although sentient beings are not the same, the great compassion [of the Buddhas] is undifferentiated. If those

---

265. *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 86–90.

266. Technically speaking, the *issendai* category is further divided into three subcategories, of which only the *mushō sendai* 無性闡提 are said to be unable to achieve Buddhahood.

For a summary of the theory behind this classification, see Paul Groner, *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*, (Berkeley: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1984), 97–100; see also Ming-Wood Liu, "The Problem of the *Icchantika* in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*," Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies 7, no. 1(1984): 57–82 and Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志, "Who Were the *Icchantikas*?" Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology 10 (2007): 67–80.

267. *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 54–5; see footnote 324.

> without the nature [of enlightenment] were rejected, how could it be the great undifferentiating compassion?[268]

Taking all the above into consideration, the path to enlightenment depicted in the *Kannon kōshiki* can be therefore described as lying somewhere in between fully depending on the powers of the bodhisattva and completely relying on one's own practices. This depiction, in turn, fits into Jōkei's overall understanding of the Buddhadharma, which is outlined in the same addendum. He explains,

> In the *Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the Buddha himself acknowledges the shortcomings in both the view that all characteristics are identical and the view that all are distinct. He did not endorse either view. They are neither one nor different, neither identical nor distinct – this is the profound principle of the ultimate truth . . . The true principle (*shinri* 真理) and its existing phenomenal characteristics are neither identical nor different . . . Thus, in our school, the most profound understanding resides in this teaching of "neither identity nor different" (*fusoku furi* 不即不離).[269]

Ford suggests two reasons as to why this neither-nor framework was adopted by Jōkei. First, the framework encapsulated the Hossō teachings of the true middle way between the dualities of existence and emptiness, representing the third turning of the Dharma wheel. Second, it allowed him to bridge the doctrinal divides—especially with respect to the question of enlightenment for *issendai*—between his tradition and the seven other established schools.[270] Indeed, this particular point of contention pre-dates Jōkei by centuries, as it was one of the topics debated by Saichō and Tokuitsu 德一 (c. 781–c. 842) during their exchanges.[271] By adopting a middling position, Jōkei was thus able to engage with the prevalent topics of his times while remaining faithful to the Hossō tradition.

---

[268] Translated in Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 62–3; the original is in *Nihon daizōkyō,* 5th vol., 770.

[269] Translated in Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 57; the original is in the *Nihon daizōkyō*, 5th vol. 748–70. Here again, we note that Jōkei relies on the authority of the past, as he refers explicitly to the *Saṃdhinirmocana sūtra,* a central scriptural source for the Hossō school (see footnote 126 in the first chapter). In fact, the term *fusoku furi* itself appears in the *Cheng weishi lun*, which Jōkei definitely had access to given that he cites it in the *Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō* (p. 724). Ford also notes that "alternative ideas for the same idea, such as *fuitsu fui* (不一不異), *fuitsu i* (不一異), and *hisoku hiri* (菲即非異) can be found in numerous texts" (p. 59).

[270] For an overall discussion of Jōkei's attempt to revive and reform Hossō doctrine, see Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 54–67.

To summarise, the above section addressed the notion of rebirth in the *Kannon kōshiki,* a central theme which reflects Jōkei's understanding of enlightenment as a gradual process anchored in the notion of karma*.* Moreover, a comparison of the text with doctrinal works composed during the same time period shows that it reflects Jōkei's framework of *fusoku furi*—a middling approach which allowed him to adapt traditional Hossō doctrine to the mainstream ideas of his times. In my opinion, these two points also be understood as the product of the doctrinal training Jōkei received at Kōfukuji. As noted in the first chapter, various forms of doctrine and praxis from different Buddhist traditions continuously co-existed within Kōfukuji's walls, and this diversity is reflected in the contents of Jōkei's writings. In a way, they add to the evidence that the Hossō tradition was not a static, elitist form of Old Buddhism disjoint from the reality of the twelfth century. Indeed, the next (and final) section will aim to situate the contents of the *Kannon kōshiki* within Jōkei's activities during his time at Kasagidera.

The *Kannon Kōshiki* as a Mirror of Jōkei's Kasagidera Years

In a study of the colossal Miroku image on the slopes of Mount Kasagi, Karen Brock dates the carving to the eight century and concludes, based on an analysis of iconographical sources, that the carving depicts Miroku receiving Shakamuni's robes from Makakashō (Sk.

---

[271] There are multiple dates for Tokuitsu's birth and death, but the above is based on the *Nanto kōsōden* 南都高僧傳. The debate took place in written format and began with Tokuitsu's *Busshō shō* 佛性抄 in 817 and concluded in 821 with Saichō's *Hokke shūku* 法華秀句, for the latter passed away the following year. A presentation of the debate is given in Groner, *Saichō*, 91–101.

Mahākāśyapa, Ch. Mohejiashe 摩訶迦葉).[272] This scene can be interpreted as a symbol of continuity between the two buddhas, but it also contributed to association of Mount Kasagi with Keisokusen (Sk. Gurupāda, Ch. Jizu shan 雞足山), the peak where Makakashō waited for Miroku to descend into the Shaba world. In any case, by the tenth century, Mount Kasagi was closely tied to Miroku worship as well as a famous pilgrimage site on the way east to the Ise shrine.[273] Given this relationship between Kasagidera with Miroku, how do we explain the presence of a devotional text addressed to Kannon composed at this site?

Ford's analysis of Jōkei's devotional practices proposes two explanations to the presence of Kannon worship at Kasagidera—one general and one specific. First, he contends that Shakamuni, Kannon and Miroku were Jōkei's main objects of devotion and formed a "temporal triumvirate," with Shakamuni being the buddha of the past; Kannon, the "persistent light of the Dharma in the present"; and Miroku, the future buddha.[274] As rationale for this framework, Ford cites the colophon of the seven-part *Kannon kōshiki* (1209), where the above three deities are identified as the "three worthies" (*sanson* 三尊).[275] He further backs up his claim with numerical data, noting that eighteen (75%) out of the twenty-four devotional texts penned by Jōkei were directly or indirectly addressed to a member of the triumvirate. Second, in a separate essay published after his monograph, Ford asserts that Jōkei gradually gravitated towards Kannon devotion during the last decade of his life. This transition, he explains, took place because Jōkei viewed Kannon as the bodhisattva of compassion, wherein the plurality of Buddhism is embodied, and was thus the "perfect symbolic foil for Jōkei to counter the popular *senju nenbutsu* teachings expounded by Hōnen and the threat it represented to established Buddhism in Japan."[276] As evidence for this devotional shift, he notes that Jōkei moved to a sub-temple called Kannon'in 觀音院 in 1202 and remained there until his departure for Kaijūsenji in 1208.[277]

---

[272] Karen L. Brock, "Awaiting Maitreya at Kasagi" in *Maitreya, the Future Buddha,* eds. Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 217, 222–6. The founding legend of Kasagidera records the image being carved during the reign of Tenchi 天智 (668–671), but Brock points out discrepancies in iconography and also notes that the consensus in modern scholarship dates its creation to the eight century; see also Brock's translation of "An Account of the Founding of Kasagi Temple by a Son of Emperor Tenchi" (pp. 240–1).

[273] Brock, "Awaiting Maitreya," 218, 222–6. See also the presentation of the temple in Janet R. Goodwin, *Alms and Vagabonds: Buddhist Temples and Popular Patronage in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), 48–51.

[274] Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 78.

[275] *Kōshiki Database* no. 70, vv. 3–4 in the colophon. Actually, Ford states that "Jōkei identified Śākyamuni, Maitreya, and Kannon as the three worthies (*sanson*) and effectively one body" (p. 78), but the colophon of the text only reads 「但大都者以釋迦・彌勒・ 觀音仰爲三尊」, with no explicit mention of the three

In my opinion, the two models above both have their merits, but neither fully explains why Jōkei composed the *Kannon kōshiki* during his stay at Kasagidera nor do they fully contextualise the text within Jōkei's activities during this period of his life. First, regarding the triumvirate model, if we count the *kōshiki* datable to the Kasagidera years and organise them by main objects of devotion (*honzon* 本尊), then there are three texts dedicated to each Shakamuni (1196A, 1196B and 1203) and Miroku (1196A, 1196B and 1201); two to Kannon (1201A and 1201B); and one to each Jizō (1196), Monju (c. 1196), the Hossō school (1200) and the *Lotus Sūtra* (1201).[278] Put simply, a third of these *kōshiki* does not fit into Ford's triumvirate framework, and this ratio is simply too high to justify

---

forming a single body. Quinter also points out that scholarship published after Ford's monograph argues that Amida should also be included as one of his main objects of devotion; see footnote 3 in Quinter, "Jōkei's Mañjuśrī's Faith," 19.

[276] 276. Ford, "Jōkei and Kannon," *The Eastern Buddhist* 39, no. 1 (2008): 11. (The formatting was slightly modified from the original for legibility purposes.)

[277] 277. Ford, "Jōkei and Kannon," 16.

[278] 278. See table 5.2 in Ford, *Jōkei and Devotion,* 150. The dating of the *Monju kōshiki* is not in found Ford's table but is based on the analysis presented in Quinter, "Materializing and Performing *Prajñā,"* 36.

their labelling as miscellaneous practices. Moreover, we have previously argued that the *Kannon* and *Monju kōshiki* shared similar characteristics, which strongly suggests that the former can be better understood by looking beyond the triumvirate. Besides, if this model were that central to Jōkei's devotional practice, then how do we justify the quasi-absence of Shakamuni and Miroku from the text? The former features only twice in the entire piece, including once in the introductory praise.[279] As for the latter, they are only alluded to indirectly, through a passing reference to the Inner Court of Tosotsu.[280] On the other hand, the *kōshiki* mentions Amida and Gokuraku more times than both buddhas combined together.[281] This, in turn, leads to our second point, which has to do with the idea that Jōkei shifted his devotion to Kannon as a foil for countering Hōnen's exclusive reliance on Amida. Returning to the texts in the above list, we see that between 1200 and 1201, Jōkei composed more *kōshiki* that were not dedicated to Kannon, suggesting that his devotional shift probably had not occurred yet (or was in its early stages). More importantly, even if Jōkei had already gravitated towards Kannon when he composed the *Kannon kōshiki*—and even if the bodhisattva did embody pluralism—it is unlikely that his devotion was not supported by other practices, for that would have brought him too close to the *senju nenbutsu* teachings preached by Hōnen. It seems very unlikely to me that Jōkei would have so forcefully rejected Hōnen's exclusive reliance on Amida to only place his own faith into the single figure of the Kannon. Thus, in order to better explain why Jōkei composed the

---

[279] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 3, 82.

[280] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 139–40

[281] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 126, 138, 142, 145.

Kannon kōshiki at Kasagidera, let us examine some of the activities he undertook during this period of his life.

In her works on monastic fundraising efforts that took place during of the Heian and Kamakura periods, Janet Goodwin contends that *kanjin* campaigns became for the established Buddhist schools a sort of counterweight to balance out the popularity of Hōnen's teachings. The campaigns suggested that anyone could make a small contribution to a monastery and receive, by virtue of this small act, great merit in return. Goodwin writes that the term originally meant the "encouragement of people to convert to Buddhism and to accumulate virtues that will enable them to attain salvation," but sometime around the mid-Heian period, it took on the meaning of "efforts by temples to canvass the public for contributions . . . [which, in itself] was one type of good deed that led to salvation."[282] In their early manifestations, the majority of *kanjin* campaigns were run informally by *hijiri* to support various local projects, such as repairing temples and copying sūtras.[283] These informal campaigns gradually shifted towards a more institutionalised form, and by the late Heian period they were integrated into the activities of many shrine-temple complexes. The activities of Chōgen 重源 (1121–1206), a *hijiri* and contemporary of Jōkei, best exemplify this shift. Appointed as the Chief Alms Collector's Office (*dai kanjin shiki* 大勸進職) of Tōdaiji, Chōgen was not only in charge for soliciting donations to support the rebuilding of the complex after the Gempei war but also involved in managing the various sources of revenue for its reconstruction, such as the Ōbe 大部 estate. Yet, as his request for donations shows, the religious motivation behind *kanjin* remained: he asked all donors to contribute according to their ability, noting that a “foot of cloth, a small life, one log, or half a *monme* [a small amount of gold or silver]” were acceptable and, in exchange, "in the afterlife, they would sit in meditation on a lotus flower.”[284]

---

[282] Goodwin traces the earliest use of the term *kanjin* in the second sense to 1072; see Janet R. Goodwin, "Alms for Kasagi Temple," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 4 (1987): 828. This article partially overlaps with the chapter titled "Alms for Kasagi Temple," in *Alms and Vagabonds*, 46–66.

[283] Goodwin, *Alms and Vagabond,* 21–7. The most famous of these *hijiri,* Gyōki 行基 (668–749), was eventually put in charge by the court in 743 to find funds for the casting of the Daibutsu 大佛 at Tōdaiji, but this is more of an exception than the rule. Goodwin theorises that the court might have sought Gyōki's support to "defuse objections to the expense of the grand project with someone close to the people" (p. 24).

Goodwin observes that Chōgen’s efforts spurred a wave of other *kanjin* campaigns modelled after the Tōdaiji effort, in that they were all led and controlled by various institutions who actively sought the support of various centres of power.[285] Kasagidera was no exception to this trend, and there is textual evidence to support at least eight different requests for donations between 1182 and 1203. The campaign can be roughly divided into two halves, with the arrival of Jōkei in 1192 marking the separation. The first half was relatively modest in terms of objectives, with the efforts of 1182, 1183 and 1185 asking to support various religious ceremonies and the effort of 1188 seeking funds for a small pagoda and an image of Miroku to be placed within.[286] Jōkei personally signed three requests (one in 1193 and two in 1196), and these sought funding for restoring the biannual Eight Lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* (*Hokke hakkō* 法華八講) and for expanding Kasagidera with the construction of a thirteen-tiered pagoda, amongst other items. The last one dates from 1203 and concerns a major renovation project—the extension of the veneration hall (*raidō* 禮堂) from which the carving of Miroku was worshipped. Yet, despite the noticeable increase in project size coinciding with Jōkei's arrival, and despite the support of some generous patrons, these *kanjin* campaigns retained their religious motivation. As Jōkei writes in one of the 1196 requests, "If you offer just a little, you will certainly develop the excellent karma to meet the Buddha and hear his teachings, to aim at enlightenment and to fulfill that aim."[287]

---

[284] Translated in Goodwin, “Alms for Kasagi Temple,” 829–30. The fundamental religious aspect in Chōgen’s activities is corroborated by the way he undertook public works while managing the various lands under the control of Tōdaiji. Nagamura Makoto and Ōyama Kyōhei both point out that Chōgen viewed these construction and reconstruction projects as his religious practice. See their chapters in Janet R. Goodwin and Joan R. Pigott, eds., *Land, Power, and the Sacred: The Estate System in Medieval Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2018), 197–210, 211–30.

[285] Goodwin, “Alms for Kasagi Temple,” 830.

[286] For a short presentation of the requests, see Goodwin, *Alms and Vagabonds*, 51–5. The 1183 request mentions a “certain holy man” who helped to plan the campaign, and Goodwin notes that it is plausible that Jōkei was involved in the *kanjin* campaigns before he moved to Kasagidera (p. 53).

Jōkei's religious motivation behind the *kanjin* campaigns can be accurately described by the concept of *kechien*, whose meaning, according to Chieko Nakano, is centred around the notions of connection and condition—both represented in the component *en* 縁. She states that through *kechien* "people established a karmic connection with a deity or superior being, which resulted in improvement of their ultimate condition for enlightenment."[288] In the Japanese context, the meaning of this concept was broadened after Genshin's time: *kechien* came to encompass establishing karmic connections with various Buddhist deities or teachers and also allowed for sentient beings to initiate the connection.[289] Moreover, amongst the many activities Jōkei undertook during his Kasagidera years, two correspond to *kechien* practices that were popular around the late Heian period. The first one is the copying and enshrining of various sūtras, including the

---

[287] 287. Translated in Goodwin, "Alms for Kasagi Temple," 835. The *kanjin* campaigns did successfully attract wealthy donors, as witnessed by the fact that the new veneration hall was completed in a single year. However, the requests themselves make no reference to the donors' status. For instance, the 1193 and 1196 requests refer to the donors as *chishiki* (Sk. *mitratā*, Ch. *zhishi* 知識), suggesting that they were laypeople, without any more details (p. 836).

[288] 288. Chieko Nakano, "'*Kechien*' as Religious Praxis in Medieval Japan: Picture Scrolls as the Means and Sites of Salvation," (PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2009), 299; see pp. 44–7 for the analysis of the compound *en.*

[289] 289. Nakano, "Kechien," 66; see pp. 47–57 for the discussion on the meaning of term based on the works of Zhiyi and pp. 57–67 for one based on the works of Genshin.

Great Wisdom Sūtra, which we mentioned earlier as one of the possible reasons for his move to Kasagidera. In 1192, Jōkei copied the tenth chapter of this sūtra in front of the carving of Miroku, and after entering Kasagidera the following year, he made efforts to properly enshrine the whole text.[290] According to Nakano, sūtra copying—which included blood characters sūtras (Ch. *xuezi jing,* Jp. *ketsuji gyō* 血字經), *emaki* scrolls 繪巻 and even other Buddhist texts—was a representative form of *kechien* practice during the Heian and Kamakura periods.[291] The second one concerns the *Hokke hakkō,* the object of the funding requests he signed in 1193 and 1196 as well as his third major ritual performance at Kasagidera.[292] These lectures were a popular ceremony across the entire society which allowed the participants to simultaneously establish *kechien* with the *Lotus Sūtra* and accrue merit by listening to (and, for some, by sponsoring) the Dharma.[293]

With this historical context in mind, I contend that various elements of the *Kannon kōshiki* reflect the concept of *kechien* practice. This, in turn, would suggest that the *kōshiki* itself can also be interpreted as an effort to connect its audience with Kannon and improve their condition for enlightenment. Indeed, the word *kechien* is explicitly mentioned thrice in the piece, evoking each time some form of practice.[294] The first two instances—"The Great Sage [establishes] karmic connections [that go] from shallow to deep" and "one can know with the certainty that the karmic connections with the *honzon* are particularly

---

290. Quinter, "Materializing and Performing *Prajñā*," 22. The tenth chapter of the *Daihannya haramitta kyō* is commonly referred to as the *Rishubun* (Ch. *Liqufen* 理趣分).

291. For a presentation of general sūtra copying, see Nakano, "Kechien," 76–116; for a specific discussion on *emaki* scrolls, see pp. 117–68.

292. Quinter, "Materializing and Performing *Prajñā*," 24–5.

293. Nakano, "Kechien," 72–4.

294. In my translation, I have rendered *kechien* as "karmic connection."

superior in the present life"—are found a few lines apart in the fourth section.[295] Read in close proximity and in the context of the fourth section which praises the depth of karmic opportunities to connect with Kannon, they appear as an encouragement to all members of the audience to bond with the bodhisattva in the present life. The last mention of *kechien* is found in the colophon of the *kōshiki*, and reads, "may the people who have [established] karmic connections [with the bodhisattva] meet Kannon together."[296] Because this passage was likely not performed, I believe it reflects Jōkei's state of mind when he finished drafting the text. Should this hypothesis hold, then it would be a strong argument in favour of interpreting the *kōshiki* as a means to establish karmic connections between its audience and the bodhisattva, which is an integral part of *kechien* practice.

The description of Kannon's pure land also reflects the above notion of *kechien*, albeit without mentioning the word explicitly. Consider for instance, how Jōkei encourages his audience to seek a bond with the bodhisattva by depicting rebirth on Mount Fudaraku as a goal accessible to all. He describes Mount Fudaraku being "in the Shaba [world] but not in the Shaba [world]" and as a "pure land but not a pure land."[297] In other words, Kannon's abode is located in the Shaba world—and therefore is easier to access than a far removed pure land—but is also not part of the Shaba world, for it is a pure land. Conversely, it is a pure land in nature, but it is not a distant pure land in the sense of being far removed from the world of his audience. This encouragement is repeated explicitly a few lines later, where he mentions that even if "one's karma is insufficient [and even if progress] towards one's rebirth stagnates for a short time, one will inevitably be reborn on Mount Fudaraku as a relative of Kannon."[298] Yet, despite being easier to reach, Kannon's pure land remains efficient in improving one's condition for enlightenment. As Jōkei describes, it a place where on can "cultivate bodhisattva practices along with [Kannon]" and where "mantra-reciting sages and dharma-protecting deities from everywhere stop and dwell [here] to cultivate and practise the Buddhadharma."[299] And for those in the audience who might be worried that taking refuge in Kannon and aiming for Mount Fudaraku is not as good as aspiring to rebirth in Amida's Gokuraku, he states that "Kannon is the Buddha-to-be in the [Land] of Ultimate Bliss [and] they inevitably will guide that land."[300] As such, I argue that Jōkei's description of Mount reflects the concept of *kechien* practice*,* for it tries to connect the audience of the *kōshiki* with Kannon, which will in turn bring them closer to enlightenment

---

[295] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 103–4, 108.

[296] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, colophon v. 2.

[297] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 133–4.

Given the above references to *kechien* practice in the *Kannon kōshiki,* I believe it is plausible to interpret the entire ritual in itself as a form of *kechien* practice. Quinter's analysis of the *Monju kōshiki* in the context of the Kasagidera restauration and Monju cult supports this conjecture, for it shows that Jōkei "integrated these same on-the-ground practices with his doctrinal and other textual activities."[301] In this proposed interpretation of the *Kannon kōshiki,* the connection with the bodhisattva would take place at the end of each section, when the assembled participants recite the line "We pay homage to the Great Merciful and Compassionate One, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled." Having thus called Kannon's name, the bodhisattva's original vow should then theoretically guarantee that no participant would not be abandoned, while in practice they should be able to rely on Kannon's powers (described in the *kōshiki*) to progress on the path to Buddhahood.

---

[298] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 145–6.

[299] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 125, 132.

[300] *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, vv. 143–4.

[301] Quinter, "Materializing and Performing Prajñā," 18.

To summarise, the last section aimed to situate the contents of the *Kannon kōshiki* within Jōkei's activities at Kasagidera. It first looked at the theories Ford proposed to explain the existence of the Kannon kōshiki in a site dedicated to Miroku. Then, it discussed the *kanjin* campaigns that took place during Jōkei's stay at Kasagidera and looked at the to the notion of *kechien* during the Heian and Kamakura eras. From these last two topics, it argued that the elements in the *Kannon kōshiki* reflected the concept of *kechien* practice and that the *kōshiki* in itself could be interpreted a form of *kechien* practice. Thus, to conclude this chapter, let us return to the question as to why a *kōshiki* dedicated to Kannon was composed in a space mainly associated with Miroku devotion. To this, I propose a two-part answer. First, as argued above, one plausible explanation is to see it as a form of *kechien* practice amongst the many others Jōkei engaged in. As for the *Kannon kōshiki*'s relationship with the restoration of Kasagidera and its *kanjin* campaigns, there is not enough evidence to demonstrate convincingly that the text at hand was composed as a fundraising piece. However, I think it is reasonable to contend that Jōkei wrote this in part because he was motivated to help others progress on their path to Buddhahood. Every text and ritual need not to be solely framed in terms of power dynamics or economics, and for the Buddhist perspective of a monk who was particularly concerned about *mappō,* this seems to me to be a good enough reason. Second, as to why the *kōshiki* was specifically dedicated to Kannon, the answer with the least amount of uncertainty would be to see this piece as one side of Jōkei's multifaceted approach to devotion, where no aspect can be meaningfully understood in isolation. As mentioned earlier, the *kōshiki* he composed during his Kasagidera years were addressed to a variety of deities and concepts, so the present piece is not an outlier. However, a more hypothetical explanation is also possible. Goodwin points out that Jōkei seemed particularly inclined to restore the *Hokke hakkō* at Kasagidera, and one could look at the *Kannon kōshiki* from this perspective.[302] The *Lotus Sūtra* does feature prominently in the present *kōshiki,* and the *Fumen bon*—one of its most famous chapters in the East Asian context—provides a natural bridge between Kannon and the *Lotus Sūtra.* Besides, as mentioned in the introduction, Jōkei did compose a *kōshiki* dedicated to the *Lotus Sūtra* in 1201, the five-part *Hokke hakkō.* However, there is not enough evidence at the hand to move this suggestion beyond the realm of conjecture. Now, let us finally move onto the conclusion of this thesis and address the questions raised at in the introduction.

---

302. Goodwin, *Alms and Vagabonds,* 53.

CONCLUSION

This thesis studied the five-part *Kannon kōshiki*, a devotional text and ritual addressed to the *bodhisattva* Kannon and composed in 1201 while Jōkei was residing at Kasagidera. The introduction noted that both Jōkei and the *kōshiki* genre were understudied topics in the field of pre-modern Japanese Buddhist studies and that the present thesis aimed to be a "modest contribution in the efforts to bridge the gap between the current lack of scholarship on Jōkei and his actual role in shaping early Kamakura Buddhism" (p.7). Thus, the first chapter presented the background information relevant to the analysis of the *kōshiki* in the context of Jōkei's life and thoughts. It summarised the socio-political developments that took place between 1155 and 1221, a turbulent period marked by the various shifts in power dynamics. Then it traced the evolution of postwar academic trends in the study of Kamakura Buddhism, which can be roughly divided into three approaches: the Kamakura "founders"-centric approach, Kuroda's sociopolitcal approach, and the newer trends that have developed around the turn of the millennium. This last category includes, amongst others, the theoretical notions of discourse, place studies, feminism and gender studies. Finally, the chapter concluded with an overview of the reception of Yogācāra on the Japanese archipelago and the development of its main centre, Kōfukuji.

The second chapter analysed the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside two pieces of similar length but dedicated to different deities. In other words, it tried to situate the *Kannon kōshiki* within the other *kōshiki* Jōkei composed during his Kasagidera years. To do so, it first examined the different names and manifestations of the bodhisattva Kannon in the present piece and noted the parallels with both Miroku and Monju in their respective *kōshiki.* In a similar fashion, it considered the various texts and lands in which Kannon appears, suggesting thus that the eponymous *kōshiki* can be better understood by situating it alongside the ideas of exo-esoteric Buddhism and *mappō* consciousness. Thus, the second chapter contended that the *Kannon kōshiki* was one of the many forms of devotional practices Jōkei engaged in during his Kasagidera years and that these works contain several recurring patterns within them.

The third chapter extended the analysis of chapter two and looked at the *Kannon kōshiki* alongside two non-devotional texts composed during Jōkei's Kasagidera years—the *Kōfukuji sōjō* and the *Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō*. This contextualisation showed that Jōkei approached enlightenment from the traditional Hossō perspective, namely, as a gradual process inextricably tied to the notion of karma*.* However, it also showed that he engaged with contemporary popular ideas through the middling approach of *fusoku furi,* which allowed him soften some of the thornier doctrinal points from the Hossō tradition. The last section then considered the *kanjin* campaigns that took place during Jōkei's stay at Kasagidera alongside the theoretical notion of *kechien.* From these two points, it argued that elements within the *Kannon kōshiki* reflect the concept of *kechien* practice and that, as a whole, the *kōshiki* could also be interpreted as a form *kechien* practice. Finally, it proposed possible reasons to explain the presence of a devotional piece dedicated to Kannon in a site associated with Miroku. The first explanation, and the one with the least amount of uncertainty, interprets the piece as one of the many forms of *kechien* practices Jōkei engaged in, which were varied both in terms of practice and in terms of objects of devotion. Devotion to Kannon would then fit seamlessly into this plural and diverse mosaic. The other explanations are conjectures that merit further research. The first hypothesis suggests that this piece could be related to Jōkei's efforts to restore the *Hokke hakkō* at Kasagidera. The second hypothesis advances that the *Kannon kōshiki* was simply composed out of concern for his audience's salvation during the times of *mappō.*

In sum, this thesis aimed to build upon Ford's interpretation of Jōkei as a window into the realities of early Kamakura Buddhism. It proposed a scaled-down version of the said window and examined Jōkei, his thoughts and his practices through the lens of the *Kannon kōshiki.* In doing so, it concurred with Kuroda's conceptualisation of pre-modern Japanese religiosity as a combination of esoteric and exoteric forms of Buddhism. However, by looking at a former member of the elite who physically left the capital, this thesis also distanced itself from Kuroda's idea of power blocs that dominated pre-modern Japanese life across social, economic and political spheres. Instead, it focussed on the interactions between doctrine and practice within the confines of one specific institution. Indeed, despite retreating to Kasagidera, our study of the *Kannon kōshiki* proved that Jōkei did not abandon worldly concerns, nor did he leave behind the religious training he received during his Kōfukuji years. In other words, his thoughts and practices at Kasagidera still fully embody Kuroda's exo-esoteric framework. In this respect, they echo Grapard's premise that Japanese religiosity was essentially combinative and inextricably linked to the realities of the specific sites in which they evolved. As such, the present study opens the door to the possibility of revisiting Kuroda's *kenmitsu taisei* by looking beyond the major institutions of the late Heian-early Kamakura period and by further examining the space between centres of power and peripheries. At the same time, by examining devotional texts, non-devotional texts and historical realities through the lens of the *Kannon kōshiki*, this thesis also tried to illustrate the malleability of the *kōshiki* genre and show how its study can contribute to our better understanding of the creativity that shaped late Heian and early Kamakura Buddhism.

WORKS CITED

Works by Jōkei

Kannon kōshiki 觀音講式 (1201A) in *Kōshiki Database* no. 67.
Miroku kōshiki 彌勒講式 (1196) in *Kōshiki Database* no. 104.
Monju kōshiki 文殊講式 (1196) in *Kōshiki Database* no. 172.
Hossōshū shōshin ryakuyō 法相宗初心略要 in *Nihon daizōkyō*, vol. 5, 715–70
Kōfukuji sōjō 興福寺奏狀 in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zenshō*, vol. 2, 103–12

Secondary Sources

Abé, Ryūichi. *The Weaving of Mantra.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Adolphson, Mikael S. *The Gates of Power: Monks, Courtiers, and Warriors in Premodern Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2000.

Adolphson Mikael S., and Anne Commons, eds. *Lovable Losers: The Heike in Action and Memory.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015.

Ambros, Barbara R., James L. Ford, and Michaela Mross, eds. "Kōshiki in Japanese Buddhism." Special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 43, no. 1 (2016).

Augustine, Morris J., and Kondō Tesshō 近藤徹称, trans. *Senchaku Hongan Nembutsu Shū: A Collection of Passages on the Nembutsu Chosen in the Original Vow.* Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1997.

Barrett, Timothy Hugh. "Rebirth from China to Japan in Nara Hagiography: a Reconsideration." *Buddhist Studies Review* 26, vol. 1 (2009): 103–9

Bauer, Mikaël. "Conflating Monastic and Imperial Lineage: The Retired Emperors' Period Reformulated." *Monumenta Nipponica* 67, no. 2 (2012): 239–62.

Bauer, Mikaël. "The Power of Ritual: An Integrated History of Medieval Kôfukuji." PhD diss., Harvard University, 2010.

Bauer, Mikaël. "The Yuima-e as Theater of the State." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 38, no.1 (2011): 161–79.

Bauer, Mikaël. "Tracing Yamashinadera." *Journal of Asian Humanities at Kyushu University* 5, (2020): 17-28.

Blair, Heather. "Religion and Politics in Heian-Period Japan." *Religion Compass* 7, no. 8 (2013): 284–93.

Blum, Mark L. *The Origins and Development of Pure Land Buddhism: A Study and Translation of Gyōnen's Jōdo Hōmon Genrushō.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Boot, Willem J. Review of *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition,* by Michael I. Como, *Monumenta Nipponica* 65, no. 2 (2010): 397–400.

Brock, Karen L. "Awaiting Maitreya at Kasagi." In *Maitreya, the Future Buddha,* edited by Alan Sponberg and Helen Hardacre, 214–57, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Busshō Kankōkai 仏書刊行会 eds. *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zenshō* 大日本仏教全書. 150 vols. Tōkyō: Busshō Kankōkai, 1913–1922.

Carr, Kevin Gray. *Plotting the Prince: Shōtoku Cults and the Mapping of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012.

Chalitpatanangune, Marisa. *"Heiji Monogatari: a Study and Annotated Translation of the Oldest Text."* PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1987.

Chandra, Lokesh. "The Origin of Avalokita-svara/Avalokit-eśvara." *Indologica Taurinenaia XIII* (1985–1986): 187–202.

Chandra, Lokesh. "Origin of the Avalokiteśvara of Potala." *Kailash: A Journal of Himalayan Studies* 7, no.1 (1979): 6–7.

Chou, Yi-liang. "Tantrism in China." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 8, no. 3–4 (1945): 251–72.

Chilson, Clark. "Eulogizing Kūya as More than a Nenbutsu Practitioner: A Study and Translation of the *Kūyarui*." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 34, no. 2 (2007): 305–27.

Chūsei zenseki sōkan henshū iinkai 中世禅籍叢刊編集委員会, eds. *Eisai shū* 栄西集 Vol. 1, of *Chūsei zenseki sōkan* 中世禅籍叢刊. Kyōto: Rinsen shoten, 2013–2019.

Como, Michael I. *Shōtoku: Ethnicity, Ritual, and Violence in the Japanese Buddhist Tradition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Cook, Frances H., trans. *Three Texts on Consciousness-only.* Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist translation and research, 1999.

Davidson, Ronald M. "Some Observations on an Uṣṇīṣa Abhiṣeka Rite in Atikūṭa's *Dhāraṇīsaṃgraha*." In *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond*, edited by István Keul, 77-99, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.

Dennis, Mark. "Rethinking Premodern Japanese Buddhist Texts: A Case Study of Prince Shōtoku's 'Sangyō-gisho'." *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 1, no. 1 (2011): 13–35.

Dobbins, James C., ed. "Kuroda Toshio and His Scholarship." Special issue, *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 23, no. 3–4 (1996).

Dobbins, James C. *Letters of the Nun Eshinni: Images of Pure Land Buddhism in Medieval Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004.

Dolce, Lucia. "Duality and the 'Kami': the Ritual Iconography and Visual Constructions of Medieval Shintō." *Cahier d'Extrême-Asie* 16 (2006-2007): 119–50.

Dykstra, Yoshiko. "Tales of the Compassionate Kannon: The *Hasedera Kannon Genki*." *Monumenta Nipponica* 31, no. 2 (1971): 113–43.

Faure, Bernard. *The Fluid Pantheon: Gods of Medieval Japan, Volume 1*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016.

Foard, James H. "In Search of a Lost Reformation: A Reconsideration of Kamakura Buddhism." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 7, no. 4 (1980): 261–91.

Ford, James L. "Buddhist Ceremonials (*kōshiki*) and the Ideological Discourse of Established Buddhism in Early Medieval Japan." In *Discourse and Ideology in Medieval Japanese Buddhism,* edited by Richard K. Payne and Taigen Daniel Leighton, 97–125, New York: Routledge, 2006.

Ford, James L. "Competing with Amida: A Study and Translation of Jōkei's Miroku Kōshiki," *Monumenta Nipponica* 60, no. 1 (2005): 43–79.

Ford, James L. *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Ford, James L. "Jōkei and Kannon: Defending Buddhist Pluralism in Medieval Japan." *The Eastern Buddhist* 39, no.1 (2008): 11–28.

Fowler, Sherry D. *Accounts and Images of Six Kannon in Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2016.

Fujii Masako 藤井雅子. *Chūsei Daigoji to Shingon mikkyō* 中世醍醐寺と真言密教. Tōkyō: Benseisha. 2008.

Fukihara Shōshin 富貴原章信. *Nihon chūsei yuishiki Bukkyōshi* 日本中世唯識佛教史 . Tōkyō: Daitō Shuppansha, 1975.

Fukuda Eijirō 福田榮次郎 and Kawane Yoshiyasu 河音能平, eds. *Enryakuji to chūsei shakai* 延暦寺と中世社会. Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2004.

Funata Jun'ichi 舩田淳一. *Shinbutsu to girei no chūsei* 神仏と儀礼の中世. Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 2011.

Giebel, Rolf, trans. *The Mahayana Sutra of Previous Lives and Contemplation of the Mind-Ground*. Moraga CA: BDK America, 2021.

Goodwin, Janet R. *Alms and Vagabonds: Buddhist Temples and Popular Patronage in Medieval Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.

Goodwin, Janet R. "Alms for Kasagi Temple." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 4 (1987): 827–41.

Goodwin Janet R. and Joan R. Pigott, eds., *Land, Power, and the Sacred: The Estate System in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018.

Grapard, Allan G. "Linguistic Cubism—Singularity of Pluralism in the Sannō Cult," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 14, vol. 2-3 (1987): 211–34.

Grapard, Allan G. *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Green Ronald S., and Chanju Mun. *Gyōnen's Transmission of the Buddha Dharma in Three Countries*. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Groner, Paul. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1984.

Guelberg, Niels. *Buddhistische Zeremoniale (kōshiki) und ihre Bedeutung für die Literatur des japanischen Mittelalters*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999.

Guelberg, Niels, ed. *Kōshiki Database*. https://faculty.web.waseda.ac.jp/guelberg/koshiki/datenb-j.htm.

Hara Katsurō 原勝郎. "Tōzai no shūkyō kaikaku 東西の宗教改革." *Geibun* 藝文 2, no. 7 (1911). Reprinted in Hara Katsurō, *Nihon chūsei shi no kenkyū* 日本中世史の研究, (Tōkyō: Dōbunkan, 1929).

He, Huanhuan. "Whence Came the Name 'Kuiji' Instead of Just 'Ji'?," *The Eastern Buddhist* 48, vol.2 (2017): 51–68.

Hiraoka Jōkai 平岡定海, ed. *Tōdaiji Sōshō Shōnin no kenkyū narabini shiryō* 東大寺宗性上人之研究並史料. Tōkyō: Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai, 1958-1960.

Hurst III, G. Cameron. *Insei Abdicated Sovereigns in the Politics of Late Heian Japan 1086–1185*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Hurst III, G. Cameron. "The Kōbu Polity: Court-Bakufu Relations in Kamakura Japan." In *Court and Bakufu in Japan: Essays in Kamakura History*, edited by Jeffrey P. Mass, 3–28. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982.

Hirasawa, Caroline. "The Inflatable, Collapsible Kingdom of Retribution: A Primer on Japanese Hell Imagery and Imagination." *Monumenta Nipponica* 63, no. 1 (2008): 1–50

Inagaki Hisao 稲垣久雄, trans. "Words and Hymns of Japanese Pure Land Masters." In *Sekai bunka to bukkyō: Yamada Meiji kyōju kanreki kinen ronbunshū*, 18–9, edited by Yamada Meiji kyōju kanreki kinenkai. Kyōto: Nagata Bunshōdō, 2000.

Jülch, Thomas. "The Buddhist Re-interpretation of the Legends Surrounding King Mu of Zhou." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 130, no. 4 (2010): 625–7.

Kamikawa Michio 上川通夫. *Nihon chūsei bukkyō shiryōron* 日本中世仏教史料論. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2008.

Kanno Hiroshi 菅野博史. "Sangyō-gisho no shingi mondai ni tsuite." In *Sōgō kenkyū Asuka bunka*, edited by Ōkura seishin bunka kenkyūjo and translated by Jamie Hubbard, 456–503, Tōkyō: Kokusho kankōkai, 1989.

Karashima Seishi 辛嶋静志. "Who Were the *Icchantikas*?" *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 10 (2007): 67–80.

Kitagawa, Joseph M. "The Career of Maitreya, with Special Reference to Japan." *History of Religions* 21, no. 2 (1981): 107–25.

Klautau, Orion. "Revisiting Religious Reformation: *Shūkyō Kaikaku* in Japanese History and Historiography." Paper presented at the 16th International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies, online, 25 August, 2021. https://nomadit.co.uk/conference/eajs2021/paper/56563.

Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会 eds. *Gyokuyō* 玉葉, 3 vols. Tōkyō: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1906–1907.

Kōzō Yamamura, ed. *Medieval Japan*. Vol. 3, of *The Cambridge History of Japan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Kragh, Ulrich Timme, ed., *The Foundation for Yoga Practitioners: The Buddhist Yogācārabhūmi Treatise and Its Adaptation in India, East Asia, and Tibet*. Cambridge : Department of South Asian Studies, Harvard University, 2013.

Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄, "Chūsei no kokka to tennō 中世の国家と天皇." In *Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi* 岩波講座日本歴史, edited by Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘 *et al.*, 6: 245–95. Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1963.

Kuroda Toshio, *Genjitsu no naka no rekishigaku* 現実のなかの歴史学, Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1977.

Kuroda Toshio. *Kuroda Toshio Chosaku shū* 黒田俊雄著作集. 8 vols. Kyōto: Hōzōkan, 1994–1995.

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

Kwon, Ye-Gee. "Embracing Death and the Afterlife: Sculptures of Enma and His Entourage at Rokuharamitsuji." PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2018.

Lee, Jung-hsi, trans. *The Great T'ang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions.* Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research, 1996.

Lee, Kenneth Doo Young. *The Prince and the Monk: Shōtoku Worship in Shinran's Buddhism.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

Lee, Sumi. "Redefining the 'Dharma Characteristics School' in East Asian Yogācāra Buddhism." *The Eastern Buddhist* 46, no. 2 (2015): 41–60.

Liu, Ming-Wood. “The Problem of the *Icchantika* in the *Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 7, no. 1(1984): 57–82.

Lusthaus, Dan. *Buddhist Phenomenology: A Philosophical Investigation of Yogacara Buddhism and the Ch’eng Wei-shih lun*. Oxford: England, 2002.

Lusthaus, Dan. “Yogācāra school.” In *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, edited Robert E. Buswell Jr., 915–6. New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004.

Machida Soho 町田宗鳳. *Renegade Monk: Hōnen and Japanese Pure Land Buddhism.* Translated and edited by Ioannis Mentzas. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Marra, Michele. “The Development of Mappō Thought in Japan (I).” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15, no.1 (1988): 25–54.

Marra, Michele. “The Development of Mappō Thought in Japan (II).” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 15, no.4 (1988): 287–305.

Matsunaga, Alicia. *The Buddhist Philosophy of Assimilation: The Historical Development of the Honji-Suijaku Theory*, Tōkyō: Sophia University, 1969.

Matsunaga, Alicia and Daigan Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, *Vol. 2: The Mass Movement.* Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International, 1974.

Matsuo, Kenji. *A History of Japanese Buddhism.* Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Matsuo Kōichi 松尾恒一. *Ennen no geinōshiteki kenkyū* 延年の芸能史的研究. Tōkyō: Iwata Shoin, 1997.

McMullin, Neil. “Historical and Historiographical Issues in the Study of Pre-Modern Japanese Religions.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, no. 1 (1989): 3–40.

Meeks, Lori. *Hokkeji and the Reemergence of Female Monasticism in Premodern Japan.* Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2010.

Miyazaki Tenshō 宮崎展昌. *Ajase ō kyō no kenkyū: sono hensan katei no kaimei o chūshin toshite* 阿闍世王経の研究─その編纂過程の解明を中心として. Tōkyō: Sankibo Press, 2012.

Moran, Sherwood F. “Early Heian Sculpture at Its Best: Three Outstanding Examples,” *Artibus Asiae* 34, no. 2–3 (1972): 119–61.

Morrell, Robert E. *Early Kamakura Buddhism: A Minority Report*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1987.

Morrell, Robert E. “Jōkei and the Kōfukuji Petition,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 10, no. 1 (1983): 6–38.

Muller, Charles A. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism.* https://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb. Accessed 23 June, 2022.

Nagamura Makoto 永村眞*. Chūsei jiin shiryō ron*中世寺院史料論. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.

Nakamura, Kyōko, ed. “Women and Religion in Japan.” Special issue. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 10, no. 2–3 (1983).

Nakano, Chieko. “‘*Kechien*’ as Religious Praxis in Medieval Japan: Picture Scrolls as the Means and Sites of Salvation.” PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2009.

Nakao, Takashi. “The Lotus Sutra in Japan.” Translated by Wayne Shigeto Yokoyama. *The Eastern Buddhist* 17, no. 1 (1984): 132–7.

Nattier, Jan. “The Heart Sūtra: A Chinese Apocryphal Text?” *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 15, no.2 (1992): 153–223.

Nishi Yayoi 西弥生*. Chūsei mikkyō jiin to suhō* 中世密教寺院と修法. Tōkyō: Bensei, 2008.

Orzech, Charles, Richard Payne, and Henrik Sørensen, eds. *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Pradel, Chari. "Shōkō Mandara and the Cult of Prince Shōtoku in the Kamakura Period." *Artibus Asiae* 68, no. 2 (2008): 215–46

Quinter, David. "Localizing Strategies: Eison and the Shōtoku Taishi Cult/Prince Shōtoku Ceremonial: Eison's 'Shōtoku Taishi *kōshiki'*." *Monumenta Nipponica* 69, no. 2 (2014): 153–97, 199–219.

Quinter, David. "Visualizing the *Mañjuśrī Parinirvāṇa Sutra* as a Contemplation Sutra." *Asia Major* 23, no. 2 (2010): 97–128.

Radich, Michael. "The Doctrine of **Amalavijñāna* in Paramārtha (499–569) and Later Authors to Approximately 800 C.E." *Zinbun* 41 (2008): 45–174.

Rhodes, Robert F. "Introduction." *The Eastern Buddhist* 39, no. 1 (2008): 1–10.

Rhodes, Robert F. "Imagining Hell: Genshin's Vision of the Buddhist Hells as found in the 'Ōjōyōshū'." *The Eastern Buddhist* 32, no. 1 (2000): 22–55.

Rhodes, Robert F. Review of *Jōkei and Buddhist Devotion in Early Medieval Japan,* by James L. Ford. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 34, no. 2 (2007): 448–52.

Ruch, Barbara, ed. *Engineering Faith: Women and Buddhism in Premodern Japan.* Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 2002.

Ruppert, Brian D. *Jewel in the Ashes.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Ruppert, Brian O. "Beyond Big Events, Their Heroes, the Nation, and the Sects: A Review of Recent Books Published in Japanese on Premodern Japanese Religion (Part One)." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, vol. 1 (2010): 135–53.

Ruppert, Brian O. "Constructing Histories, Thinking Ritual Gatherings, and Rereading "Native" Religion: A Review of Recent Books Published in Japanese on Premodern Japanese Religion (Part Two)," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 40, vol. 2 (2013): 355–75.

Sekiguchi Makiko 関口真規子. *Shugendō kyōdan seiritsu shi: Tōzan-ha o tōshite* 修験道教団成立史ー当山派を通して. Tōkyō: Bensei Shuppan, 2009.

Shimosaka Mamoru下坂守. *Chūsei jiin shakai no kenkyū* 中世寺院社会の研究. Kyōto: Shibunkaku, 2001.

Shively, Donald H., and William H. McCullough, eds. *Heian Japan*. Vol. 2, of *The Cambridge History of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Stein, Rolf-Alfred. "Avalokiteśvara/Kouan-yin, un Exemple de Transformation d'un Dieu en Déesse." *Cahiers d'Extrême-Asie* 2, no. 1 (1986): 17–80.

Stone, Jacqueline I. *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999.

Stone, Jacqueline I. "Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Age: 'Mappō' Thought in Kamakura Buddhism (Part II)." *The Eastern Buddhist* 18, no. 2 (1985): 35–64.

Stone, Jacqueline I. "Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Age: 'Mappō' Thought in Kamakura Buddhism (Part I)." *The Eastern Buddhist* 18, no. 1 (1985): 28–56.

Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士, *Bukkyō tenkairon* 鎌倉仏教展開論. Tōkyō: Transview, 2008.

Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団. *Nihon daizōkyō* 日本大蔵経. 51 vols. Tōkyō: Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan, 1973–1978.

Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡辺海旭 eds. *Taishō shinshū* *daizōkyō* 大正新脩大蔵経. 100 vols. Ed. Tōkyō: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1934.

Tanaka Tanako 田中貴子. *Keiranshūyōshū no sekai* 渓嵐拾葉集の世界. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku, 2003.

Tay, C.N. "Kuan-yin: the Cult of Half-Asia." *History of Religions* 16, no. 2 (1976): 147–77.

Teeuwen, Mark, and Fabio Rambelli, eds. *Buddhas and Kami in Japan:* Honji suijaku *as a combinatory paradigm.* London: Routledge Curzon, 2004.

The *Senchakushū* English Translation Project, eds. *Hōnen's Senchakushū: Passages on the Selection of the Nenbutsu in the Original Vow*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1998.

Thompson, Luke Noel. "Returning to the Founder: Śākyamuni Devotion in Early Medieval Japan and Japanese Buddhist Conceptions of History." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2017.

Tōkyō National Research Institute for Cultural Properties 東京文化財研究所 (*Kōfukuji Senju Kannon Tainai butsu no chōsa* 興福寺千手観音胎内仏の調査 [article no: 02030, date: October 1958]; accessed June 23, 2022). https://www.tobunken.go.jp/materials/nenshi/5957.html.

Tyler, Royall. "Kōfuku-ji and Shugendō," *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 16, vol. 2–3 (1989): 143–80.

Tyler, Royall. "Kōfukuji and the Mountains of Yamato," *Japan Review* 1 (1990): 153–223.

Tyler, Royall, trans. *The Tale of the Heike.* New York: Penguin Books, 2014.

Uejima Susumu 上島享. *Nihon chūsei shakai no keisei to ōken* 日本中世社会の形成と王権. Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku, 2010.

University of Hawaii Press. "Memory, Music, Manuscripts: About the Book." Accessed 23 June, 2022. https://uhpress.hawaii.edu/title/memory-music-manuscripts-the-ritual-dynamics-of-koshiki-in-japanese-soto-zen/

Watson, Burton, trans. *The Lotus Sūtra.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Weinstein, Lucie R. "The Yumedono Kannon: Problems in Seventh-Century Sculpture." *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 25–48.

Wilson, William Ritchie. *Hōgen Monogatari: Tale of the Disorder in Hōgen*. Ithaca: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2001.

Yamada Shozen 山田昭全, ed. *Jōkei kōshiki shū* 貞慶講式集. Tōkyō: Sankibō busshorin, 2000.

Yamazaki Keiki 山崎慶輝. "Hossō yuishiki no kaikakusha Jōkei 法相唯識の改革者貞慶," *Ryūkoku daigaku Bukkyō bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 龍谷大学佛教文化研究所紀要 17 (1978): 137–49

Yokouchi Hiroto 横内裕人. *Nihon chūsei no Bukkyō to Higashi Ajia* 日本中世の仏教と東アジア. Tōkyō: Hanawa Shobō, 2008.

Yoshida, Kazuhiko, "Revisioning Religion in Ancient Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 30, no. 1–2 (2003): 1–26.

Yü, Chün-fang. "Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara and the Scriptural Sources for the Cult of Kuan-yin in China." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 10 (1997): 409–64.

Yü, Chün-fang. *Kuan-Yin: the Chinese Transformation of Avalokiteśvara.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

APPENDIX A: TRANSLATION OF THE FIVE-PART *KANNON KŌSHIKI* (1201A)

Kannon Kōshiki

Performed as usual.[303]

Reverently, we address the great benevolent and virtuous Shaka Nyorai; all the Three Jewels across the ten directions and the three Times; the extraordinarily great merciful and compassionate Kannon; and the innumerable beings on Mount Fudaraku—and we say:

At present, we renew our sincerity and convey our resolve; we light incense and offer flowers to Lord Kannon. We have composed a sermon. What does that resolve mean? It means we should entrust ourselves to the Three Jewels. Even if we entrust ourselves to them but do not achieve emptiness, we can [still] accumulate a single good deed. Furthermore, what is accumulated does not perish.

In particular, the Great Being Kannon has especially deep karmic opportunities [to connect] with this world, and the benefits are exceptionally prosperous during the latter age. Who amongst those praying for their aspirations [to materialise] would not take refuge [in the bodhisattva]? The entire exoteric and esoteric teachings speak of the characteristics of Kannon. Their division has been expounded by various teachers into five, six, eight and more categories. Hence, some rely on recited divine spells, and others [practice] according to their capacities. Truly, all [the different manifestations of Kannon] are one with the bodhisattva. The effects are interchangeable; the benefits, undivided — this is unheard of amongst other buddhas and bodhisattvas. Suppose a practitioner follows what brings them joy and specialises in a single practice. Then, they can take refuge in each of the three divisions [of Kannon's] mind[-made bodies].[304]

---

[303] The usual order of rites are as follows: the ritual offerings (*dengu* 傳供), the communal obeisance (*sōrai* 總禮), the essential dharma rites (*hōyō* 法用), the petition to *kami* (*jinbun* 神分) and the pronouncement of intentions (*hyōbyaku* 表白). Sometimes Jōkei only writes down part of these categories (*e.g*. three-part *Kannon kōshiki*, 1201B); sometimes he writes out the entire list (e.g. *Hokke kōshiki*).

Therefore, like a drop of water in the ocean of virtues, we summarily pronounce this praise. First, we praise the removal of hardships; second, the bestowal of blessings and longevity; third, the salvation in the next rebirth; fourth, the depth of karmic opportunities [to connect with Kannon]; fifth, the arousal of the vow of meeting [beings at death].

*

First, as for praising the removal of hardships, Kannon's original vow states: "Should suffering sentient beings thrice invoke my name, and should I not go towards those in need of salvation, may I not attain perfect enlightenment."[305] The *Lotus Sūtra* states: "Should countless sentient beings experience various [forms of] suffering and distress, and should they invoke [Kannon's] name single-mindedly, [the bodhisattva] will perceive the sound of their voices, and all will attain emancipation."[306]

---

[304] It is not clear which three divisions 三分 Jōkei is referring to. Given his Hossō background, the most probable interpretation is the three types of mind-made bodies (*sanshu ijō shin* 三種意生身) of a bodhisattva mentioned in the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* (Ch. *Lengqie jing*, Jp. *Ryōga kyō* 楞伽經; T 670.497c19–22). However, it is also possible to interpret 三意 as the three meanings in the Tendai exegesis of the *Lotus Sūtra* (*kyōsō san'i* 教相三意); see the *Fahua xuanyi* (Jp. *Hokke gengi* 法華玄義; T 1716.683b8–9).

[305] Kannon's original vow appears in the *Pei-hua ching* during an exchange between Buxuan taizi (Jp. Fushun Taishi 不眴太子) and his father Wuzhengnian wang (Jp. Mujōnen'ō 無諍念王). The prince and king later reincarnate respectively into Kannon and Amida (T 157.185c20–5).

Jōkei's formulation of Kannon's vow is particularly interesting: the passage is found *verbatim* in Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* (T 2682.44b15–6), which in turn cites the *Hung-meng hai-hui ching* (Jp. *Gumyōkaikyō kyō* 弘猛海慧經). The latter text is listed in both the *Kaiyuan shijiao lu* (Jp. *Kaigen shaku kyō roku* 開元釋教録; T 2154.675b12) and the *Zhenyuan xinding shijiao mulu* (Jp. *Teigan shinjō shakkyō mokuroku* 貞元新定釋教目錄; T 2157.1019c28) as an alternate name for the *Guanshiyin shi dayuan jing* (Jp. *Kanzeon jū daigan kyō* 觀世音十大願經). The *Hongmeng haihui jing* is also cited in the *Fahua yishu* (Jp. *Hokke gisho* 法華義疏; T 1721.34.628c3–10) and the *Shiyimian shenzhou xin jing yishu* (Jp. *Jūichimen jinju shin kyō gisho* 十一面神咒心經義疏; T 1802.1006c27–1007a10) as an explanation for Kannon's karmic bond with this world. Jōkei definitely had access to the first text (see footnote 170) and might have encountered the second one, given that its author, Huizhao (Jp. Eshō 慧沼; 648–714), was an important Faxiang commentator who studied under both Xuanzang and Chi.

For this reason, suppose one enters a great fire. Then, the flames will turn into a pond. Suppose one is washed away by a great flood; then, the waves will be unable to drown them. [Suppose] one either encounters hateful brigands, or [suppose one] faces calamities. Then, the heart of compassion will arise [within the brigands]. Furthermore, no one will be harmed, as blades and staves will break; and none will be afflicted by curses.[307] Poisons will return to their original expeditor.[308]

[If] one is stationed in a battlefield or contesting at court, the various forms of hatred will be completely dispelled.[309] [If] one sees the flash of lighting or hears the sound of [thunder], one can fasten their mind onto Kannon. All the more, one will have a fearless mind! [If] one crosses ocean waves or traverses the mountain road, one can trust in and entrust oneself to the Great Sage. There is evidence for all of this—those *yasa* and *rasetsu*

---

306. I suspect this is a digitization error and should read 法華經, as the following lines paraphrase the *Universal Gate Chapter* of the *Lotus Sūtra* by combining prose and verse; see「善男子，若有無量百千萬億眾生、受諸苦惱，聞是觀世音菩薩，一心稱名，觀世音菩薩即時觀其音聲，皆得解脫。」(T262.56c6–8).

307. This is an amalgam of the following passages from the *Lotus Sūtra*:「若有持是觀世音菩薩名者，設入大火，火不能燒，由是菩薩威神力故。若為大水所漂，稱其名號，即得淺處。」、「若復有人臨當被害，稱觀世音菩薩名者，彼所執刀杖尋段段壞，而得解脫。」、「假使興害意，推落大火坑，念彼觀音力，火坑變成池。或漂流巨海，龍魚諸鬼難，念彼觀音力，波浪不能沒。」and「或值怨賊繞，各執刀加害，念彼觀音力，咸即起慈心。」(T 262.56c5–11, 16–7, 17–20, 25–6).

308. Emending the character 箸 to 著, based on「呪詛諸毒藥，所欲害身者，念彼觀音力，還著於本人」(T 262.58a2–3).

309. This is a contraction of「雲雷鼓掣電，降雹澍大雨，念彼觀音力，應時得消散。」and「諍訟經官處，怖畏軍陣中，念彼觀音力，眾怨悉退散。」(T 262.58a10–1, 24–5).

that fill the land and torment people have evil eyes that cannot see the practitioner [devoted to] Kannon.[310]

Entirely healing all the illnesses, [Kannon is] like the king of medicinal trees.[311] Suppose one relies on karma [accumulated] from prior lives. Then, even if one experiences severe illnesses, the bodhisattva will be able to extinguish one's transgressions and, in the end, remove one's illnesses.[312] How much more so for minimal illnesses or minimal afflictions that are provisional? Now, in the impure world of the latter age, sentient beings are deficient in blessings—nowhere is still, no person is safe. During the present times, one should especially, and exceptionally, entrust oneself to Kannon's divine protection. Therefore, we chant the verses,

> From one thought to the next, do not let doubt arise!
> [O] Perceiver of Worldly Sounds, [O] Pure Sage!
> For those facing suffering, afflictions, hardships or death,
> [Kannon] can be relied on and depended upon.[313]

---

[310] Emending the character 刃 to 叉, based on the following passage, which Jōkei seems to be paraphrasing, 「若三千大千國土滿中夜叉羅刹，欲來惱人，聞其稱觀世音菩薩名者，是諸惡鬼尚不能以惡眼視之，況復加害？」(T 262.56c17–20). *Yasa* 夜叉 are one of the eight spiritual beings appearing in Buddhist scriptures and are said to devour human flesh. *Rasetsu* 羅刹 are another type of creatures said to eat humans, but in the *Lotus Sūtra,* the ten *rasetsunyo* 十羅刹女 are said to protect the Dharma.

[311] The digitisation is unclear here, but I suggest taking 愈 as a verb and the missing characters as 藥王. (A quick search in the Daizōkyō and CBETA databases shows that various authors use 藥樹王 and 藥王樹 interchangeably.) This conjecture is based on Chi-tsang's commentaries of the *Lotus Sūtra,* which Jōkei were familiar with, and which describe one of Kannon's bodies as the king of medicinal trees (see footnote 170). For example, the *Fahua xuanlun* (Jp. *Hokke genron* 法華玄論) states「二身一雙。觀音是藥樹王身。根莖枝葉華果皆能愈病。普門謂如意珠王身。能與一切樂。二身義出十地論釋文無心能滅物苦。」(T 1720.448a7–10). A similar explanation is found in the *Fahua yishu* (T 1721.624a4–10). Moreover, Zhiyi's lectures on the *Universal Gate Chapter* provide a similar explanation, which further supports the above conjecture; see the *Guanyin xuanyi* (Jp. *Kannon gengi* 觀音玄義; T 1726.880c29–a8).

[312] Emending the character 誡 to 滅, based on context.

[313] The *kada* at the end of the first part is quoted *verbatim* from the one at the end of the *Universal Gate Chapter* (T 262.58a28–9). Grammatically, the original text is truncated, so I have rendered the first two verses as independent sentences. In this passage, "Pure Sage" translates *jōshō* 淨聖, a superior class of beings, but here it refers specifically to Kannon.

We pay homage to the Great Merciful and Compassionate One, the Honourable Lord
Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled.[314]

**

Second, as for praising the bestowal of blessings and longevity, this bodhisattva is able to fulfill aspirations of sentient beings in the present, just like a wish-granting jewel.[315] Clothing on one's body; food in one's mouth; riches and treasures; and fields and houses — of all the above blessed virtues, not a single will be lacking. Moreover, a *sūtra* states: "Anyone without office or rank who recites Juntei's *dhāraṇī* for two seven-day periods [will progress in clerical status] according to their heart's delight."[316] Besides, [it states:] "One who recites the *Nyoirin dhāraṇī* a full thousand eighty times will attain a lifespan of a thousand years."[317]

---

[314] 自在 *jizai* is a translation of the Sanskrit *īśvara* (*ishibara* 伊濕伐邏), commonly rendered as "Lord"; see also footnote 162.

[315] The wish-fulfilling jewel (*nyoi* 如意) is associated with Nyoirin Kannon, a popular form of the bodhisattva during the early medieval period related to esoteric practices. See Brian D. Ruppert, *Jewel in the Ashes,* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000),146–7 and Fowler, *Accounts and Images of Six Kannon in Japan*, 27–8.

The relationship between the bodies of Kannon, the *Universal Gate Chapter*, the king of medicinal trees and the wish-fulfilling jewel is outlined in the three abovementioned exegeses of the *Lotus Sūtra* (see footnote 311). The tree and jewel form a pair, with each being a manifestation of the bodhisattva's body. In addition, the former explains the origin of the name "Kannon", and the latter the name "*Universal Gate Chapter.*"

[316] Jōkei does not explicitly name the text in question, but this exact merit is found in Kanjo's 寬助 (1052–1125) *Betsugyō* 别行, which states 「若人總無福祿官位。但二七日中至心念誦。隨縁部如功依法。即得福祿官位。隨意所樂。」(T 2476.141a12–4). Specifically, the merit is listed in the third section dedicated to Kannon and in the subsection labelled Saishō Kongō 最勝金剛, the esoteric name of Juntei Kannon (T 2476.140b17–151a28, 140c24–141c22).

The three-part *Kannon kōshiki* (1201B), written a few days before present *kōshiki*, supports the idea that Jōkei is citing from the *Betsugyō.* We find the following passage word-for-word in both「如意輪經云、『始從今日乃至成佛、不墮惡道、常生佛前。』」(T 2728.886c29–887a1, T 2476.148a28–9), as well as Yijing's *Guanzizai pusa ruyilun xin tuoluonizhou jing* (Jp. *Kanzeon bosatsu nyoirin daraniju kyō* 觀自在菩薩如意心陀羅尼呪經 (T1081.196b15–197b20). I-ching's text, I believe, is the *Nyoirin Sūtra* which Jōkei is referring to. However, there is a second version of the *Nyoirin Sūtra*—the *Guanzizai pusa mimizang ruyilun tuoluoni shenzhou jing* (Jp. *Kanzeon bosatsu himitsuzō nyoirin darani shinju kyō* 觀世音菩薩祕密藏如意輪陀羅尼神呪經) translated Śikṣānanda (Ch. Shichanantuo, Jp. Jisshananda 實叉難陀)—which is very similar in content to Gijō's copy; see T 1082.198b4–5.

If a person prays for a son to [be endowed] with blessed virtues and wisdom or [prays] for a daughter to be loved and respected by a multitude of people, their prayers will be fulfilled accordingly.[318] [The child] will be born peacefully and steadily, permanently liberated from hardships. In this way, the benefits [of Kannon] are countless and limitless. Suppose a person solely seeks the Buddha's way to end their desires in the present rebirth, and they particularly [do so] to help the worldly realm. Then, they should entrust themselves to these virtues.[319] Therefore, we chant the verses,

> Endowed with all the merits,
> [Kannon's] compassionate eyes view sentient beings.
> Their ocean of accumulated blessings is immeasurable;
> Because of this, we should reverently prostrate ourselves [before them].[320]

We pay homage to the Great Merciful and Compassionate One, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled.

***

Third, as for praising the salvation in the next rebirth, how many habits of the deluded beings are transgressions?[321] One who commits transgressions also inevitably experiences suffering as fixed by the way of cause and effect. [If] rebirth were like a dream, why would the three [evil] paths exist?[322] Now, those with much greed, anger or ignorance can always call upon Kannon Bosatsu with reverence—furthermore, they will all attain liberation.[323] All the karmic hindrances have the three poisons at their root. The three poisons are the aforementioned greed, anger and ignorance.

---

[317] Emending the passage to「又(云)、『誦如意輪呪滿千八遍得壽一千歳云云。』」, based on context. Interestingly, this benefit is absent from Gijō's translation of the *Nyoirin Sūtra* but appears in Śikṣānanda's version (T 1082.199c11–4).

[318] This paraphrases the following from the *Universal Gate Chapter,*「若有女人，設欲求男，禮拜供養觀世音菩薩，便生福德智慧之男；設欲求女，便生端正有相之女，宿植德本，眾人愛敬。」(T 262.57a7–9).

[319] 望 refers to desires (*yokumō* 欲望). The sentence alludes to the bodhisattva's practice of "seeking the *bodhi* above and saving sentient beings below" (*jō gu bodai ge ke shūjō* 上求菩提下化衆生, *jō gu butsu dō ge ke shūjō* 上求佛道下化衆生), which certain authors equate with (arousing) the aspiration for enlightenment (*e.g. bodaishin* 菩提心, *gan sabutsu shin* 願作佛心). For an example of the first term, see Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan* (Jp. *Maka shikan* 摩訶止觀; T 1911.6a13–9); for the second, see Genshin's 源信 *Ōjōyōshū* (T 2682.48c4– 7).

[320] The *kada* at the end of the second section continues the previous quote from the *Universal Gate Chapter* (T 262.58b1–2).

The way of repentance and the plan to extinguish transgressions cannot surpass the calling upon this bodhisattva. Suppose it is hard to quickly end [the cycle of *saṃsāra* in this rebirth.] Then, one can gradually be liberated in the next one. Relying on this, [one who commits] the four grave or five heinous transgressions can still rely on Kannon's majestic powers — there is nothing they cannot extinguish or eradicate.[324] [If] the karmic causes are thoroughly exhausted, how will the fruits of suffering be experienced? Suppose repentance

---

321. Emending the punctuation to「凡夫之習、犯罪幾許。有罪亦必受苦因果定道也。」, based on an identical passage from the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* (T 2728.86c25) in the *Daizōkyō Database*. The *Kōshiki Database* version of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* has「凡夫之習、犯罪幾許有罪 。」(*Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 77–8), but I think this is likely a digitisation error given that 幾許 is commonly used as a final particle.

322. 三途 refers to two related concepts. The first denotes the three unfortunate paths of reincarnation—namely, the path of fire (*kazu* 火途) for beings in hell; the path of blood (*ketsuzu* 血途) for animals; and the path of swords (*tōzu* 刀途) for hungry ghosts. The second points to the Sanzu river that one traverses after departing from the present rebirth. This river has three crossing points (a bridge, a ford and snake-infested waters), and where one traverses depends on their past karma. The three-part *Kannon kōshiki* in *Kōshiki Database* contains the same sentence as the present text (*Kōshiki Database* no. 65, v. 78), but the *Daizōkyō Database* version explicitly refers to the Sanzu as a river「 一生如夢三途河。」(T 2728.886c25–26).

323. Emending the character 掌 to 常, based on the following passage in both editions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki*,「若此過多之者常念觀音、更皆得離」(T 2728.886c27, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, v. 80). The passage paraphrases the following from the *Universal Gate Chapter*, 「若有眾生多於淫欲，常念恭敬觀世音菩薩，便得離欲；若多瞋恚，常念恭敬觀世音菩薩，便得離瞋；若多愚癡，常念恭敬觀世音菩薩，便得離癡。」(T 262.57a1–5). In Kumārajīva's edition of the *Lotus Sūtra*, 淫欲 *inyoku* translates the Sanskrit *rāga*, but in later texts, 淫 is sometimes conflated with 婬, and *inyoku* with *tonyoku* 貪欲.

324. The four grave offences are the most serious offences that a monastic can commit and result in their expulsion from the saṃgha. The five transgressions refer to the five heinous acts that leads one directly to be reborn in *avīci* hell (*abi jigoku* 阿鼻地獄), the lowest level of the "hot" hells where one suffers the most.

does not suffice; then, even if one falls into the evil ways, Kannon will go to those sites and will be able ferry one [to the other shore of *nirvāṇa*].

Someone created an image of Kannon. That image radiates light, which enters the eighteen [levels of] hell, completely destroying the instruments causing suffering and turning [the entire place] into a clear and cool lake.[325] Next, it enters the city of the thirty-six [classes of] hungry ghosts and, in the middle of the sky, [transforms] into ambrosia to satiate all.[326] Next, it enters the four billion different animal ways, releases the light of wisdom and saves each and every one. The benefits of the image are just as mentioned. How much more so for the majestic power of [Kannon's] transformation body?[327]

---

[325] Emending the punctuation to「能施濟度者。有人造觀音像。」, based on context.

The clear and cool lake (*shōryō chi* 清凉池, also called the "lake without heat" or *munetsu chi* 無熱池) is a common metaphor for *nirvāṇa*, where one is said to be free from torments (*netsunō* 熱惱). For an example of such usage, see the *Dazhidu lun* (Jp. *Dai chido ron* 大智度論; T 1509.221c2–28).

[326] Multiple models of hell co-existed alongside one another during the early Kamakura period. However, it is worth mentioning that the present text does not reflect the configuration of eight hot (and eight cold) hells presented in Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū.* Instead, I believe Jōkei might have been influenced by Zhimeng's (Jp. Chimō 智猛; fl. 5th c. CE) recording of Prince Shilimituo (Jp. Shirimittara 尸利密多) story, which can be found in the *Sanbao ganying yaolue lu* (Jp. *Sanbō kannō yōryaku roku* 三寶感應要略錄; T2084.852a12–b3). Both passages narrate similar events, and even the numbers in the classification of hells, hungry ghosts and animals match. For a summary of Genshin's reconfiguration of hell, see Robert F. Rhodes, "Imagining Hell: Genshin's Vision of the Buddhist Hells as found in the 'Ōjōyōshū'," *The Eastern Buddhist* 32, no. 1 (2000): 22–55; and for an overview of the overall development of hell imagery in Japan, see Caroline Hirasawa, "The Inflatable, Collapsible Kingdom of Retribution: A Primer on Japanese Hell Imagery and Imagination," *Monumenta Nipponica* 63, no. 1 (2008): 1–50.

甘露 *kanro*—literally sweet dew—is a common metaphor for the teachings of the Buddha. In the context of the present *kōshiki*, there are two additional references. The first alludes to the use of *kanro* in ritual offerings to hungry ghosts in order temporarily stop food from instantly combusting in their mouths. The *urabon* 盂蘭盆 ceremony exemplifies this first use. The second points to iconographical depictions of Kannon where the bodhisattva holds a vase (or jar) filled with *kanro* that possesses various wondrous benefits. For an example of such a depiction in the Heian period, see the images of the Hokkeji 法華寺 Kannon in Sherwood F. Moran, "Early Heian Sculpture at Its Best: Three Outstanding Examples," *Artibus Asiae* 34, no. 2–3 (1972): 136–7.

[327] Emending the punctuation to「一一救 之。形像利益猶以此。」, based on context.

The transformation body (*shōshin* 生身 , also called *ōjin* 應身 or *keshin* 化身) is one the three bodies of a buddha. Specifically, it is the body manifested in response to the needs of sentient beings. For example, Siddhārtha Gautama, the historical Buddha, is considered to be a transformation body.

For this reason, in various *sūtras*, Kannon [states]: "When facing the end [of this rebirth], some will attain the four benefits, and others will achieve the eight dharmas. Moreover, some will be liberated from the fifteen types of evil deaths and attain the fifteen types of good rebirths. Besides, those desiring to know whether their parents or children have [achieved] an auspicious or inauspicious rebirth will immediately know about it."[328] In this way, the praises of [these] benefits are innumerable. Therefore, we chant the verses,

> Across the multiple various evil destinies,
> be it hell, hungry ghosts or animals,
> the sufferings of birth, old age, sickness and death
> are already being gradually and completely extinguished [by Kannon].[329]

We pay homage to the Great Merciful and Compassionate One, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled.

****

Fourth, as for praising the depth of karmic opportunities [to connect with Kannon], a *sūtra* states: "In this Shaba world, all call [the bodhisattva] the 'Bestower of Fearlessness'."[330] For this reason, the *Heart Sūtra* states: "First, [let us] especially praise

---

[328] There is no definite evidence for what the missing character is, but I suggest 凶 to contrast with 吉 . Unfortunately, it is also not clear which sūtras are being cited here, as the contents of the first and third sentences are quite generic. The second sentence appears to be paraphrasing a passage in the *Daihishin darani*, which mentions the benefits of reciting the *dhāraṇī* of Senshu Kannon 千手觀音. There are two extant translations of the text and both list the same fifteen evil deaths and good rebirths; see T 1060.107a28–b20 in the translation by Bhagavaddharma (Ch. Qiefandami, Jp. Gabondatsuma 伽梵達摩; fl. 7th c. CE) and T 1064.116a16–b8 in Amoghavajra's. However, neither version contains a reference to the four benefits, eight dharmas or the ability to know the rebirth of one's family.

[329] Emending the character 者 to 苦 , based on the following passage in the *Universal Gate Chapter*, 「種種諸惡趣，地獄鬼畜生，生老病死苦，以漸悉令滅。」(T 262.58a16–7). 已 and 以 are synonymous in the above passage.

[330] This is a direct but uncited quote from the *Universal Gate Chapter* (T 262.57b23–4) that explains Kannon's epithet, which is derived from their ability to bestow fearlessness on those who are in fear during critical circumstances (T262.57b19–21).

Kanjizai Bosatsu."[331] Jion explains the above, and thus, he states: "[Kanjizai] perpetuates [the Buddhadharma] in the pure land afar, and he saves the polluted place at hand. Because the capacities [of sentient beings] and the response of [the bodhisattva] are corresponding, they uniquely bear this name."[332]

Again, to seek that realisation is to also have faith in it and accept it. The so-called worldly realm is extremely recent, [but the depth of karmic opportunities to connect with Kannon] is unsurpassed between the sun and the moon, as well as across the stars and the constellations. It always revolves in the void, and it universally illuminates the country's land.[333] It reaches grass and trees, birds and beasts—all will receive that energy and attain growth. How much more so will it be for humankind?

Furthermore, the Sun-god is a transformation body of Kannon according to the Buddha's sermons.[334] For this reason, when Zemmui Sanzō prayed for rain, Kannon appeared from the centre of the sun-disc.[335] Taking water sprinkled from [Kannon's] vase, he instantly realised true understanding. If so, when we gaze upon the light of compassion each morning, the dew of transgressive hindrances will easily vanish.[336] Throughout the day, as we turn to the shadow of the one who benefits [sentient beings], the seeds of *bodai* will gradually sprout.[337] Additionally, Shōtoku Taishi [is also a transformation body of] the World-saving Kannon, and the world praises him appropriately.[338] He spreads the Buddhadharma and guides sentient beings; he is simply an expedient means for the holy spirits [of the departed].

---

[331] Emending the character 思 to 恩 and the punctuation to「『初殊擧觀自在菩薩。』慈恩釋其。故云」. This is based on the following two points. First, the latter citation in this passage is paraphrasing Ji's *Bore boluomiduo xinjing zan* (Jp. *Hannya haramitta shingyō san* 般若波羅蜜多心經贊), a commentary on the *Heart Sūtra* that extensively discusses the name Kanjizai Bosatsu (T 1710.524b4–c13). Second, Ji is also referred to as Ci'en Dashi, a name derived from the temple where he resided at (see footnote 133). The above emendations would also agree with the contents of the *Heart Sūtra* translated by Xuanzang, whose first sentence literally calls the name "Kanjizai Bosatsu" (T 251.848c6). The other popular version translated by Kumārajīva (T 250) begins with "Kanzeon Bosatsu" 觀世音菩薩 (T 250.847c10). The longer version by Prajñā starts with "Thus I have heard" 如是我聞 (T 253.849b26).

[332] Reading the missing character as 標, based on the following passage from the *Xinjing zan*,「紹隆淨刹府救穢方。機感相應故唯標此。」(T 1070.c10–1). Interestingly, Chi's commentary argues for us to call the bodhisattva Kanjizai and not Kannon, lest we misinterpret the term and lose the meaning of the name (T 1710.524c3–4).

[333] Emending the character 區 to 過, based on the similar passage found in both editions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki*「其中世間奇特眼前猶新者。無過日月星宿。」and「其中世間奇特、眼前猶新者、無過日月星宿。」(T 2728.886a17–b17, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 22–3).

[334] The presence of a sun-god in Buddhist cosmology can be identified in the earlier layers of the canon. For instance, the *Longer Āgama-sūtra* (Sk. *Dīrgha-āgama-sūtra*, Ch. *Chang ahan jing*, Jp. *Jō agon kyō* 長阿含經) gives a substantial description of the solar deity and the palace in which they reside (T 1.145b11–146c22; incidentally, this chapter on Buddhist cosmology is absent from the Pali *Dīgha Nikāya*). On the interpretation of celestial asters as transformation bodies of different bodhisattvas, see footnote 170.

Inside the womb of the Compassionate Mother, a relic of the Honoured Shakamuni is presented as an offering; in front of the eyes of the deluded beings, the eastern gate of the pure land is revealed.[339] Infants all know of these wonders.[340] Thinking at length about [Kannon's] benevolence, we personally pay reverence to their virtues. Our dull minds lack faith, and the tears of joy are hard to hold back. Who amongst the people certain to be reborn in this land would doubt the karmic opportunities [to connect] with Kannon?

---

[335] Śubhakarasiṃha (Ch. Shanwuwei sanzang, Jp. Zemmui Sanzō; 637–735) was an Indian Tripiṭaka Master associated with the propagation of esoteric Buddhism during the Tang dynasty. He is particularly remembered for translating the *Mahāvairocana-sūtra* (Ch. *Dari jing*, Jp. *Dainichi kyō* 大日經) with his disciple Yixing (Jp. Ichigyō 一行; 683–727) but was also a prolific ritual expert. In Japan, Zemmui is listed as one of the eight doctrine expounding patriarchs (*denji hasso* 伝持八祖) of the Shingon 真言 tradition; see Gyōnen's 凝然 (1240–1321) *Sankoku buppō denzū engi* 三國佛法傳通緣起 for a Kamakura account of the Shingon lineage (B186.654a3–658b7). For a concise biography and bibliography of Zemmui in English, see Klaus Pinte, "Śubhākarasiṃha," in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, eds. Charles Orzech, Richard Payne, and Henrik Sørensen (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 339–41.

An account of Śubhakarasiṃha praying for rain appears in the *Xuanzong chao fanjing sanzang shanwuwei zeng hongluqing xingzhuang* (Jp. *Genshū chō hongyō sanzō zemmui sō kōrokyō gyōjō* 玄宗朝翻經三藏善無畏贈鴻臚卿行狀; T 2055.291a2–4). Incidentally, this account, the bodhisattva appears out of a moon-disc. This could either be a reflection the rising popularity of the "Water-moon" Kuan-yin during the Tang, or it could be a typographical mistake (日 vs 月). For a concise summary of the development of the "water-moon" Kuan-yin, see Yü, *Kuan-Yin*, 233–47.

[336] Emending the character 胡 to 朝, based on context.

[337] Here, "one who benefits" translates *rishō* 利生 , which is an abbreviation of *riyaku shūjō* 利益衆生—an allusion to the buddhas and bodhisattvas bringing benefits to sentient beings and saving them from suffering.

[338] Shōtoku Taishi was deified and worshipped as a transformation body of Kuse (Guze) Kannon 救世觀音 during Heian and Kamakura periods. The Kuse Kannon at Hōryūji 法隆寺 aptly illustrates this practice; see Lucie R. Weinstein, "The Yumedono Kannon: Problems in Seventh-Century Sculpture," *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 25–48. For another example of Shōtoku worship at Hōryūji, see Chari Pradel, "Shōkō Mandara and the Cult of Prince Shōtoku in the Kamakura Period," *Artibus Asiae* 68, no. 2 (2008): 215–46; for a more general treatment of Shōtoku worship in English, see Kevin Gray Carr, *Plotting the Prince: Shōtoku Cults and the Mapping of Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012).

Amongst those who bow down [to the bodhisattva] — there are families who are poor but subsist in the world, people who are lowly but accepting of others, and [individuals] who [wear] many [garments of] praise on their bodies but [conceal] deep resentment at the bottom of their minds. There are some who care for elderly parents, and others who nurse young children. There are [couples], if a spouse forgets their vows, and [subjects], if a ruler is indifferent. Or there are also orphans who have neither father nor mother, and people who have many illnesses and sorrows. [Of all the above] people, eight or nine in ten can entirely entrust themselves to Kannon's oath.

From the vicinity of flowery [Kyōto] to the faraway borderlands, from the peaks of high mountains to the bottoms of valleys, the spiritual efficacies everywhere [pertain] most likely to Kannon.[341] Even if the deities of various shrines have many original grounds, the recent powerful efficacies in the world are traces of Kannon.[342] Those who rely on [the bodhisattva] walk around and long for them in their heads, with the noble and the lowly [coming together], like in a market. [Amidst this crowd of] people, there is no gap to stand an awl. The carts cannot turn their shafts.[343] Within royal curtains and inside brushwood houses, how many more people privately turn to and distantly call upon [Kannon]? No one but the Buddhas knows that number.

---

[339] Emending the character 拳 to 奉, based on the following in the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* found in the *Daizōkyō* Database 「彼如悲母胎内奉釋尊之舍利」(T 2728.886b6). The *Kōshiki Database* version reads「彼如悲母之胎内、拳釋尊之舍利」(*Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 29), but I believe this is a digitisation error because *tainai butsu* 胎内仏 or *tainai nōnyūhin* 胎内納入品 refers to the enshrining of smaller religious objects (*e.g.* statues, texts, relics) within a larger statue in the Japanese context. This practice was popular during the Heian and Kamakura periods, including within Kōfukuji. See the report in Tōkyō National Research Institute for Cultural Properties 東京文化財研究所 (*Kōfukuji Senju Kannon Tainai butsu no chōsa* 興福寺千手観音胎内仏の調査 [article no: 02030, date: October 1958]; accessed June 23, 2022), https://www.tobunken.go.jp/materials/nenshi/5957.html.

There is another point of interest in this passage—Jōkei links Kannon (the Compassionate Mother) with Shaka, departing from the association between Kannon and Amida. The later is particularly evident in iconographical depictions of Kannon, where a smaller figure of Amida often rests on Kannon's head.

[340] "Infants" translate *eiji* 嬰兒 , which is an abbreviation of *eiji bonbu* 嬰兒凡夫, which in turn is calqued on the Sanskrit *bālapṛthagjana* and is synonymous with 凡夫 *bonbu*.

In this way, the [above] customs of the land began long ago. Even if they are instructions from a parent or orders from a ruler, they are not in vain — they are the mind of a person! If a sympathetic response has no body [to interact with], and a benefit lacks a world [to exist in], who would mysteriously induce faith? Who would vainly convey merits? By inference, one should know that the spiritual efficacies will not fall on the ground.[344] For this reason, nescience does not manifest in dreams, and knowledge confers divine protection upon the body. Even if one supposes that it is not like the mind, [Kannon's oath] to every single [being] is not empty.[345] It is not simply for fame and profit in the present life; it inevitably helps suffering and afflictions in the next rebirth. It is not solely for the benefit of a single body, but it is vast like a reception by the benevolent.[346]

---

[341] *Karaku* 花洛—literally "flowery Lo-yang," but refers to the city of Kyōto in the Japanese context.

[342] This refers to the theory of *honji suijaku* 本地垂迹, according to which *kami* were local manifestations (or traces, *suijaku*) of Buddhist deities (*i.e.*, the original ground, *honji*); see footnote 185.

[343] Emending the punctuation to 「運歩欣首、貴賤爲市。人無隙立雖。車不得廻轅。」, based on the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* in the *Daizōkyō Database* edition (T 2728.886c16–7). The *Kōshiki Database* version punctuates a similar sentence as 「貴賤爲市人、無隙立錐、車不得廻轅。」(*Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 69–70), but I believe the parallels between「人無隙立錐」 and 「車不得廻轅」suggest a break before 人. Also emending the character 雖 to 錐 , based on both passages above.

[344] Emending the character 末 to 不, based on the following 「靈驗不墜地」, found in both the versions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* (T 2728.886c20, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 72).

[345] I suggest reading the missing character as 空 and emending the punctuation to 「面面不空。不只現世之名利」, based on 「設雖不如心、面面不空。」in the *Daizōkyō Database* version of the three-part *Kannon*

All parents who think of their children pray to Kannon often. Even if they themselves do not know about it, how many divine protections are conferred? Having repaid [Kannon's] benevolence, the karmic opportunities [to connect with the bodhisattva] are extremely corresponding. The Great Sage [establishes] karmic connections [that go] from shallow to deep. The majestic power of the Buddhadharma turns delusion into awakening. Suppose one's mind is defiled because of the desires in the present rebirth. Then, because of [Kannon's] sympathy in the coming life, one can entrust oneself even more deeply to [the bodhisattva]. Why is this so? [It is because] a person who possesses a mind [can] simultaneously think about the two lives, and they [can] entrust themselves to the oath of the *honzon*.[347] Even if there are differences between the two, one's merits will rightly be conveyed.[348]

[Because] what is at hand is more important than what is far away, and [because] [one's] intention is foremost in the sphere of cognition of the Three Jewels, one can know with certainty that the karmic connections with the *honzon* are particularly superior in the

---

kōshiki and 「輒雖難助隨分利益。面面不空。」in the *Kōshiki Database* version (T2728.886c15–6, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 67–8).

[346] "Reception" translates *injō* 引接 (synonymous with 引攝). It refers to a buddha welcoming sentient beings who call upon them. More specifically, with respect to Amida devotion, it refers to Amida's nineteenth vow of coming to receive sentient beings, as mentioned in the *Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra* (Jp*. Muryōju kyō,* Ch. *Wuliangshou jing* 無量壽經; T 360.268a29–b2).

The "benevolent" translates *onsho* 恩所, which I am interpreting as the "site where benevolence lies," namely within the bodies of buddhas and bodhisattvas. This reading is supported by the passage mentioned in footnote 361.

[347] The two lives (*nise* 二世) are this present life and the coming one.

[348] *Honzon* 本尊 is the main objection of veneration in a devotional setting. In this text, it refers to Kannon.

present life. If so, let us go towards the path of darkness and help with Enma's duties.[349] Death and rebirth will settle down; fear and dreams of delusion will take over our bodies. Already, we have become Kannon! Therefore, we chant the verses,

> The bodhisattva is mindful of all sentient beings;
> [their] love penetrates the bone marrow.
> Constantly, they desire benefits [for all]
> because [to them each being] is just like an only child.[350]

We pay homage to the Great Merciful and Compassionate One, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled.

*****

Fifth, as for praising the arousal of the vow to meet beings [at death], the bodhisattva's original vow states, "Should one invoke my name a single time, then in rebirth after rebirth and in age after age, may I never abandon [them], and may I inevitably alleviate their suffering."[351] However, when one thinks at length about this, none of it can be doubted. In their long-gone days of transmigrating through the Shaba [world], Kannon was also a deluded being! With us, sentient beings, they became a parent and a sibling. They built mutual bonds of affection with their spouse, children and relatives. Rebirth after rebirth, how many [times did Kannon come back]? In the last one, they aroused a single thought about the true mind and gradually ascended to the stage of equal enlightenment.[352]

---

[349] A character is missing before 空, and I have not been able to identify with certainty what it ought to be. However, I don't think it would drastically change the overall meaning of the sentence, so I have omitted both in my translation and read the sentence as 「若爾冥途往」.

During the Heian and Kamakura periods, Enma figured prominently in the *Jizō jūō kyō* 地藏十王經 (X 20)—where he held a court in the underworld, was supported by assistants and carried out judgement on the deceased. However, he was also at times associated with esoteric practices, depicted donning garments of a bodhisattva and even seen as the manifestation of the bodhisattva Jizō. For a brief survey of Enma's role and multiple identities in iconographical and literary sources, see Hirasawa, "The Inflatable, Collapsible Kingdom of Retribution," 11–27 and Kwon Ye-Gee, "Embracing Death and the Afterlife: Sculptures of Enma and His Entourage at Rokuharamitsuji" (PhD diss., University of Kansas, 2018), 22–7.

[350] The verses are originally from the *Dacheng zhuangyan jing lun* (T 1604.623a11–2) but are also cited in Jōkei's *Shin'yō shō* (T 2311.52b7–8) and Genshin's *Ōjōyōshū* (T 2682.61c17–8).

[351] "Alleviate their suffering" translates *dai ki ku* 代其苦—literally to "replace their suffering."

An elision appears to have slipped into Jōkei's paraphrase of Kannon's original vow, with "invoke my name single-mindedly" 「一心稱我名」 becoming "invoke my name a single time" 「一稱我名」. A quick search for the latter string in the SAT Daizōkyō and CBETA databases supports this hypothesis. I suspect this is due to the conflation of Jōkei's paraphrase of the *Lotus Sūtra* in the first section and Kannon's original vow in the *Pei-hua ching* (T 157.185c20–5).

As we draw into the deluded realm of the five desires, emptiness becomes a fish in the ocean of suffering. The Great Sage illuminates this [realm]; their compassion penetrates our bones. The [residual] karma from previous [rebirths] does not perish, and they mysteriously induce the mind of faith. Tearfully, we chant the name of the Great Compassionate [One] — it should resemble the voice of an only child from long ago. If we are close [to donning] the robes of forbearance, how will the past sympathy of our two benevolent [parents] bear fruit? For this reason, Kannon themselves announced to the practitioner: "In a future rebirth, you will [abide] in my pure buddha-field and cultivate bodhisattva practices along with me.[353] My pure land is far away from the luminous [Land of] Ultimate Bliss in the west; [at the same time,] it is also in the vicinity of Mount Fudaraku."[354]

---

[352] *Tōgaku* 等覺 can either be an abbreviation of *shōtōkaku* (perfect enlightenment 正等覺), or it can refer to the second to last stage of enlightenment on the bodhisattva path (namely, equal enlightenment). Here, I believe it is the latter for two reasons. First, as seen in the present text and in both editions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki*, Jōkei tends to abbreviate *shōtōkaku* as *shōgaku* 正覺 (T 2728.886a23, *Kōshiki Database* no. 67, v. 19 and no. 65, v. 18). Second, the idea of attaining enlightenment in multiple stages is consistent with Jōkei's overall understanding of the Dharma, which follows the Hossō subdivision into five stages (*go i* 五位), which also corresponds with the fifty-two (sometimes fifty-one, forty-one or forty-two) stages in the bodhisattva path; see footnote 240.

[353] This announcement is repeated in the closing *kada* of this section. The original verses are found *verbatim* in Prajñā's forty-fascicle translation of the *Flower Garland Sūtra* (T 293.734b9–10).

"Robes of forbearance" translates *ninniku no koromo* 忍辱之衣 and alludes to the gentle and forbearing mind of the Thus-come One who teaches the Dharma. It is one of the three rules for teaching the Dharma mentioned in the tenth chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra* (T 262.31c23–8). However, when taken in conjunction with *ni'on* 二恩 (here translated as one's "two benevolent parents"), the robes also designate a monastic's *kesa* 袈裟. Specifically, I believe the passage at hand refers to the tension between the monastic lifestyle and the Confucian obligations a child has towards their parents.

The abovementioned mountain is in a great ocean southwest from here.[355] The flowering trees and fragrant herbs [there] are all unlike any kind [found] in the human realm. There are ponds and springs, filled with water possessing the eight attributes.[356] The birds and beasts on that mountain have extraordinarily wonderful shapes and colours; their minds are all endowed with compassion; and their voices always sound like music. Each and every palace and pavilion is dignifiedly adorned, just like a pure land [in and of itself]. Moreover, there are adamantine rocks [adorned] with jewelled leaves, and Kannon and the various bodhisattvas each sit on those.[357] Mantra-reciting sages and dharma-protecting deities from everywhere stop and dwell [here] to cultivate and practise the Buddhadharma.

That being the case, [Mount Fudaraku] is in the Shaba [world] but not in the Shaba [world]. The worthy and the sage can truly rejoice in it. It is a pure land but not a pure land. Who amongst the deluded beings would not be reborn [there]? [Indeed,] those who cultivate the bodhisattva practices together with me also [cultivate] the brilliant practices of the great compassionate teachings.[358] A person who takes refuge under Kannon inevitably dwells in that site. Those who serve the Great Sage all learn the above practices.

---

[354] Emending the punctuation to 「我淨土者、遠明西方極樂、近亦補陀洛山也。』」, given the continued use of the particle *ga* 我.

[355] I suggest reading the missing character as 在 , based on a similar passage in both editions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki;* see「彼山者自此西南之方在大海之中」and 「彼山者自此西南之方、在大海之中」in T 2728.887a13–4 and *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 969–7.

[356] "Attributes" here translates *kudoku* 功德 , but there is no canonical list of the eight attributes. Given the comparison between Kannon and Amida at hand, it is worth noting that these waters are also featured in the Land of Ultimate Bliss (with variations in the attributes). For examples, see the *Shorter Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra* (Ch. *Amituo jing*, Jp. *Amida kyō* 阿彌陀經; T 366.346c16–347a1) and the *Longer Sukhāvatīvyūha-sūtra* T 360.271a29). However, a search for the string 「八功德水」in the SAT Daizōkyō and CBETA databases yields hundreds of results across categories and genres, suggesting that these waters were a common epithet across the Buddhist textual landscape.

[357] This scene is from Prajñā's translation of the *Flower Garland Sūtra* in forty fascicles, where Zenzai dōji 善財童子 visits Kannon on his quest for enlightenment (T 293.733a11–3).

The *Nyoirin Sūtra* states: "Should one recite the *dhāraṇī* a [full] hundred times, one will immediately see [Kannon] in person at the centre of this sun. Besides, one will also see the Thus-come Ones across the ten directions; one will see Amida's [Land] of Ultimate Bliss; and one will see Kanzeon's Palace on Mount Fudaraku."[359] When temporarily abiding in this place, one can personally see the Pure Land of the Vulture Peak and Inner Court of Tosotsu without changing out of this body. The present age is just like so. How much more so will it be in the next rebirth? In particular, Amida is Kannon's original teacher — they always reside on [Kannon's] head. Kannon is the Buddha-to-be in the [Land] of Ultimate Bliss—they inevitably will guide that land.[360]

---

[358] "Brilliant" here translates *kōmyō* 光明 and alludes to the wisdom of a buddha or bodhisattva that shines through the darkness of ignorance. However, it is worth mentioning that the expression「大悲法門光明之行」is found *verbatim* in Buddhabhadra's 佛陀跋陀羅 (Ch. Fotuobatuoluo, Jp. Buddabaddara; 358–429 CE) translation of the *Flower Garland Sūtra* (in sixty fascicles; T 278.718b9–10, 27–8). Buddhabhadra also uses *kōmyō* as a rendering of Potalaka (*i.e.* Fudaraku), as the latter is etymologically related to "flaming" and "lighting [a fire]" (T 278.717c28). A brief explanation of the etymology of Potalaka is available in Lokesh Chandra, "Origin of the Avalokiteśvara of Potala," *Kailash: A Journal of Himalayan Studies* 7, no.1 (1979): 6–7.

[359] Emending 觀音世 to 觀世音 , based on the context at hand. Moreover, I am reading the missing character as 滿 , based on the formulation seen in previous sections.

Both versions of the three-part *Kannon kōshiki* include longer paraphrases of the *Nyoirin Sūtra* that agree with the passage at hand, except for two details. First, both mention reciting the *dhāraṇī* one hundred and eight times; and second, neither mention anything appearing from the centre of the sun (T 2728.887a2–6, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 84–7). Similarly, both I-ching and Śikṣānanda's copies of the *Nyoirin Sūtra* mention reciting the *dhāraṇī* one hundred and eight times and omit the solar appearance (T 1081.197a23–5, T 1802.198a25–b1).

"Thus-come One(s)" translates 如來, a term used by the historical Buddha to refer to himself and other Buddhas, which in itself is a translation of the Sanskrit *tathāgata,* but it indicates without ambiguity that the compound is parsed as *tathā-āgata* (vs. *tathā-gata*).

[360] "Buddha-to-be" translates *fusho* 補處—literally one who repairs or occupies a place—and refers to a bodhisattva who will be reborn as a buddha in their next rebirth. Normally, this refers to Miroku as the

We plead: “When facing the end [of this rebirth], may we [maintain] right mindfulness and gratefully mount Kannon’s lotus dais; [may we attain] rebirth faultlessly and wander long in Amida’s pure land.” Suppose, moreover, that one’s karma is insufficient. [Even if progress] towards one’s rebirth stagnates for a short time, one will inevitably be reborn on Mount Fudaraku as a relative of Kannon. Beginning with my parents and teachers in the present rebirth, and up to the benevolent and acquaintances from a prior life, all will arrive [on Mount Fudaraku] together with me and serve [Kannon] along with me.[361] May we, like Kannon, also arouse unconditional great compassion! May we, like Kannon, also be endowed with countless merits—to the extent that all the sentient beings completely become [like] Kannon! Therefore, we chant the verses,

In a future rebirth, one will [abide] in my pure buddha-field
and cultivate bodhisattva practices along with me.
May I, the Great Compassionate Lord Perceiver,
bring them all to achieve [enlightenment.][362]

May the above merit
be universally extended to all
May we, with sentient beings,
all achieve the Buddha’s way together.

We pay homage to the great merciful and compassionate one, the Honourable Lord Perceiver; may all wishes in our hearts be settled and fulfilled.

---

successor of Shakamuni in our realm, but here Jōkei uses the term to suggest that Kannon will succeed Amida in the Land of Ultimate Bliss. This hypothesis is based on the iconographical depiction of Kannon wearing a miniature image of Amida on their headdress and is supported by textual sources such as the *Pei-hua ch’ing*. However, Yü notes that there are also a lot of ambiguities surrounding the name, the form, the role and the status of Kannon in both textual and iconographical sources; see Yü Chün-fang, “Ambiguity of Avalokiteśvara and the Scriptural Sources for the Cult of Kuan-yin in China,” *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 10 (1997): 411–3.

[361] Emending the punctuation to 「設又行業未備、往生暫滞者必生補陀洛山、爲觀音眷屬。」, based on the context. I also suggest reading the missing character as 至, based on the following passages in the three-part *Kannon kōshiki*, 「我等始今生父母親族至先世恩愛知識。」and 「我等始自今生父母親族、至先世恩所知識」(T 2728.887a24–5, *Kōshiki Database* no. 65, vv. 107–8).

[362] These verses are quoted directly from the *Flower Garland Sūtra* (T 293.734b9–10).

******

Draft completed on eighteenth day of the fifth month of the first year of Kennin — for all women.[363] Even if I used words from the mundane, [and even if] this destiny is extremely lowly, may the people who have [established] karmic connections [with the bodhisattva] meet Kannon together. Moreover, [may I gratefully] repay the affection of all compassionate mothers!

Shamon Jōkei

---

[363] Emending the punctuation to 「爲女人等。」, based on the context.

APPENDIX B: *KŌSHIKI DATABASE* EDITION OF THE FIVE-PART *KANNON KŌSHIKI* (NO. 67)

觀音講式
作法如常

敬白恩徳廣大釋迦如來・十方三世一切三寶・殊大慈大悲觀自在尊・補陀洛山中無數大衆・而言。方今、改誠運志燒香捧花於觀音御前。有修一座講。其志何者、可憑者三寶也。憑而遂不空、可貯者一善也。貯而更無朽。就中、觀音大士者機縁殊深此界、利益專盛末也。祈願望之者誰不歸依。凡顯密教中説觀音相。其類區分諸師開之爲五六八等。是則或依所持神呪、或隨所化機根。實皆一躰菩薩也。功能互通、利益無隔。自餘佛菩薩之中未聞如此。行者隨欣設專一行各三分意惣可歸依。仍徳海一滴聊述讃嘆。一者讃除厄難、二者讃與福壽、三者讃救後生、四者讃機縁深、五者發値遇願也。

第一讃除厄難者、觀音本願云、「衆生有苦、三稱我名、不徃救者、不取正覺云云。」法善經云、「無量衆生受諸苦惱、一心稱名觀其音聲皆得解脱云云。」是以、設入大火、火焔變爲池。設漂大水、波浪不能没。或値怨賊、或臨災難、慈心起。而不害刀杖 壞、而無患呪咀。毒藥還箸本人。軍陣諍庭悉退諸怨。見電光、聞音、懸心於觀音。猶無怖心、渡海波、過山路、寄憑於大聖。皆有憑。其夜刃羅剎滿國惱人、觀音行者惡眼不視。凡愈一切病、如□□樹。設依先世業、雖受重病、能誡其罪、遂除其病。況復臨時少病少惱乎。爰濁世末代衆生薄福無處而静、無人而安。當時殊可憑者、專觀音加護也。仍唱伽陀曰。

　　念念勿生疑 觀世音淨聖
　　於苦惱死厄 能爲作依怙

南無大慈大悲觀自在尊心中所願決定圓滿

第二讃與福壽者、今此菩薩能滿衆生望、譬同如意寶珠。身上衣・口中食・財寶・田宅・所有福徳一無不備。又經云、「惣無官位之者二七日間誦准胝呪、隨心所樂云云。」又誦如意輪呪、「滿千八遍得壽一千歳云云。」若人求子福徳智惠之男、衆人愛敬之女、隨求得之。安穩産生、永離厄難。如此利益無量無邊。設絶今生之望、偏求佛道之人、猶爲助世間、可憑此徳。仍唱伽陀曰。

　　具一切功徳 慈眼視衆生
　　福聚海無量 是故應頂禮

南無大慈大悲觀自在尊心中所願決定圓滿

第三讃救後生者、凡夫之習、犯罪幾許有罪。亦必受苦因果定道也。一生如夢、三途何爲。爰婬欲多、瞋恚多、愚癡多之者掌念恭敬觀世音菩薩、更皆得離。一切業障三毒爲源。三毒者彼貪嗔癡也。懺悔之道、滅罪之謀無過念此菩薩。設速難止、後漸可離。依之、四重五逆罪、尚依觀音威力無不滅除。業因既盡、苦果何受。設不及懺悔、雖落惡道、觀音徃其所。能施濟度者、有人造觀音像。其像放光、入十八地獄、苦器悉破爲清凉池。次入三十六餓鬼城、空而甘露皆令飽足。次入四十億畜生道、放智惠光、一一救之形像。利益猶以此。況又生身威力乎。是以、觀音諸經中、「臨終之時、或得四勝利、或成就八法。又離十五種惡死、得十五種善生又欲知□吉父母男女生所即得知之云云。」如此利益擧不可數。仍唱伽陀曰。

　　種種諸惡趣 地獄鬼畜生

生老病死者 已漸悉令滅
南無大慈大悲觀自在尊心中所願決定圓滿

第四讚機縁深者、經云、「此娑婆世界皆號之爲施無畏者云云。」是以般若心經云、「初殊擧觀自在菩薩慈思釋。其故云、「紹彼淨剎、救此穢方。機感相應故、唯□此云云。」重尋其證、有是信受。所謂世間尤新者、無區日月星宿、常廻虛空、普照國土。至草木禽獸、皆受其氣、得生長。況亦人類乎。而日天子是觀音化身、則出佛說。是以、善無畏三藏祈雨之時、觀音出自日輪中。以瓶灑水現證實明。若爾我等每胡瞻慈悲光、罪障之露易消。終日仰利生影、菩提之種漸萌。加之、聖徳太子救世觀音者、世擧所許也。弘佛法導衆生、只聖靈方便也。悲母胎内拳釋尊之舎利、凡夫眼前示淨土之東門。此等奇特嬰兒皆知。倩思其恩、親禮其德。不信拙之心、隨喜淚難抑。決生於此國之人、誰疑觀音機縁。伏之貧而渡世之家、賤而受人之輩、身上歎多、心底恨深。或養老親、或懷幼子。若夫妻忘契、若主君無顧。或又無父無母之孤、病多悲多之人、十人之八九皆憑觀音誓。近自花洛、遠至夷鄉、高山之峯、深谷之底、處處靈験、多是觀音也。諸社神明本地雖多、威験世新者觀音垂跡也。依之運歩欣首、貴賤爲市人。無隙立雖車、不得廻轅。況王簾之内、柴戸之間、竊仰遠念之人、非佛誰知其數。國土風俗自昔始此。夫雖親訓、雖君命、輒不徒者是人之心也。若感應空身、勝利少世者、誰暗催信、誰徒運功。靈験末墮地、推而可知。是以夢中蒙不現、身上知加護。設雖不如心、面面不□不。只現世之名利、必助後生之苦患、不偏一身之利益、廣乃恩所之引接。凡父母思子多祈觀音。自雖不知、加護幾許。報其恩、機縁尤相應。大聖結縁自淺及深。佛法威力返迷成悟。今生之望、其心設污、來世之愍、其憑還深。所以者何。有心之人、兼思二世、憑本尊誓。彼此雖異、正運其功。近重遠輕、而三寶境界以志爲先。定知現世本尊結縁猶勝。若爾冥途□空往、助焔魔之責。生死枕下來驚妄想之夢取我等身。既當觀音矣。仍唱伽陀曰

菩薩念衆生 愛之徹骨髓
恒時欲利益 猶如一子故
南無大慈大悲觀自在尊心中所願決定圓滿

第五發値遇願者、菩薩本願云、「一稱我名、生生世世永不捨離、必代其苦云云。」但倩思之、全不可疑。夫娑婆流轉之昔、觀音又凡夫也。與我等衆生成父母兄弟。爲妻子眷屬互結恩愛。生生幾許。後者發一念之眞心、漸登等覺之位。我等引五欲之妄境、空爲苦海之鱗。大聖照之、其悲徹骨。宿縁不朽、暗催信心。泣唱大悲之名、可似一子之昔聲。若近忍辱之衣、何果二恩之古愍。是以觀音自告行者云、「彼當生我淨佛剎、與我同修菩薩行云云。」我淨土者、遠明西方極樂、近亦補陀洛山也。彼山者、自此西南方□大海之中。花樹芳草皆不人間類。有池有泉、湛八功德水。其山禽獸形色殊妙、心皆具慈悲、聲常如作樂。宮殿樓閣一一莊嚴、猶如淨土。又有金剛寶葉石、觀音及諸菩薩各坐其上。持明仙人・護法神衆處處止住修行佛法。然則、娑婆而不娑婆。賢聖實可欣。淨土而不淨土。凡夫誰不生。與我同修菩薩行者、大悲法門光明之行也。歸觀音之人必住其所。仕大聖之者皆学其行。如意輪經云、「誦呪□一百遍、即其日中見彼人。別又見十方如來、見阿彌陀佛極樂世界、及見補特勒伽山觀音世宮殿云云。」靈山淨土都率内院不改此身、乍住此處、親得見。豈不奇特哉。現世猶爾。況於後生哉。就中、彌陀者觀音之本師也。常在其頂。觀音者極樂之補處也。必導其國。乞願我等臨終正念忝乘觀音之蓮臺、往生無誤、永遊彌

陀之淨土。設又行業未備、往生暫滯者必生補陀洛山。爲觀音眷屬、始今生父母師長。□先世恩所知識、與我共詣、與我同仕。願如觀音、我等又發無縁之大悲。願如觀音、我等又具無量之功德。乃至令一切衆生、悉成觀世音矣。仍唱伽陀曰、

彼當生我淨佛刹 與我同修菩薩行
由我大悲觀自在 令其一切皆成就
願以此功德 普及於一切
我等與衆生 皆共成佛道

南無大慈大悲觀自在尊心中所願決定圓滿

建仁元年五月十八日草之了。爲女人等雖用世俗之詞、其趣尤賤。願結縁之人共値遇觀音。又報悲母等恩愛矣。

沙門貞慶