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Preface

A statue depicting the Healing Buddha (Jp. Yakushi nyorai 薬師如来; Sk. Bhaiṣajyaguru) at Kokusenji 谷川寺, a temple in the city of Yame 八女, Fukuoka Prefecture, is one of the oldest extant statues in northern Kyushu (figures 1–4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 18, and 19). The standing figure, henceforth generally referred to as the Kokusenji statue,1 can be dated to the first century of the Heian period (794–1185) based on its sculptural configuration and style. Recent studies have made clear that statue types of northern Kyushu, the region of Japan located closest to continental Asia, differed from those that de-
on the project to transcribe the entire Buddhist canon (issakyō shosha jigyō 一切經書寫事業), led by the Kanzeonji Lecturer Eun 忍俊 (798–869), and hypothesize that this massive sutra-copying project, which was devised to bring the Hachiman deity 八幡神 from Jinganji 神願寺 to Jingoji.6 provided the impetus that allowed knowledge of the appearance of the Jingoji statue to reach Kanzeonji 飛世音寺. Lastly, I touch on the possibility that the Yame area, the site of Kokusenji, may have been controlled by Usa Hachimangū 宇佐八幡宮 and administered by Dazaifu 大宰府 from the Nara period onward. I conclude by hypothesizing that knowledge of the appearance of the Jingoji statue may have been brought from Kanzeonji to Kokusenji, and that knowledge of the statue’s appearance led to the production of the Kokusenji statue.

An Overview of the Statue and Kokusenji in Yame

After Fukuoka Prefecture designated the Kokusenji statue a prefectural Cultural Property (shitei bunkazai 指定文化財) in 1993, research on the statue was begun at Kyushu University. Kusui Takashi then argued for the statue’s importance.7 Detailed descriptions of the statue also appeared in Chikugo Yame Kokusenji 筑後八女谷川寺, a volume edited by the Kyushu Historical Museum (Kyūshū Rekishi Shiryōkan 九州歴史資料館).8 Descriptions of the statue likewise appeared in a number of illustrated exhibition catalogues.9

2 The following scholars have addressed the issue of the special characteristics of the sculpture of northern Kyushu: Iwata, “Sōsetsu Fukuoka no shinbutsu no sekai”; Suyoshi, “Kyūshū”; Suyoshi, “Fukuoka.” Iwata has dealt specifically with Kokusenji in Iwata, “Gozusan Kokusenji no butsuzō.” [n1 and n2]
3 See Miyata, “Kanzeonji ni ore kōji to zōzo: Heian jidai zenki o chūshin ni.” [n3]
5 [Translator’s note] The precise relationship between Jinganji and Jingoji, about which there is much scholarly debate, is addressed below in the section titled “Buddhist Sculptural Forms in Northern Kyushu in Relation to Kanzeonji and Jingoji.” The character of faith in the Hachiman deity is taken up in the conclusion, but several basic points regarding that faith should be noted here: first, faith in this kami seems to have arisen in the Usa region of northern Kyushu prior to the establishment of the eighth-century Japanese state located in Nara; second, by the eighth century, Hachiman was associated with the rulers of the central state as an ancestral deity; and third, Hachiman was considered a bodhisattva, a Buddhist divinity and protector of that faith, from the same century onward.
6 See Kikutake et al., “Tachibana-machi Kokusenji chōsa.” [n5]
7 Kusui, “Chikugo Kokusenji.” [n6]
8 Kyūshū Rekishi Shiryōkan, Chikugo Yame Kokusenji. [n7]
9 See, for example, Kōkai to Kyūshū no mihotoke Ten Jikkō linkai, Kōkai to Kyūshū no mihotoke; Kyūshū Rekishi Shiryōkan, Fukuoka no shinbutsu; and Kyūshū Rekishi Shiryōkan, Yame no meiō. [n8]
The discussion by Kokushō Tomoko in the Chikugo Yame Kokusen-ji volume is undoubtedly the most complete study of the statue to date, describing in addition to basic information on the Kokusen-ji statue the special characteristics of its sculptural form and the date of its production. Although there is little to be added to her discussion, I wish to summarize her findings and include new knowledge gained in preparation for this article. The following charts highlight the distinguishing characteristics of the Kokusen-ji statue. Sections 1–3 of table 1 confirm the buddhalogical status of the statue as that of a buddha (nyorai 如来) and adumbrate the special characteristics of the carving that allow it to be dated and placed within a specific geographic context. Section 4, describing the clothing, is crucial in documenting the uncanny resemblance of the statue to that at Jingoji. Section 5 on the pose, on the other hand, is vital in demonstrating an important difference to the Jingoji statue. The last sections (6–8) describe in detail the current state and physical appearance of the statue, and identify later restorations, thereby permitting us to visualize how the statue must have originally appeared.

Table 1. Major Characteristics of the Kokusen-ji Statue

| 1. Height: 96.5 cm; height to the hairline (hassaikō 髪際高), a traditional measure of the height of statues, 86.5 cm | 2.1. Large semihemispherical cranial protuberance (nikkei 肉髻; Sk. uṣṇīṣa) (figure 2)  
2.2. Now-lost spiral “snail-shell” knots of hair (rahotsu 螺髪) (figure 3)  
2.3. Now-lost curl of hair in the middle of the forehead that radiates light (byakugō 白毫相) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Characteristic features of a buddha of particular relevance to descriptions herein</td>
<td>3. Selected features of the statue’s carving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1. Eye sockets  
3.2. Oblong unpierced earlobes (jida kanjō fukan 耳丸環状不貫)  
3.3. No openings for the nostrils or ear holes  
3.4. Nostrils represented by small protuberances  
3.5. Vertical groove between the nose and upper lip  
3.6. Mouth with pursed lips  
3.6a. V-shaped bulge at the center of the upper lip  
3.7. Contours of the chin  
3.8. Three grooves around the neck (the sandō 三道相, one of the thirty-two characteristics of a buddha)  
3.9. Chest and midsection each represented by a protruding bulge  
3.10. Concave curve of the spine clearly rendered (figure 4) |

---

10 Kokushō, “Kokusen-ji no Yakushi nyorai ryūzō.” [19]  
11 The research was conducted in June 2017 by the author, along with Naqata Yasushi. 永田 寧 (of the Yameshi Bunka Shinkōka 八女市文化振興課), Igata Susumu 井形進 and Hino Ayako 日野雅子 (of the Kyushu Historical Museum), and Nakagawa Maho 中川真帆 (of Kyushu University). [11]
### 4. Clothing

1. Skirt-like undergarment (*kun* 裙)
2. Shoulder-covering undergarment (*fugen'e* 覆肩衣)
3. Formal outer robe (*daie* 大衣) completely covering only the left shoulder, leaving the right shoulder partially exposed (*hentan uken* 偏袒右肩)
4. Shoulder-covering undergarment (*fugen'e* 覆肩衣)
5. Formal outer robe (*daie* 大衣) completely covering only the left shoulder, leaving the right shoulder partially exposed (*hentan uken* 偏袒右肩)

#### 4.2a.

Not tucked into the formal outer robe on the right side, as is generally the case in other statues.

#### 4.3a.

Robe crosses over the left chest and shoulder and covers the entire back; a portion hangs slightly over the right shoulder and wraps around the right side, from where the upper edge is folded back twice. After crossing the midsection, the robe is flung back over the left shoulder so as to cover the upper left arm. (Although the first layer of the main robe appears on the left forearm, this portion does not conform to any rational representation of the clothing.)

### 5. Pose

1. Faces straight forward
2. Right hand bent at an acute angle with the palm facing outward, left hand lowered with the palm facing upward and holding a medicine jar (*yakko* 薬壺)
3. Stands upright with the feet aligned

### 6. Material and Sculptural Composition

1. Wood, probably *kaya* 梨 (torreya nucifera or Japanese nutmeg)
2. Carved from a single block with the exception of the wrists and hands
3. Eyes carved directly into the surface of the wood in the technique known as *chōgan* 影眼, in general use throughout most of the Heian period
4. Central core of the tree evident on the lower portion of the back of the statue
5. Not hollowed in the *uchiguri* 內割 method in which wood from the interior of the torso and sometimes the head and torso of a statue is removed to prevent cracking
6. The lotus seed pod portion (*rennikubu* 蓮肉部) of the dais, apparently from the same block of wood as the head and body, reduced from its larger form to a peg-like tenon (figure 6)

### 7. Coloring

1. Very dark, nearly black
2. Entire surface displays a reddish-brown tint
3. Red pigment remains on the lips and at the edges of the eyes; white pigment on the whites of the eyes, and *sumi* 墨 ink on the eyeballs

### 8. Later Restorations

1. Wrists, hands, and the medicine jar from later restorations
2. Area from the third to fifth toe of the left foot a later addition
3. Pedestal (*daiza* 台座) and halo-like mandorla (*kōhai* 光背) are not original
4. Shell of both ears, earlobes, and the main robe on the back to waist formed with *kokuso* 木漿 (paste made from wood dust mixed with lacquer, *urushi* 漆)

---

12 [Translator’s note] There is some inconsistency among scholars regarding to the terminology used to describe the garments worn by Buddhist divinities and monks. The key terms here are *fugen'e* (also *fuken'e*), literally “shoulder-covering garment,” which refers to an undergarment, and *daie* (also *tai*), the most formal, outermost robe of the three robes (*san'e*, also *sanne* 三四), prescribed for a Buddhist monk. Often made of nine panels, the formal robe is also referred to as a *kesa*, which is often translated as “surplice” in English. Note, however, that *kesa* is also used on occasion for the other two varieties of priestly robes. For a lucid overview of the complex issue of the proper terminology for Buddhist robes, see Yoshimura, Butsuzō no chakui to sói no kenkyū, particularly the first chapter.
Kokusenji is located in the Yame region on a gentle hill called Tsujinoyama that forms the border between Fukuoka and Oita prefectures on the southern side of the middle reaches of the Yabegawa, a river that runs westward from the mountain called Shakadake.

Although the historical significance of the immediate Kokusenji area is unclear, it is of note that the Yame region was situated near the borders of the ancient provinces of Chikugo and Bungo (between modern Saga and Kumamoto prefectures). Under the ritsuryō system of government, the Yame region was incorporated into the jurisdiction of Kamizuma no kōri and Shimotsuma no kōri, districts within the province of Chikugo. The Register of the Gods of Chikugo Province (Chikugo kokunai jinmei chō), which has a colophon dated Tenkei 7 (944), mentions two female gods, Kami Yame tsu me-gami and Shimo Yame tsu me-gami. The existence of a pair of upper (kami) and lower (shimo) gods suggests that the god enshrined at the iwakura on the mountain was brought down from the summit, and it also hints at the possibility that the cult of Yametsuhime spread widely over the plain that included Kokusenji.

For descriptions of the geology and history of Yame and Kokusenji, the author has consulted Kyushū Rekishi Shiryōkan, Chikugo Yame Kokusenji; Kadokawa Nihon chimei daiziten; and Heibonsha Chihō Shiryō Sentā, Fukuoka-ken no chimei. [n11] Igata, “Gozusan Kokusenji no butszū,” p. 61. [n12]
To the north of Kokusenji, across the Yabegawa, are located the Yame tumuli (kofungun 古墳群); they spread along the hills that form a strip of land extending east and west for about ten kilometers. At the center of these tumuli is the Iwatoyama Kofun 岩戸山古墳 that is said to be the tomb of Tsukushi no kimi Iwai 篠紫君磐井, who led a revolt in 527 known as the Iwai no Ran 磐井の乱, the largest instance of warfare during the Kofun period (ca. 3rd–7th c.). Given the excavation of what appear to be Korean gold ear accessories from the Eighth Tomb at Mount Tateyama (Tateymasan Hachigōfun 立山山八号墳, which was built around the same time as Iwatoyama Kofun), Matsukawa Hirokazu claims that Tsukushi no kimi likely maintained his own diplomatic channels across the Ariake Sea (Yamaguchi 2006, 17).

Regarding the history of Kokusenji, some early modern gazetteers (chishi 地誌), such as Chikugo chikan 筑後地鑑 and Dazai kannai shi 太宰菅内志, as well as the temple’s own tales of origins (engi 緑起), which are assumed to have been compiled around 1881 (Meiji 14), recount that Kokusenji was established by Gyöki 行基 (668–749) in Jinki 神亀 5 (728) and rebuilt by Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝 (1147–1199) in Kenkyū 建久 5 (1194). Considering the lack of historical sources that can be traced back to medieval times, however, it is difficult to regard these accounts as accurate; historical records that would directly describe the background of the creation of the Kokusenji statue are completely absent.

Nevertheless, it has been ascertained that the Yame area, where Kokusenji is located, was not only the home of an ancient gözoku 豪族, a powerful local clan, but also an important hub for land and sea transportation as well as a region thoroughly dominated by the cult of Yametsuhime, enshrined there at her massive iwakura.

Given that scattered atop Tsujinoyama are a number of tombstones that probably date from the early modern period or later, and that from the summit the entire downtown area of Yame can be seen (figure 5), it is easy to imagine how this mountain came to function from ancient times as a place of worship and prayer. We can presume that these geological and historical factors were latent causes leading to the production of the Kokusenji statue, one of the oldest and rarest wood-carved images in Kyushu.

The Date of Production and Special Characteristics of the Sculptural Form

In this section, I would first like to discuss the statue’s style and the date of its production in light of previous research. The entire statue, with the exception of both wrists and hands, was carved from a single block of coniferous wood, probably kaya, without employing the uchiguri method of hollowing out the statue. It is thought that the rennikubu, the core of the lotus flower, which served as the dais would have been carved from the same block of wood as the head and body (figure 6). This is indicative of an older mode of production common to statues made from a single block of wood during the early Heian period. It has been pointed out that because the surface was tinted reddish brown, there is a possibility that the statue was a dansō 標像, a statue made in imitation of those carved from ox-head sandalwood (gozu sendan 牛頭栴檀).

Viewed from the front, the most striking feature of this statue is the size of the head in relation to the body. The statue appears broad considering its height, and overall it presents a rather squat appearance. And when viewed from the side, both the head and body of the figure are strikingly thick in appearance. This is especially evident in the emphasis on the contours seen in the modeling of the flesh of the chest, midsection, and legs.

17 Matsukawa, “Sōron Yame no meihō.” [n15]
18 Kyushū Rekishi Shiryokan, Chikugo Yame Kokusenji. [n16]
19 Igata, “Gozusan Kokusenji no butsuzō,” p. 64; Kokushō, “Kokusenji no Yakushi nyorai ryūzō,” p. 35. [n17]
These features are prominent characteristics of works from the early Heian period, but as demonstrated by Fujioka Yutaka, a new trend appeared in the capital region (Kinai 總内) during the Jōwa 承和 era (834–848) as each part of the body became less clearly articulated and sculptors tried to contain the whole body within an encompassing silhouette.\(^\text{20}\) Although Fujioka's observation, which has been associated with developments in the capital area, cannot be applied uncritically to works in northern Kyushu, if we compare the standing figure of a buddha from Ukidake Jinja 浮嶽神社 (figure 7), made around the middle of the ninth century, with that from Kanzeonji (figure 8), probably made in the first half of the tenth century, the latter clearly shows less articulation of each body part.

Thus, although it may be useful to recognize that the trend to capture the whole body within a larger outline grew stronger among the sculptures of the northern area of Kyushu during the early Heian period, the Kokusenji statue displays characteristics common to an earlier period before this trend began to dominate.

The sculpture's taut pose with protruding head thrust forward and anterior pelvic tilt leaving the lower back slightly arched is common to those of other standing sculptures produced in northern Kyushu during the early Heian period, such as the standing Buddha at Ukidake Jinja, but the Kokusenji statue shows a greater curvature when compared with the others as is evident in a comparison of the figures. This characteristic, combined with the representation of the deeply carved musculature of the back, gives the entire work a sense of latent power (figure 9).

In considering the representation of the face, one notes the statue has a thick head of hair covering its scalp and a high bowl-shaped ushiwa 妻瓦 atop it (figure 2). There are clear signs that it once had large knots of spiraling “snail-shell” hair (rahotsu 螺髪) that have all been lost (figure 3). The appearance of the head in its original form must have been considerably more impressive than at present (figure 10).

The relatively small facial features concentrated in the lower half of the face, the outline of which is nearly circular, are a unique characteristic, evoking the charm of a child’s face. Nevertheless, as previous studies have pointed out, this facial expression fundamentally exhibits a certain stern severity.\(^\text{21}\) The upward-tilted eyes and the clearly carved eye sockets, as well as the curled upper lip, are expressions of a stately restraint called shingen 森厳, which is common among sculptures of the early Heian period.

---

\(^{20}\) Fujioka, “Yōshiki kara mita Shin Yakushiji Yakushi nyorai-zō,” p. 47. [n18]

\(^{21}\) Kokushō, “Kokusenji no Yakushi nyorai ryūzō,” p. 35. [n19]
Features that have been pointed out in earlier re-
search, such as the firm round face, long narrow eyes,
small nose and mouth, and the taut modeling of the
flesh on the jowls, are common elements in early Shin-
gon esoteric (Shingon mikkyō 真言密教) statues made
during the second quarter of the ninth century, such as
the seated figure of Nyoirin Kannon 如意輪觀音坐像
(Sk. Cintāmani-cakra Avalokiteśvara) at Kanshinji 観心寺 (figure 11) and the five
seated figures known as the Godai Kokūzō 五大虚空蔵菩薩坐像 (Sk. Akāśagarbha)
at Jingoji (figure 12).\(^\text{22}\) In addition, the
V-shaped bulge at the center of the upper lip is a common feature often seen in
works from this period.

The manner of dress seen here includes a basic shoulder-covering under-
garment (fugen'e) that is worn in a style exposing the right shoulder (hentan
uki). The upper portion of the main outer robe (date) covering the midsec-
tion is clearly shown as layered; after being wrapped around the right side, the
top edge is folded back twice (figure 13).

This manner of wearing the main robe in the hentan uki style with the
upper edge folded back twice is often found in works produced during the
nineth century, such as the standing figure traditionally identified as Nichira 日羅 at Tachibanadera 橋寺
(figure 14) and the standing Jizō 地蔵菩薩 (Sk. Kṣitigarbha) at Akishinodera 秋篠寺 (figure 15); however,
this characteristic element almost completely disappeared after the tenth century. This change seems to be related to the shift away from the rippling (so called “wave-buffeted”) pattern and complexly folded edges of the robe, both common during the early Heian period, toward a more orderly and restrained representation of clothing from the end of the ninth century onward, as seen on the seated statue of Amida Buddha (Sk. Amitābha) at Ninnaji 仁和寺 and the seated statue of Amida 阿弥陀如 at Seiryōji 清涼寺.

A notable feature related to the representation of clothing is the “wind-blown effect” (fūdō hyōgen 風動表現) on the clothing of the Kokusenji statue. Viewed from the side, the hems of the sleeves appear to be inflated and blown backward, as if struck head-on by the force of the wind. This kind of representation can also be seen in other statues such as the seated form of Miroku 弥勒仏 (Sk. Maitreya) at Tōdaiji (figure 16) and the standing statue of a Buddha at Kongōshin’in 金剛心院 (figure 17), which were made during the first half of the ninth century.

However, the Kokusenji statue differs from these examples produced in the Kinai capital region whose dynamism was enhanced by a forward-leaning pose coupled with the wind-blown effect. In contrast, the Kokusenji statue curves backward, giving the impression that it has been bent by the wind (figure 4). Thus it cannot be said that the wind-blown effect contributes to any sense of movement here. Although this difference indicates a gap in the levels of skill between the sculptors of the Kinai region and those in northern Kyushu, the attempt to represent the wind-blown effect on the clothing of the Kokusenji statue can surely be seen as illustrating popular trends taking place around the first half of the ninth century.

---

Matsuda, “Heian shoki chōso no seiritsu.” [n21]
One of the characteristics of the representation of the emon 衣文, the pattern of the creases and folds of the robes of the Kokusenji statue, is the use of numerous shallow incised lines (inkokusen 隠刻線). Compared with the many sculptures produced during the early Heian period that skillfully depict three-dimensionality and evoke a feeling of movement in the robes by employing various carving techniques such as the honpashiki 翻波式, a style in which the drapery folds resemble rolling waves with alternating sharp and rounded crests, the Kokusenji statue, especially on the front, goes no further than very plain and simple carving. Nevertheless, it can be surmised, as explained below, that the representation of the drapery folds achieved chiefly by the shallow incised lines was deliberately employed to faithfully reproduce a work that served as its model.

In fact, it is the delicate blade cuts of the carving between the drapery folds on the sides of the statue, which resemble the modeling of fine clay (sodo 塑土), that demonstrate the sculptor’s true skill. This manner of representation effectively shows the texture and movement of the robes (figure 18). Although it is difficult to find examples of this carving technique in Kina, a study by Mizuno Keizaburō demonstrating that sculptors working in wood imitated the expressiveness of molded clay (nenso 捲塑) from the Enryaku 延暦 (782–806) through the Jōwa 朝和 era is relevant when considering the date of the Kokusenji statue.24

Additionally, as has previously been noted both by Igata and Kokushō, the hem of the formal outer robe, daie, draped over the left arm, is sharply pointed, a V-shaped pattern is repeated on the hanging sleeves, and a vertical ridge connects the apexes of these V shapes (figure 19). This type of representation is often seen in works produced in the early Heian period in northern Kyushu, such as the standing Buddha statues at Ukidake 立行 and Kanzeonji.25

Each of the techniques and types of representation mentioned above are characteristic of the early Heian period: the carving of the entire statue, including the lotus core, from a single block of wood; the thick body with highly articulated modeling; and the robe worn with the right shoulder exposed and edge folded back twice rarely appear on works produced from the tenth century onward. As previous studies have indicated, we can surely conclude that this statue was made in the ninth century. When this opinion is combined with a consideration of the facial features and the wind-blown effect, this statue can confidently be dated to the first half of the ninth century.

Regarding the origins of the sculptor who produced the Kokusenji statue, the expression of the V-shaped pattern of the left sleeve provides a hint. Because this type of sculptural expression is a unique, local style limited to northern Kyushu during the early Heian period, this statue must undoubtedly have been made in this

24 Mizuno, “Murōji kondō horonzonzō to Heian shoki mokuchōzō no tenka.” [n22]
area. However, when compared to the statue at Ukidake Jinja, which exhibits the same local style but also demonstrates more advanced carving techniques, such as the honpashiki alternating wave pattern, the Kokusenji statue shows a less refined and somewhat artless quality due to the sculptor’s lack of technical skill.

If this discrepancy is due to the backgrounds of the sculptors, it is reasonable to assume that the Ukidake Jinja sculpture was made by a sculptor from Kinai, while a local sculptor would have carved the Kokusenji statue. Even if we were to attribute this statue to a local artisan, there would still be various complicating factors to consider. Judging from the close relationship between this statue and Kanzeonji, discussed below, the sculptor of this statue is likely to have been active in the environs of Dazaifu.

Based on the above, we can conclude that the Kokusenji statue was made during the first half of the ninth century in northern Kyushu by a local sculptor. Moreover, what has drawn the attention of previous scholarship besides the statue’s age is its close resemblance to the famous standing figure of the Healing Buddha at Jingoji, which is considered representative of early Heian-period sculpture. The next section is devoted to a discussion of this issue.

**Similarities with the Standing Healing Buddha at Jingoji**

The similarities between the Kokusenji and Jingoji statues have drawn attention for some time, and the following section reaffirms them in light of the views of conservator and art historian Kokushō Tomoko.26

Some of the most obvious similarities between the Kokusenji and Jingoji statues are the overall proportions, the Y-shaped pattern of the folds of the robe, and the U-shaped expression of the drapery between the legs, which emphasizes the distended thighs, and the unnatural disjunction of the drapery patterns of the main robe over the midsection and on the thighs (figure 20). The disjunction between such *emon* patterns is an extremely rare feature, visible only on these two statues.

The representation of the *fugen* on the Kokusenji statue must not be overlooked. It is generally the case that works produced during the early Heian period show the *fugen* draped over the right shoulder and tucked into the formal robe on the right side, but the garments on both the Kokusenji and Jingoji statues hang downward inside the upper right arm and are not tucked in. There is, however, a difference between the two in that a shawl-like *ōhi* 横披 hangs over the Jingoji statue’s right forearm,27 while the equivalent role is played by the broad *fugen* of the Kokusenji statue.

---

26 Kokushō, “Kokusenji no Yakushi nyorai ryūzō.” [n24]
27 Asai, “Jingoji, Yakushi sanzonzō o megutte (III),” p. 4; Asai, “Jingoji, Yakushi nyoraizō (sakuhin kaisetsu).” [n25]
What is truly remarkable is that both these statues share the nearly unprecedented style in which these garments are not tucked into the formal outer robe.

Considering these similarities, it is highly probable that the Kokusenji statue was made with knowledge of the Jingoji statue. As the examination in the previous section has revealed, the Kokusenji statue must have been made in northern Kyushu by a local sculptor. This sculptor would probably have had no opportunity to see the actual Jingoji statue. How then would he have known how to emulate the style and proportions? Before addressing this issue, I wish to call attention to the differences in representation of the drapery patterns between the Kokusenji and Jingoji statues. If we compare the two statues, we see the arrangement of emon lines is quite similar. However, the folds of the robes of the Kokusenji statue are depicted with shallow carving using the grooved inkokusen, while the folds of the Jingoji statue have sharply raised ridges created by carving in high relief (yōkokusen 陽刻線). In other words, the statues employ contrasting techniques of either raised or grooved (inryō 隱陽) drapery folds. But, as shown above, the representation of the drapery folds produced with the grooved inoku lines is concentrated on the front of the Kokusenji statue, while the sides show carving of a different character with a gentler, more relaxed feel.

Based on the points addressed above, and as demonstrated in earlier studies, there is ample room for speculation that knowledge of the Jingoji statue obtained through visual information may have been utilized in producing the Kokusenji statue. In short, it is likely that the frontal view was the result of the sculptor’s earnest attempt to duplicate an image of the Jingoji statue that he had seen. His mode of expression relied chiefly on the grooved inkokusen, but for other parts, he relied in contrast on his own basic skills and sense of sculptural form, as on the sides of the statue, where the results resemble works made of molded clay.

These two statues also show remarkable differences in terms of their mudras, symbolic hand gestures also known as insō 印相. It must be noted that the Kokusenji statue forms an ordinary mudra, with its right hand raised and the left hand lowered, while the Jingoji statue bends both arms upward in front of its chest. The Kokusenji statue probably employs a mudra that differs from that of the Jingoji statue because it followed more faithfully some canonical exemplar. The views of Igata Susumu are helpful in this regard.\(^\text{28}\) Igata argued that the Kokusenji statue adopts the mudra of four Yakushi statues (no longer extant) said to have been carved by Saichō at Kamadosanji 龜門山寺, a temple on Mt. Kamado 龜門山, Dazaifu, in Enryaku 22 (803) when he awaited repairs for his ship before setting off on the voyage to China as a member of the embassy to the Tang court (kentōshi 遣唐使). According to one source, each was a six shaku 尺 (roughly 180 centimeters) danzō (sandalwood-style) statue of the Healing Buddha. Saichō is said to have made the four Yakushi images as part of his supplication for safe passage. Careful study is still needed in regard to the mudra of this statue due to discrepancies in interpretations found in books detailing ritual practice (jisō 事相) involving Yakushi,\(^\text{29}\) but there is a distinct possibility that the danzō Healing Buddhas carved by Saichō had a canonical character in northern Kyushu and that their influence may have been similar to, or even more powerful than that of, the Jingoji statue. Another possibility is that the pose of the Kokusenji statue with one hand raised and the other lowered was simply the most common at this time, and the mudra used for the Healing Buddha may have simply conformed to popular practice, while still relying on the Jingoji statue as the basic model.

In either case, the Kokusenji statue must have been created with knowledge of the appearance of the Jingoji statue. If this assumption is accepted, we must consider the following: How was knowledge of the Jingoji statue obtained in northern Kyushu? And what environment permitted this transfer of knowledge? An attempt to answer these questions is made in the next section.

**Buddhist Sculptural Forms in Northern Kyushu in Relation to Kanzeonji and Jingoji**

The previous section analyzed the sculptural form of the Kokusenji statue and demonstrated the following points:

---

28 Kokushō, “Kokusenji no Yakushi nyorai kyūjō,” p. 37. [n26]
29 Igata, “Gozusan Kokusenji no butsuzō,” p. 64. [n27]
30 For example, the Kakuzenshō 朧禅師 describes this mudra as the right hand forming Semuin 青無印 with the left hand at the chest and holding a wish-fulfilling jewel (hōin 宝珠). TZ zusō vol. 4, pp. 438-39. [n28]
1. It dates to the early Heian period, and probably to the first half of the ninth century.
2. It is thought to have been produced in northern Kyushu because it incorporates local styles.
3. Due to the two sculptures’ remarkable resemblance, the sculptor must have had access to visual knowledge of the Jingoji statue.

The second and third points in particular indicate the coexistence of elements of both the local and the central style of the capital area as a principal characteristic of the production of this statue, as has been repeatedly noted above. However, this kind of coexistence of styles can be seen to a certain degree in most statues in the ninth century. Therefore, an overview of the sculptural composition of Buddhist sculpture in northern Kyushu, of which the Kokusenji statue is only one example, is needed before addressing this statue specifically.

In conducting this overview, the roles of Dazaifu and Kanzeonji must be examined. Dazaifu was a political institution that ruled over all the provinces of the Saikaidō, literally the Western Sea Circuit. Described in the early ninth century as being “neither a capital nor a province, but occupying a unique intermediate place” (kyō ni arazu koku ni arazu chūkan ni kokyo su 非, 京非, 国中間居). Dazaifu functioned as a large-scale regional government office (kanga 官衙) whose operations were analogous to those of the central government under the ritsuryō system. Kanzeonji provided religious backing for the Dazaifu’s rule. The definitive difference between Kanzeonji and other temples in the region is that the regulations of the Engishiki 延喜式 stipulated that the “kōdokushi of Kanzeonji in Dazaifu should supervise the governance of all the kōji and dokushi of the provinces within its jurisdiction” (ayoso Dazai Kannonji kōdokushi wa kannai shokoku kōdokushi no mōsu tokoro no matsurigoto o yochi su 凡太 (ママ) 座観音寺講談師者、預知管内諸国講談師所佐之政)。

Kōdokushi 講談師 is a collective term indicating the Lecturers and Readers (dokushi 諭師) who were regional monk-officials (sōkan 僧官) dispatched to each province by the central government in order to administer the Buddhist services within their jurisdiction. In the case of the Dazaifu jurisdiction, the Kanzeonji kōdokushi were appointed to administer all the provincial kōdokushi. As the role of the Kanzeonji Reader is unclear due to a paucity of historical records, the considerations in the following section will apply only to the Kanzeonji Lecturer.

The post of Kanzeonji Lecturer is said to be the successor of that of the Precept Master (kaiishi 戒師), which was created in Tempyō Hōjō 天平宝字 5 (761) when the Kaidan’in was established at Kanzeonji. The Kanzeonji Lecturer first appears in historical sources in Kōnin 弘仁 11 (820). These sources confirm that the Kanzeonji Lecturer gradually increased his influence during the first half of the ninth century while strengthening cooperation among the provincial temples (kokubunji 国分寺) and the government-endowed temples called jōgakujī 定額寺 in Saikaidō. It is thus thought that the office of the Kanzeonji Lecturer, as the general supervisor of Buddhist services conducted in Saikaidō (as stipulated in the Engishiki), would have been established during this period.

Another significant characteristic of the Kanzeonji Lecturer that cannot be overlooked is the fact that the origins of the post can be traced back to the Kinai region. It is known that the post of Lecturer was also established at Shimotsuke Yakushiji 下野薬師寺 in Kashō 嘉祥 1 (848). On that occasion the post was described as being equivalent to that at DaizaiFUL Kannonji, and is to be selected from the Ten Masters of the Ordination Platform (kaidan jisshi 戒壇十師) who are adept at practice and equipped with knowledge; and upon recommendation of the company of monks, is to be appointed Lecturer and to additionally be an esoteric master (jp. ajari; Sk. Açarya) who confers the precepts (jukai no ajari ni nara 授戒之阿闍梨).

---

31 Miyata, “Kanzeonji ni okeru kōji to zōzō.” Hereafter some parts of the discussion on Kanzeonji overlap with this essay, but the author reiterates those parts in order to develop the argument. [n29]
32 Ruiju 孫道栄著, 6, Kugegoto, Daijōkanpu 大政官符 dated Jōwa 5 (838).6.21, KST vol. 25, p. 266. [n30]
33 Engishiki 21, Genbaryō, KST vol. 26, p. 540. [n31]
35 [Translator’s note] Yakushiji in Shimotsuke Province (modern-day Tochigi Prefecture) was designated one of only three temples in Japan where monks could be ordained.
36 [Translator’s note] Kannonji is an alternative name for Kanzeonji.
In other words, the Shimotsuke Yakushiji followed Kanzeonji’s precedent in choosing a Lecturer from the Ten Masters of the Ordination Platform. Earlier studies have pointed out that the Ten Masters of the Ordination Platform were identical to the Ten Masters (jisshi 十師) at Tōdaiji Kaidan’in. Thus, the post of Kanzeonji Lecturer was derived from that of the Preceptor Master at the Kaidan’in of Tōdaiji.

Based on the above, it can be surmised that the Kanzeonji Lecturer had significant influence on the establishment of sculptural works in northern Kyushu that display the coexistence of both the local and central styles of the capital area styles. This conclusion is likely applicable to the Kokusenji statue. Thus, when examining the accomplishments of the Kanzeonji Lecturer again from the viewpoint of the relationship between Kanzeonji and Jingoji, one is struck by the fascinating example of the project to transcribe the complete set of the Buddhist canon led by the monk Eun.

Eun was from Tōdaiji, and had studied under Jitsue 実楽 (751–827), one of the leading disciples of Kūkai 空海 (774–835). Eun had gone to China in Jwa 9 (842), and when he returned to Japan in Jwa 14 (847), he brought with him many ritual manuals (giki 像軸), sutras, and treatises (kyōron 経論), and images of buddhas, bodhisattvas, and the patriarchs, as well as mandalas (mandara 曼荼羅). Eun is also celebrated as one of eight Japanese monks who went to China (Nittō Hakke 入唐八家), as are Saichō and Kūkai.

The following passage from the Anshōji Ledger of Assets (Anshōji shizaichō 安詳寺資財帳) (henceforth, Source 1) indicates that Eun, who was seen as the founder (kaiki 創基) of Anshōji, was involved in the sutra-copying project as Kanzeonji Lecturer:37

An edict had quickly been issued [ordering him] to examine the copying and collating of the Buddhist canon in Bandō [Eastern Region], which had taken more than four years to complete. In the tenth year of the Tenchō 天長 era, an imperial edict was issued saying [him] as the Kannonji [Kanzeonji] Lecturer and also the Lecturer of Chikuzen Province in Chinzai. As the leader of the monks of Kyushu and the two islands, he, Eun, should not be permitted to decline being specially appointed to manage the matter of copying the canon and should be compelled to do his duty.

Source 1 explains that after Eun had spent four years editing a transcription of a complete set of the Buddhist canon (issaikyō 一切経) in Bandō, he was designated both Kanzeonji Lecturer and Lecturer of Chikuzen Province (Chikuzen no kuni kōshi 築前国講師) in Kyushu by imperial order (chokunai 指命) in Tenchō 10 (833). He had first declined the positions, but eventually accepted them, and was placed in charge of the monks in the Saikaidō region, with a special charge of copying the Buddhist canon (daizōkyō 大蔵経). The following entry from the Shoku Nihon kōki 續日本紀 (hereafter Source 2) for the 28th day of the 10th month of Tenchō 10 is closely related to this sutra-copying project:38

In accord with the oracle produced by Hachiman Daibosatsu in the years of the Keiun 慶雲 era, Dazaifu was ordered to have the entire Buddhist canon copied during the years of the Tenchō era and to have it kept at Mirokuji and now it is further ordered to copy another set of the canon to be kept at Jingoji.

Thus, the court ordered that in accordance with the oracle of the Hachiman deity issued during the years of the Jingo Keiun 神護景雲 era (767–770), Dazaifu was to have the complete Buddhist canon copied in the

37 Dazaifu Kannonji ni jun ji, kaidanjisshi no naka no chigōy usaoku nishite shu no tamaeni osai tokoro no mono o kantakushi, kō ni junmin shi sunawachi jukai no ajari to nasu. Ruji sandaijikai 3, Shokoku kōtōji, Kashō 1 (848):11.3, KST vol. 25, p. 130. [n33]
38 Okano, "Tsukushi Kannonji no jin kikō" p. 33. [n34]
match one another has confirmed that the contents of these two canons match one another. Therefore, it is clear that during the Tenchō era there was a relationship among Dazaifu, Kanzeonji, and Jingoji via the canon-copying project. The following argument is a more detailed study of this canon-copying project drawing on and amplifying the results of these earlier studies.

Note first that the phrase “In accordance with the oracle produced by Hachiman Daibosatsu in the years of the Keiun era” (Keiun no toshi Hachiman daibosatsu no tsugeru tokoro ni yorite 禪院の天智大菩薩所告 in Source 2) is critically important. This records that the project was carried out on the basis of an oracle issued by the Hachiman deity during the Jingoji Keiun era. This obviously relates to the “Incident of the Oracle of Hachimangū in Usa” (Usa Hachimangū shin-taku jiken 宇佐八幡宮信託事件), when the powerful monk Dōkyō 道鏡 (700–772) attempted to succeed to the royal rank (kōi 皇位) and Wake no Kiyomaro 和気 清麻呂 (733–799) was sent to Usa Hachimangū, where he received Hachiman’s oracle declaring that Dōkyō should not be allowed to become emperor. The following is an account of that famous episode from the Ruijū kokushi 頼信国史 (Classified National History, 892), henceforth Source 3, that describes the content of the oracle issued at that time.44

41 Especially p. 128 in his “Heian jidai no issai kyō shokyō to Hōryūji issai kyō” 平安時代の一切経書写と法隆寺一切経 in Horike, Nanta bukkkyō-shi no kennkyū (ge), pp. 119–81. [n35]
42 According to Kawajiri, the Jingoji godaidō issai kyō mokuroku 書籍寺五堂一切経目録 at Kōyasan Daigaku Library corresponds to the catalogue of the canon supervised by Eun, Kawajiri, “Jingoji godaidō issai kyō mokuroku” no seikaku.” [n36]
43 Fukuyama Toshio has previously indicated that the sutra-copying project is related to the Dōkyō shrine oracle incident. Fukuyama, “Shoki tendai shingon jin no kenchiku,” pp. 29–30. [n37]
44 Ruijū kokushi 180, Tenchō 1 (824):9.27; KST vol. 6, pp. 259-60. [n38]

[T]he heavenly sovereign Junna, in the first year of Tenchō (824) … designated that Takaodera was to be made a jōgakuki temple, and the ordinands, scripture, and ritual practices were determined. Governor of Kawachi, Wake no Matsuna 和気 眞綱 (783–846) of the Senior Fifth Rank, Lower Grade, and Senior Clerk of the Board of Censors, Wake no Nakayo 和気仲世 (784–852) of the Junior Fifth Rank, Lower Grade, are subjects who heed (the adage) “what fathers prepare, sons complete,” and this is called great filial piety, and their contributions to the public good are called the epitome of loyalty. In considering matters of loyalty and filial piety, who fail to conform to their example? Long ago during the [Jingo] Keiun era, the monk Dōkyō, employing flattery and deception, rose to the pinnacle of power, disgracefully usurping the title of Dharma King (Hōō 法王). He harbored pretensions and evilly appealed to the assembled gods and made league with the treacherous Tachibana. The Hachiman, Great God (Ōmikami), was pained by the fragility of the heavenly succession and greatly resented this ruffian’s ascendency. The warriors of the god sharpened their spears, but the demons fought continuously for many years. They were numerous, and we were few: the wicked were strong and the righteous weak. Bemoaning the threat to its own majesty, the Great God called on the miraculous powers of the Buddhas for protection. Then, entering the dream of [Empress Shōtoku] (713–770; r. as Shōtoku 称徳 764–770), (the god) requested an envoy. There was an imperial order issued by [Shōtoku] to assemble her noble subjects so that the Minister of Popular Affairs Kiyomaro of the Junior Third Rank appeared before the throne and [she] told him of the dream. In regard to abdicating the heavenly position to Dōkyō, [Shōtoku] ordered this be addressed to the Great God, and Kiyomaro was summoned to carry this appeal to Usa Jingō. At that time, the Great God issued an oracle, stating, “There are various gods great and minor, who are unlike in their preferences. Good gods dislike licentious rites, and greedy gods [like to] receive improper offerings; I, who exalt the imperial lineage, will aid the state [if you] copy the entire Buddhist canon and produce a Buddhist image, recite ten thousand scrolls of the Saishōdōkyō, and build a temple. [These actions]...
will eliminate evil in a day, solidifying the sacred altars for eternity. You [Kiyomaro] must heed these words and not fail to deliver them.” Kiyomaro vowed before the Great God, “After the state has become peaceful, I will certainly report this to the next emperor who will fulfill this sacred vow (jōgakujī). Even if this costs (me my) life and my bones are ground to dust, I will not mistake these sacred words.” Returning to the capital, [Kiyomaro] reported these words (to the throne). But the time was not right and [Kiyomaro] met with ill fortune, being imprisoned and exiled to the wilds. Fortunately, by grace of the sacred power, he returned to the imperial capital. And during the reign of Go-tahara Tennō [Emperor Konin 光仁, r. 770–781] in the eleventh year of the Hōki 宝亀 era [780] he repeatedly reported this matter (to the throne). The emperor ordered that in each province of Bizen should be awarded for two generations as merit fields in the province of Bizen should be awarded for two generations as merit fields, thus completing the temple. And if the sacred vow is thus fulfilled, this benefice will be extended further for two generations, and the rest in accord with the request.”

(Underlined emphasis added by the author)

This is the central government directive issued by the Great Council of State (daijokanpu 大政官符) in response to a plea that Jinganji, which had been built during the Enryaku era and which was later named a jōgakujī (endowed temple),26 be replaced by Takaodera 高雄寺 (Takaosanjī 高雄山寺) because the topography of Jinganjī was defiled (chisei oe 地勢汚穢). The request was granted, giving Takaodera the status of jōgakujī and renaming it Jingokokuso Shingonji 神護国寺真言寺—the official name of Jingoji—which was to serve in perpetuity as a place of practice (dōjō 道場) for the Shingon faith.

The first half of this source recounts the history of Jinganjī, the forerunner of Jingoji. The underlined part is highlighted because it explains that the Hachiman oracle directed Kiyomaro to produce a set of the entire Buddhist canon, a Buddhist icon (butsuzō 仏像), and to build a temple. Kiyomaro responded by vowing to...

---

45 The more common title is Shugo kokkai shū darani kyō 守護国界主院灌頂経.
46 [Translator’s note] This is a modified version of the translation by Suzuki, “The Founding of Jingoji,” pp. 150–31 in Suzuki, Medicine Master Buddha. See the appendix at the end of this article for the original kanbun text of Source 3.
47 [Translator’s note] There is no scholarly consensus on the exact benefits that would accrue to a temple by being designated a jōgakujī, and the meaning of the term jōgakujī itself is uncertain. One important point agreed on by nearly all historians is that the designation gave a private institution state recognition, thereby elevating its status. For a lucid discussion of the issue regarding Jinganji/Jingoji, see the first chapter (pp. 5–35) of Nakano and Kasuya, Bukkyō bijutsu o manabu.
the Hachiman deity that he would definitely fulfill this sacred vow (jingan 神願). It was due to the reception of this oracle that Jinganji was built during the Enryaku era, but the canon-copying project was finally completed only later in Tenchō 10 (833).

Then, as can be seen in Source 2, two sets of the canon were completed based on the Hachiman oracle. One of them was finished prior to Tenchō 10 and enshrined at Mirokuji in Usa. When the copying of the second set was started, Eun had already been designated Kanzeonji Lecturer. But the question of who took charge of copying the first set remains unanswered. The following discussion attempts to examine this issue in detail.

On the 19th day of the 5th month of Tenchō 6 (829), ten monks conducted a ritual reading (tendoku 転読) of the complete canon at Mirokuji in Usa, and thus the transcription of the first set of the canon must have been completed prior to Tenchō 6. The monk Köhō 光恵 (n.d.) was then the Kanzeonji Lecturer. The first appearance of Köhō in historical sources is on the 28th day of the 2nd month of Tenchō 5 (828). His request made as Kanzeonji Lecturer for the revitalization of the monks of the provincial temple and its approval are recorded.

In addition, Kanzeonji Lecturer Köhō and Mirokuji Lecturer Koe 光恵 (n.d.) jointly submitted the following three-article petition (sankaijō 三箇条), which was also approved, regarding Usa Mirokuji in Tenchō 7 (830):

1) Nenbundosha 年分度者, the annual cohort of ordinands should be chosen from those who have lived at Usa Mirokuji for at least three years and the Lecturer and Shrine Administrator (gyūji 宮司) shall choose them by testing the candidates’ proficiency at sutra-chanting (dokyō 読経).
2) Tax collected from sustenance households (fūbutsu 封物), used to support Usa Hachimangū, should be used for the alms (fuse 布施) and robes (hifuku 法服) provided to the Lecturer and Reader at Mirokuji in Usa at New Year (shōgatsu 正月), the summer study retreat (ango 安宿), and on other occasions.
3) Six of the twenty-four shrine workers (jinpu shichō 神仏仕丁) should serve Usa Mirokuji.

Article 1 was aimed at improving the quality of those who would become monks at the temple, while articles 2 and 3 tried to stabilize the economic basis of Usa Mirokuji. The enshrining of the canon in the temple’s organization. Additionally, a chōbun 壇文, an official document exchanged between government offices, states that Usa Mirokuji did not originally have a Lecturer or a Reader, and that they were designated by two central government directives issued on the 1st day of the 2nd month and on the 10th day of the 5th month of Tenchō 6. Köhō seems likely to have been involved in the establishment of the post of Mirokuji Lecturer, and it can be surmised that he had great influence on the events related to the enshrining of the canon. Given these circumstances, it is reasonable to conclude that Köhō led the project to transcribe the first canon.

Although Köhō stepped down from the post of Kanzeonji Lecturer to make way for Eun when the second sutra-copying project began, he later returned to this position. In Jōwa 2 (835), two years after the copying of the second set of the Buddhist canon in Tenchō 10, his name appears on a record as Kanzeonji Lecturer. By that year at the latest, the second canon-copying project must have been completed, and Eun seems to have resigned his post at that time. Eun had become Kanzeonji Lecturer only for this project, as he is described as “specially appointed to manage the matter of copying the Buddhist canon” (tada daizōkyō o utsusu [no] koto o kōtu su 特勾て 造立す 之事). Just after Eun became Kanzeonji Lecturer in the first year of the Jōwa era, his spiritual master Jitsue was designated abbot (betti 別当) of Jingoji. Thus, it is highly likely that Jitsue was involved in the canon-copying project.
as well as the appointment of Eun.57 Considering that Wake no Nakayo and other donors (danōtsu 捐越) of Jingoji consigned the temple to Kūkai,58 Kūkai himself may have had some influence on the canon-copying project.

Nevertheless, the different standpoints of Kōhō, whose background was in the former capital of Nara, and Eun, who was associated with Kūkai’s Shingon tradition, must be carefully considered. In particular, the extent to which Kūkai was involved in the appointment of Kōhō to the post of Kanzeonji Lecturer is unclear. A series of articles by Abe Ryūichī about the relationship between Kūkai and the temples of the former capital is useful in assessing this problem.59 In his discussion of this issue, Abe emphasized the role of the Nara temples in determining that Kūkai’s esoteric Buddhism was quickly accepted as orthodoxy. In support of his argument, Abe specifically introduces an event from Kōnin 7 (816) when Gonshō 勤操 (754–827) and his disciples from Daianji 大安寺 visited Takaosanjō to receive the esoteric consecration (kanjō 藍頂) from Kūkai.60 Abe also points to Kūkai’s building of the Kanjōdō 藍頂堂 at Tōdaiji in Kōnin 13 (822).61

Particularly important in our focus on the relationship between the Kanzeonji Lecturer is the latter example of the building of the Kanjōdō. This is apparent in the central government directive of the first year of the Kashō era (848), which stipulated that the Lecturer at Shimotsume Yakushiji was to be the equal of that at Kanzeonji and that both the Lecturer at Shimotsume Yakushiji and Kanzeonji are described therein as “Ajari who administers the precepts” (jukai no ajari 授戒之阿闍梨).62 The act of building the Kanjōdō is thus understood as having been devised to consolidate the functions of Buddhist ordination at Tōdaiji by combining the traditional ordination (jukai 受戒) system employed there, inherited from Ganjin, with the kanjō, the jukai system of esoteric Buddhism, which Kūkai had learned in Tang China.63 The phrase “Ajari who administers the precepts” indicates that the Lecturers at both temples had themselves received the kanjō. Kōhō may have been one of the monks who received the kanjō from Kūkai, and this relationship might in fact have been the reason for his appointment as Kanzeonji Lecturer.

The discussion above has securely established that the canon-copying project at Kanzeonji carried out during the Tenchō era was based on the Hachiman oracle. But what requires additional attention here is the fact that the Hachiman deity requested the building of temple grounds (garan 加藍) as well as the production of the Buddhist canon and an icon. As mentioned above, Jinganji (later Jingoji) was built as a result of this request. There has been a long-standing debate whether the extant Healing Buddha at Jingoji was originally installed in Takaosanjō, the earlier name of Jingoji, or at Jinganji.

The results of recent studies demonstrate that it is highly probable that the Jingoji statue was originally installed in Jinganji and that it was produced in order to fulfill the Hachiman oracle.64 If that is indeed the case, it is easy to imagine that when the canon-copying project was carried out at Kanzeonji, the Jingoji statue, whose creation was likewise based on the oracle of Hachiman, would have attracted renewed attention. Key to this argument is the hypothesis that this resulted in an image of the Jingoji statue being brought to Kanzeonji via Eun, and that this eventually led to the creation of the Kokusenji statue.

As was noted, two sets of the Buddhist canon were made during the Tenchō era. One set was enshrined at Usa’s Mirokuji and the other was dedicated at Jingoji. At the risk of reiterating the point, it was the Hachiman deity’s oracle that had instructed Kiyomaro to produce the canon, and a temple. If he were to fulfill this oracle straightforwardly, it seems that it would have been sufficient to enshrine one set of the canon at Jinganji (later Jingoji), which was built at Hachiman’s request. Why then were two sets of the canon produced?65

57 Kawajiri, “Jingoji godaidō issaiyō mokuroku no seiakaku,” p. 46. [n47]
58 Jingoji yakkai. [n48]
59 Abe, “Kūkai to Nanto bukkō syōkō”; Abe, “Nara-ki no mikkyō no saikentō”; Abe, “Tennō no seiken kōtai to kanjō girei.” [n49]
61 Abe, “Kūkai to Nanto bukkō syōkō,” p. 278. Abe cites Ružić sandaikyaku 2, Jōwa 3 (836) 5.9, KST vol. 25, p. 68. [n51]
62 Ružić sandaikyaku 3, Kashō 1 (848) 11.3, KST vol. 25, p. 130. [n52]
63 Abe, “Kūkai to Nanto bukkō syōkō,” p. 278. [n53]
64 Sarai, “Jingoji Yakushi nyoraijō no shiteki kōsatsu,” pp. 122-24. [n54]
65 Sarai also has argued this point. She asserts that “in order to fulfill the Hachiman deity’s request, the one transcribed canon at Mirokuji temple would have been sufficient and there would have been no need to make two transcriptions.” She infers that “the impetus for having the issaiyō enshrined at Jingoji was...
In considering this question, it is particularly significant that the Hachiman deity was invited to Iwashimizu (神出 in the Heian capital from Usa in Jōgan 元観 2 (860). According to the *Iwashimizu senza ryaku engi* 清水遷居略記起 (Abbreviated tales of karmic origins of the transfer of the god to Iwashimizu, 995), the monk Gyōkyō 行教 from Daianji was chosen as the imperial envoy (chokushi 勅使) to Usagū 字佐宮, the shrines of Usa, in Tenenn 天安 2 (858), and he left for Usa in the following year (Tenenn 3). At the same time, a project at Mirokuji to transcribe the Buddhist canon was underway led by the monks Anshū 安宗 (813–887) and En'en 延逸 (n.d.), who were both Dento daishosshii 除照大法師 (the third of the nine priestly ranks).

This example clearly shows that when Hachiman was invited to Iwashimizu, the canon-copying project was being carried out at Mirokuji, the shrine-temple of Usa Hachimangū. As can be seen in Source 2, Jingoji in the first year of the Tenchō era. It must have been at that time that the set of the Buddhist canon was unanswerable. An e argument in the previous section hypothesized the relationship between Kokusenji and Usa Mirokuji in the Tenpyō era, when the Kitain was built, and any relationship between Kokusenji and Usa Mirokuji in the Tenpyō era must therefore have been established a different, and we would be transferred to Jingoji instead.

That the project to transcribe the complete set of Buddhist scripture, which was led by the Kanzeonji Lecturer Eun, could have been the impetus behind the image of the Jingoji statue being brought to Kanzeonji, and that this image could have become a source for the Kokusenji statue, seems a natural conclusion based on the above. But even if this hypothesis is accepted, the question why the Kokusenji statue was created remains unanswered. An effective way to address the question is to explore the relationship between Yame, home of Kokusenji Temple, and the cult of Hachiman (*Hachiman shinkō* 八幡信仰). The next section will discuss this relationship.

**Worship of Hachiman and Kokusenji Temple in Yame**

The argument in the previous section hypothesized that the canon-copying project, which was led by the Kanzeonji Lecturer Eun and based on the oracle of Hachiman, may have triggered the creation of the Kokusenji statue that closely resembles the Jingoji statue. Therefore, in considering the background of the statue’s creation, an exploration of the relationship between Kokusenji and the worship of Hachiman would be productive, and we find that previous scholarship on this issue is, in fact, instructive. It was Kusui Takashi, for example, who determined that the territory of Kōzumashō 上妻荘, an estate controlled by the Kitain 喜多院, a sub-temple of Mirokuji in Usa, included a swath of land south of the present-day city of Yame where Kokusenji is located.68

The Kitain was built during the Kankō 宽弘 era (1004–1012) at Mirokuji at the request of the regent’s house (sekkante 摂関家), the Northern House of the Fujiwara clan that produced sons who could be appointed to the regental posts of Sesshō 摂政 or Kanpaku 間白.69 It is said that the Mirokuji Lecturer Genmei 元明 (n.d.) and Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長 (966–1028), who strongly supported Genmei, were involved in the establishment of this sub-temple. It is also assumed that the territory of the Kitain was instituted by these two men.70 The Kōzumashō estate must therefore have been established after the Kankō era, when the Kitain was built, and any relationship between Kokusenji and Usa Mirokuji in the Tenpyō 天平 era, when the Kokusenji statue was created, cannot be clarified by reference to this later relationship.

Of greater relevance is a theory put forth by Nakayama Shigeaki that provides circumstantial evidence of a relationship between Kokusenji and Usa Mirokuji prior to the establishment of the Kitain.71 Nakayama proposes that some fuku 封戸, sustenance households due to the view that transcription of the issaikyō based on Hachiman’s oracle should naturally be kept at Jingoji.” Sazai, “Jingoji Yakushi nyorai-zō no shiteki kōsatsu,” pp. 123–24. [n55]

66 *Usa jingū-shi* shiryōhen 2, pp. 148, 173. [n56]

67 The sutra-copying project was probably carried out at Kanzeonji because Usa Mirokuji did not have an issaikyō from which to copy. When the issaikyō sutra was later copied at Usa Mirokuji during the Jōgan era, the sutras dedicated during the Tenchō era would have been used as the source texts. [n57]

68 Kusui, “Chikugo Kokusenji,” Regarding the presumed location of the Kōzumashō estate, I consulted Matsuzaki, “Kōzumashō no seiritsu to tenkai.” [n58]


70 Linuma Kenji has repeatedly made this claim. See linuma, “Hachiman Usagū to Hachiman Iwashimizugū no tōgo,” pp. 188-89; linuma, “Kenmon toshite no Hachimangū no seiritsu,” p. 98. [n60]

71 Nakayama, “Usa Hachimangū fuku to iden so saikentō.” [n61]
whose taxes were allotted to courtiers, shrines, and temples, and iden (位田), fields assigned to those of the fifth rank or above, had been allotted to the Usağū, the shrines at Usa. These lands were later transformed into estates (shōen 草園) that became Mirokuji territory. Before making a detailed consideration of Nakayama's theory, a firm understanding of the fuko and iden of the Usağū is necessary. The fuko and iden of Usagū can be subdivided into the Hachiman portion and the Himegami 比咩神 portion. In essence, they were rewards for the divine help of the gods in the year following the creation of the Great Buddha (daibutsu 大仏) at Tōdaiji in Tenpyō Shōhō 天平勝宝 2 (750).

The Hachiman Usagū Go-Shinyō Ōkagami 八幡宇佐宮御神領大鏡 (Great Mirror of the Divine Territory of the Hachiman Shrine at Usa), abbreviated Usa Ōkagami 字佐大鏡, details the Usagū territories (shoryō 所領) in medieval times and indicates that the estate called Jukagō-Sankashō 十箇郷三箇庄 was based on fuko of the Himegami portion. This example makes clear that some fuko of the Usagū were transformed into the territory of the Usagū estates in medieval times.

Care must be taken, however, because only the Himegami portion of the households is described as the source of shoryō in Usa Ōkagami. Nothing indicates that the Hachiman portion became Usagū estate territory in medieval times.

Nakayama harbors doubts about this discrepancy between the Himegami and Hachiman portions, and focuses on the Great Council of State directive of the 11th day of the 12th month of Enryaku 17 (798) in which the fuko and iden of the Usagū were incorporated into the Official Storehouses of Dazaifu (Dazaifuku 大宰府倉) as “assets to build a shrine temple” (zōjingüjiryo 造神宮神料). Prior to this directive, all fuko and iden of the Usagū had been returned to the court (chōtei 朝廷) in Tenpyō Shōhō 7 (755). Nevertheless, the Himegami portion was reallocated to the Usağū in Tenpyō Jingo 天平神護 2 (766).

Working from this knowledge, Nakayama hypothesized that it was the Hachiman portion of the fuko and iden that was allocated “for the building of a shrine temple” and later made into a shōen that became Mirokuji territory.

According to Nakayama’s theory, the Kōzumashō, the estate where Kokusenji was located, also originated from the Hachiman portion of the fuko and iden. In that case, we can conclude that Kokusenji had already established a relationship with the worship of Hachiman by the Tenchō era, when the Kokusenji statue was produced. However, the fuko and iden of the Usağū have a complicated history due to various changes in political circumstances over time. In addition, the process that led to their becoming Usagū territory during the medieval period is still unclear because of the paucity of historical sources. Thus, it must be admitted that Nakayama’s theory is no more than a surmise based on circumstantial evidence.

Nevertheless, because there are insufficient grounds to completely reject Nakayama’s theory, it remains at present one of the most influential hypotheses. When making the assumption that the area around Kokusenji was once the Hachiman portion of the fuko and iden, the three-article petition submitted by Köhō and Koe in 830 (Tenchō 7) deserves renewed attention. Although I have addressed them above, the most significant points, 2 and 3, bear repeating here:

2) Tax collected from sustenance households (fūbutsu) and alms (fuse) made to Usa Hachimān should be used for the priestly robes (hōfuku) of the Lecturer and Reader of Usa Mirokuji for the New Year (shōgatsu), the rainy-season retreat (ango), and other occasions.

---

73 Ōta-ken Shirōyō Kantōkai, vol. 24 of Ōta-ken Shirōyō, part 1, Usa Hachimangū monjo 1, pp. 120-58. [n63]
74 Nishitani, “Chiki kemonon kara mita shōen kōrō sei no keisei.” [n64]
75 Shinsō kyakuchokokushō, Jinpu 神事, Enryaku 17 (798):12.11/217, KST vol. 27, p. 8. [n65]
76 Shoku Nihongi, Tenpyō Shōhō 7 (755):3:28, KST vol. 2, p. 223. One year prior to this record, in the 11th month of Tenpyō Shōhō 6 (754), the Yakushiji monk Gyoōshin 高信 (n.d.) as well as Ōga no Tamamaru 大額多聞尼 (n.d.) and Ōga no Morime 大額摩利尼 (n.d.) from Usa Hachimangū shrine were exiled because it was said that they had plotted together to curse their enemies; Shoku Nihongi, Tenpyō Shōhō 6 (754):11.24 and 11.27, KST vol. 2, p. 222. The return of fuko and iden may have been related to this incident. [n66]
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78 Nishitani mentions that although this assumption is based on circumstantial evidence, it is highly likely the Hachiman portion became the source of Usa Mirokuji territory. Nishitani, “Chiki kemonon kara mita shōen kōrō sei no keisei.” p. 154. [n68]
79 Ruijū sandaikyū, 3, Shokoku kōdōkushi goto, Tenchō 7 (830):7.11, KST vol. 2, p. 94. [n69]
As previously mentioned, these articles may have been devised to strengthen the organization of Usa Mirokuji at the time of the tenkoku ceremony involving the ritual reading of the canon. Because the Hachiman portion of the fuko was employed to support the economic foundations of Mirokuji, this surely indicates the possibility of its later transformation into Mirokuji territory. As seen above, after the fuko and iden of the Usagū were returned to the court, they were placed under the administration of Dazaifu. On the basis of these findings, it is highly probable that the image of the Jingoji statue brought to Kanzeonji, which had been prompted by the canon-copying project, was then transmitted to the fuko and iden of the Usagū. In that case, the Kokusenji statue can surely be regarded as one example of such a transfer.

Conclusion

This article has concentrated on the statue of the Healing Buddha at Kokusenji in Yame and offered the hypothesis that the statue likely dates to the first half of the ninth century, and further, that it was made by a local sculptor who was active in the Dazaifu area. The article then posited the possibility that knowledge of the statue of the Healing Buddha at Jingoji was conveyed in the form of an image via Kanzeonji, and this transfer of visual knowledge resulted in the close resemblance between the Kokusenji and Jingoji statues. In support of this hypothesis, I have focused specifically on the canon-copying project led by the Kanzeonji lecturer Eun during the Tenchō era and demonstrated how this event triggered the connection between Kanzeonji and Jingoji. This massive sutra-copying project was based on the oracle of Hachiman issued at the time of the event known as the Incident of the Usa Hachiman Oracle. Considering these factors together, I have contended that because the canon-copying project was based on the oracle issued by the Hachiman deity at the time of that incident, renewed attention was placed on the Healing Buddha at Jingoji, which had been built as a result of the same oracle, and that an image of the Jingoji statue was then transmitted to Kanzeonji. Lastly, because the southern area of Yame, the location of Kokusenji, had been the Hachiman portion of the fuko and iden since the Nara period and Dazaifu administered this area, I hypothesized that the image of the Jingoji statue was first transmitted to Kanzeonji as a result of the canon-copying project, then later conveyed to Kokusenji.

Although difficult to prove, the rise of Hachiman worship in both Kinai and the northern Kyushu area as well as their mutual influence on one another’s development may well have had great significance as underlying factors in the creation of the Kokusenji statue. In place of a definitive conclusion at this point, I wish instead to consider the prospects for addressing the issue of the upsurge in faith in Hachiman in forthcoming research.

The Hachiman deity displayed multiple characteristics, being seen as a god of war (gunshin 軍神), a god who protects the state (chingokokkashin 鎮護国家神), and as an imperial ancestor god (kōsoshin 皇祖神) but, in terms of the ninth century with which this study is concerned, Hachiman as imperial ancestor is the most significant of these identities. The idea of Hachiman as imperial ancestor can be traced back to the Oracle Incident in which Hachiman influenced the imperial succession, but the definitive factor was the identification of Hachiman with the legendary Emperor Ōjin 大神天皇 (trad. r. 270–310) that took place during the reign of Kanmu. As a result, Hachiman was frequently summoned to insure the legitimacy of the imperial succession, such as during the Kusuko Incident (Kusuko no hen 萬葉の変), which stemmed from a conflict between Emperor Saga 崇敬天皇 (786–842; r. 809–823) and Emperor Heizei 平城天皇 (773–824; r. 806–809), when Tōji Chinju Hachimangū 東寺鎮守八幡宮 was founded. Another example is the enthronement of the youthful Emperor Seiwa 清和天皇 (850–881; r. 858–876), when the god was invited to the newly built Iwashimizu Hachimangū, just south of the Heian capital. As noted above, the massive sutra-copying project for the Buddha canon seems to have been devised in

81 Hasebe, “Hachiman daibosatsu seiritsu no zentei: Kōtō no tankan to Hachimanshin no tensei,” pp. 61–62. [n71]
82 Takahashi, “Tōji Hachiman san shinjō no sesaku haikei ni kansuru kōsatsu.” [n72]
83 Yoshiie, “Iwashimizu Hachimangū jōshi no shūhen.” [n73]
order to invite (or transfer) Hachiman from Jingoji when Jingoji was established. We should probably accept the supposition of Kawajiri Akio that because the statues and the building of the Godaidō 大堂 at Jingoji were built at the behest of Emperor Junna 淳和天皇 (786–840; r. 823–833), the canon-copying project was also likely done upon his request. 84 If we exercise our imagination a little further, we can envisage that the merger of Jinganji and Takaodera to become Jingoji in the first year of the Tenchō era (824) signified a guarantee of the legitimacy of Emperor Junna’s succession in the previous year, Kōnin 14 (823).

Based on his demonstration that the statues of the Five Great Wisdom Kings (Godai Myōō 五大明王像) sponsored by Emperor Junna for the Godaidō and the seated statues of the Five Space Repository bodhisattvas (Godai Kokūzōbosatsu 五大虚空蔵菩薩) sponsored by Emperor Ninmyō 仁明天皇 (810–850; r. 833–850) for the pagoda were likely based on knowledge gained from images with which Kūkai and Emperor Saga were involved, Sasaki Moritoshi made clear that “copies of iconography” (zuzō 仏像 雕像) had special significance in validating the imperial succession from Saga, to Junna and Ninmyō. 85 Another notable aspect of Sasaki’s theory is the possibility that Kūkai influenced the merger of Jinganji and Takaosanji to become Jingoji, as well as the designation of the statue of the Healing Buddha of Jinganji as the chief object of worship (honzon 本尊) at Jingoji. 86

Working from these suppositions, we must conclude that the creation of the Kokusenji statue had more significance than simply its link to the rise of the worship of Hachiman. In short, the statue of the Healing Buddha, whose transfer from Jinganji to Jingoji was inspired by the enthronement of Emperor Junna, played an even more powerful role than heretofore imagined, functioning to insure the legitimacy of the imperial succession. It is thus easy to conceive that from the time of its creation, the Kokusenji statue would have been expected to perform a function similar to that of the Jingoji statue. The fact that Eun was appointed by imperial order (choku 勢) to head the canon-copying project as Kanzeonji Lecturer also buttresses this supposition.

Coincidently, another notable achievement of Eun as Kanzeonji Lecturer was the trade he carried out with Silla 新羅 merchants. 87 According to the Anshōji Ledger of Assets, the Kanzeonji Lecturer Eun employed alms (fuse) from National Lectures on the Sutras (kokka kōkyō 国家講経) to purchase Buddhist ritual implements (butsugu 仏具) from Silla merchants, and when he later established Anshōji 安祥寺, he donated these ritual implements to the temple. Although the exact meaning of the term “National Lectures on the Sutras” is not clear, Eun certainly received some financial support from the government for them. Also, the fact that Eun, in the position of Kanzeonji Lecturer, donated goods derived from the trade to Anshōji, which had not yet been completed at the time, cannot be ignored. Anshōji was established and developed with the support of Fujiwara no Nobuko 藤原順子 (809–871), an official consort (nyūgo 女御) of Emperor Ninmyō. Eun had thus built up close relationships with people around the emperor. It is quite natural that Eun, Jitsue—who had chosen Eun to be Kanzeonji Lecturer—and Kūkai focused on the Hachiman deity as a sacred imperial ancestor.

In considering instead the Hachiman deity from the viewpoint of Dazaifu and Kanzeonji, it is noteworthy that the rise of the worship of Hachiman and the strengthening of the Kanzeonji Lecturer’s control within his jurisdiction had developed in concert. The canon-copying project led by Eun examined here symbolizes this mutual development. It can be anticipated that the rise of faith in Hachiman would have led to further development of shinbutsu shūgō, the ideology of the unity of native and Buddhist deities, in the provinces of the Saikaidō. As recent studies have clearly demonstrated, shinbutsu shūgō was a strategy to re-structure the context of the national order, interpreting various local gods as good spirits who protected the dharma (gohōzenshin 護法善神). 88 One example seen in northern Kyushu is the case of Fujiwara no Hōtoku 藤原重俊 (d. 740), who was once feared as a vengeful spirit, but whose character was transformed so that he became a guardian deity of safe voyages. 89

---
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For the Kanzeonji Lecturer who was deeply tied to the development of the concept of the unity of native and Buddhist deities, popular faith in the Hachiman deity, who was understood as having quickly become a believer in Buddhism and a leader of other gods, would have been most welcome. With the rise of the worship of Hachiman in the circles around the emperor, the Kanzeonji Lecturer deepened cooperation with Usa, the seat of Hachiman faith. The actions of the Kanzeonji Lecturer can be seen as an attempt to transform the local gods into tutelary deities (gohōshin) and to incorporate these gods into the system of control centered around Kanzeonji. Without the Kanzeonji Lecturer, who had close ties to the central government as well as strong influence on the provinces within his jurisdiction, the sculptural form of the Kokusenji statue that blended both the central style of the capital area and local styles could not have been created.

Table 2. Chronology of Related Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day and Month</th>
<th>Kanzeonji Lecturer</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenpyō Shōhō 2 (750)</td>
<td>29th day, 2nd month</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>800 fuko and 80 iden allotted to Usa Hachiman of the First Rank, as an additional 380 fuko added to the original 420, and 30 new iden added to the original 50; additionally, 600 fuko and 60 iden awarded to Second-rank Himegami-shin (Shoku Nihongi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenpyō Shōhō 7 (755)</td>
<td>28th day, 3rd month</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oracle of Usa Hachiman proclaims that 1,400 fuko and 140 iden are not needed, and they are returned to the court; however, the original shinden are ordered to be retained (Shoku Nihongi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenpyō Jingo 2 (768)</td>
<td>11th day, 4th month</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,000 shinpu households are bestowed on Himegami-shin (Shoku Nihongi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingo Keiun 3 (769)</td>
<td>25th day, 9th month</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Wake no Kiyomaro conveys the oracle of Usa Hachiman, and is exiled to Ōsumi Province (Shoku Nihongi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enryaku 12 (793)</td>
<td>circa this year</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>In response to the oracle of Usa Hachiman, Wake no Kiyomaro builds Jinganji (Ruijū kokushi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enryaku 17 (798)</td>
<td>21st day, 12th month</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>After this date, Usa Hachiman Daibosatsu and Himegami-shin transfer 1,410 fuko and 140 iden to government coffers at Dazaifu (Shinshō kyakukan fushō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Könin 10 (820)</td>
<td>4th day, 3rd month</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Dazaifu sends an order to Kanzeonji stating that the Kanzeonji Lecturer is to lead the Shitennoji Keka rite hereafter (Heian ibun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenchō 1 (824)</td>
<td>27th day, 9th month</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Takaosanji is elevated to jōgakuji status and renamed Jingokokusoshingoji (abbreviated Jingoji) (Ruijū kokushi) and a Standing Healing Buddha was received by the temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenchō 2 (825)</td>
<td>28th day, 2nd month</td>
<td>Kōhō</td>
<td>Dazaifu’s petition, which was based on a written request from Kanzeonji Lecturer Kōhō, asking that five of the twenty monks over sixty years of age who had been appointed to serve at provincial temples should be replaced with newly tonsured monks who are over twenty-five years of age, is approved (Ruijū sandaikyaku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenchō 6 (829)</td>
<td>19th day, 5th month same year</td>
<td>Kōhō</td>
<td>10 monks are ordered to perform a tendoku ritual reading of the Buddhist canon at Mirokuji in Usa (Nihon kiryaku)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the “Events” listed in the table, I consulted Shigematsu, Dazaifu kodai shi nenpyō; Asai, Nara jidai ii: Tōdaīji, Shōsōin to Kōfukuji; and Ito, Heian jidai i: Mikkyōjiin karara Byōdōin e.

For the “Events” listed in the table, I consulted Shigematsu, Dazaifu kodai shi nenpyō; Asai, Nara jidai ii: Tōdaīji, Shōsōin to Kōfukuji; and Ito, Heian jidai i: Mikkyōjiin karara Byōdōin e.
| Tenchō 7 (830) | 11th day, 7th month | Kōhō | Kōhō, the Kanzeonji Lecturer, and Koe, the Usa Mirokuji Lecturer, make a three-article petition that is approved; the petition requested that the annual cohort of ordinands (nenbundosha) be selected from those who had resided at the temples for over three years and that the Lecturer and Shrine Administrator test them on sutra-recitation (Ruijū sandaikyaku 2); that the fabutsu from Usa Hachiman-shin sustenance households be applied to alms and robes of the monks during New Year’s and the summer retreat and that six of the twenty-four shrine workers be put in service to the temples (Ruijū sandaikyaku 3); and the petition revealed that the Lecturer and Reader from the temples were first appointed in two central government directives from the 1st day of the 2nd month and the 10th day of the 5th month of Tenchō 6. |
| Tenchō 8 (831) | 7th day, 3rd month | Kōhō | Kanzeonji lecturer Kōhō was ordered by Dazaifu to distribute 500 kernels of shari to the kokubunji and jōgakuji temples within its jurisdiction (Nihon kiryaku) |
| Tenchō 10 (833) | 26th day, 10th month | Eun | Dazaifu is ordered to have the Buddhist canon copied in accordance with the oracle of Hachiman-shin in the Keiun era and to keep it at Mirokuji, and another set is to be copied and kept at Jingoji (Shoku Nihon kōki). Eun was appointed Kanzeonji Lecturer and Lecturer for Chikuzen Province specially to oversee the copying of the Buddhist canon (Tōji chōja bunin). |
| Jōwa 1 (834) | this year | Eun | Eun was appointed the abbot of Jingoji (Tōji chōja bunin). |
| Jōwa 2 (835) | 25th day, 8th month | Kōhō | Kanzeonji lecturer Kōhō petitions for five monks to be appointed to Miroku Chishikji in Matsura no kōri, Hizen Province; Dazaifu forwards the request to the Great Council of State of the central government (Daijōkan), which approves it (Ruijū sandaikyaku). |
| Jōwa 9 (842) | 5th day, 5th month | Eun? | Eun resigns posts of Lecturer at Kanzeonji and Chikuzen in preparation for a voyage to Tang China (Anshōji shizaichō). |
| Jōwa 14 (847) | 28th day, 11th month | unknown | On his return from Tang, Ennin 円仁 (794–864) sojourns at Daisenji 大山寺 from this day until the 3rd day of the 12th month, during which time he conducts a tendoku ritual reading before Hachiman Daibosatsu, Kawara Myōjin 香春明神, Kamado no Ōkami 竜門大神, Sumiyoshi no Ōkami 住吉大神, Kashii Myōjin 香椎明神, Chikuzen Myōjin 筍前明神, and Matsura Shōni no Kumo 毛浦少女の雲 (Nittō guhō junrei kōki 入唐求法巡礼行記) by Ennin 円仁. |
| Kashō 1 (848) | 8th month | unknown | Shimotsuke Province 下野国 petitions that Yakushiji in Shimotsuke be recognized as the equal of Kanzeonji and that a monk be appointed to the post of Lecturer; the petition is recognized (Shoku Nihon kōki, Ruijū sandaikyaku). |
| Jōgan 1 (859) | 8th month | unknown | Based on an appeal by Gyōkyō 行教 (n.d.), a Hōden hall is constructed at Iwashimizu Otokoyama 石清水男山 in Kyoto in order to invite Hachiman from Usa (Iwashimizu Hachimangū Gokokuji ryakki). |
Continued study of the intricate circumstances behind the production of the Kokusenji statue is necessary, but the existence of a statue that was the product of complex interwoven motives in both Kinai and Dazaifu offers a perspective that will be useful in considering the historical subsequent creation of other Buddhist statues in northern Kyushu.
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孝、考、公職、可、謂之至忠、惟孝惟忠、不、可
不、順者也、昔年時中、僧道鏡、謂-僧之資
登、玄亜之上、辱僧、法王之号、遂懸、覇覇
之心、僧法僧御僧僧、行-行僧御僧僕、愛八
輔大神、痛-天暴之暦顚、愛-猿猴之行、與、神
兵士、齢、鬼鬼大年、専用我整、邪罪正弱、大
神獻-自威之難、當、仰-仏力の奇妙、乃入-御
夢、請-使者者、有、勧-道引等故考従五十
民勧清麻呂、面宜-御夢之事、仍以、天位識-道
鏡、事、、令、言-大神、清麻呂奉-詔旨、向、宇
佐神宮、于、時大神托宜、夫神有-大工、好欲
不、同、善悪-罇祀、貪神受-神竜、我為-紳
-隆皇経、扶、清家員、写、造一切經仏、講
譲-義徳主経-一方卷、-建-伽藍、除、凶逆於二
旦、-国-社院於万代、-汝承-此言、莫、有-遺失、
清麻呂-大神-警云、國家平定之後、必奏-後
帝-奏、果-神聖、粉骨塗命、不、縁、神言、還
奏-此言、-遭-不時遇、-身-降、刑獄、迷-荒隅、
-幸蒙-神力、-再入-帝都、-後田原天皇、
十年、-敬-奏-此言、-天皇感嘆、親製詔書、未
行之間、-遇-識-位之事、-天態-三年又奏之、相原
先帝、即-以-前語、普布-天下、-延-延應年中、
-私-建、伽藍、名-神願寺、天神追嘉-先歴、
-以、神願寺-為-定額寺、-今此寺地勢朽、不、宜
-塚場、-伏望、相-相-定高寺、-以為-定額、名
-曰、-神護国仏真言寺、-仏像-依、-大悲胎蔵及金剛
界等、-簡、-解-真言-僧二十七人、-永為、-國家、修
-行三密法門、-其僧有、-圖、-比、-道行-僧、-補、-之、
-又-簡-真義赤亦二十七人、-令、-覇-護護國界王経
-及調和風雨成熟五穀経等、-晝夜更代、不、断-其
声、-七年之後、-予、-得度、-一則果、-大神之大願、
-二則除-國家之災難、者、勅、-代-間、毎年得
-度、-人、-再-前田原水田廿町、賜伝、-二世、-為
-功田、者、-入-彼寺-充、果、-神願-者、更-延、-二世、
-自余依-請
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