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1. Introduction

Saichō’s *Shugokokkaishō* 守護国界章 (abbrev. *Shugoshō*), the most representative text of the controversy between Saichō 最澄 (767-822) and Tokuitsu 徳一 (8-9c) in the early Heian period, contains a variety of quotations. They force *Shugoshō* to be very hard to read that many of them, including the fragments called *Girin* 義林, are not extant. In this paper, I would like to investigate the original and authorship of *Girin*, and examine the thought of *Girin* especially with relation to Wŏnhyo 元曉 (617-686).

2. Ŭijŏk and the twelve chapter version of *Daijō-girin-jō*

There are two schools of thought on the authorship of *Girin* : first, people who are represented by Yagi [1960] and Morishige [1995] regard *Girin* as the quotation of the twelve chapter version of *Daijō-girin-jō / Daesung-uirim-jang* 大乗義林章 written by Ŭijŏk 義寂 of Silla, based on *Toiki-dento-mokuroku* 東域伝灯目録 or else, and assume that *Daijō-girin-jō* is Ŭijŏk’s commentary on *Dâchéng-fâyuăn-yilin-zhâng* 大乗法苑義林章 written by Ji 基 (632-682), the founder of the Chinese Fâxiâng 法相 school (the East Asian transmission of Yogācāra). According to *Toiki-dentō-mokuroku*, the twelve chapter version of *Daijō-girin-jō* which supplements *Dâchéng-fâyuăn-yilin-zhâng* was attributed to Êijŏk, and its first chapter was also called *Girin-san* 義林纂. In addition, Morishige points out that sentences of *Girin* are quoted in Zenju’s *Houon Gikyō* 法苑義鏡 as those of (Girin-)san, and as those of Êijŏk in *Goshingi ryakki* 五心義略記 written by Shōban 清範 (962-1004). Secondy, people who are represented by Tamura [1992] believe that the twelve chapter version of *Daijō-girin-jō* was imported and regarded as the work of Ji in Nara period, based on a Shōson manuscript. Both schools argue that the twelve chapter version of *Daijō-girin-jō* is compiled by Ji’s disciples based on Saichō’s statement
as follows:

Generally, as to the theory of Cîn 慈恩 (=JI), (Dâchêng-fâyuân-) yîlin-zhâng is an orthodox. He wrote more than fifty commentaries, and then began to write (Dâchêng-) fâyuân- (yi) lin-zhâng. The draft nearly finished, but he died before its revision. After that, the draft was compiled by his disciples (基弟子等), and spread over the east of Jambu (=dvipa) (=this world) 3).

The former school considers the disciples as the authors of the twelve chapter version of Daijô-girin-jô. The latter, in contrast, regard them as mere compilers. It is reasonable to think Girin is the abbreviation of Daijô-girin-jô or Girin-san and is the partly enlarged and rewritten edition of Dâchêng-fâyuân-yîlin-zhâng.

Although the information presented by Morishige [1995] seems to be of value to investigate the authorship of Girin, it is necessary to point out that his interpretation on Saicho’s statement quoted above is confused. Morishige interpreted this quotation as follows:

Since Saicho says that Girin is the edition compiled after the death of Cîn (=JI) by his disciples (弟子達), I believe that the disciple (その弟子こそが) is nobody else but Ūijôk. 4

He distorts the word ‘disciples弟子等’ to Ūijôk alone. In addition, it is important to note that, concentrating on the texts before Saicho, there is only one quotation to show the clear relationship between Ūijôk and Girin 5, although there are many quotations attributed to Girin in Shugôshô and Houon Gikyô. Proofs which Morishige pointed out other than this were based on Goshingi ryakki, Tôki-dentô-mokuroku and so forth, which were written more than one century after Saicho. From this, it follows that Ūijôk was a member of the compilers and, taking Saicho’s attitude of quotation into consideration, it is unlikely that he was the author of the parts of Girin quoted by Saicho. For example, Saicho wrote in Hokke-shûku 法華秀句 as follows:

(Master of) Tripitaka of Great Tang (=Xuanzang) and the masters of Hossô school such as Shênfang 神昉, Ūijôk, Ūi-il 義一 and so forth say that... Details can be seen in the second volume of Shênfang’s (Zhòngxing-) Ji 種姓集, the third (volume) of Daijô-girin-jô, and the last volume of Ūi-il’s commentary on the treatise on the Lotus sutra (法華論述記)... Shênfang, the translator monk of the Tang dynasty, says in the second volume of his Zhòngxing-jì that... The third (volume) of (Daijô-) girin-jô write that... Both Ūijôk and Ūi-il say that... so far the quotation from the last volume of Ūi-il’s commentary on the treatise on the Lotus sutra ends 6.
The quotation clearly shows that Saichō did not regard Ūijōk as the author of the third volume of (Daijō-) girin-jō quoted above. The authors of later texts such as Tōiki-dentō-mokuroku probably did not know the complicated circumstances behind the authorship of Girin and mistakenly attributed it to Ūijōk alone.

3. Criticism of the Three-Period Teaching Classification in Girin

In Shugoshō, there are two quotations from Girin. The first quotation starts with the statement “Girin says (義林云)…” and finishes with the comment saying “so far the quotation from Girin ends (已上義林文也)”. Taken over, this quotation aims a criticism of the position of the Prajñāpāramitā sutras in the three-period teaching classification, however, this criticism can be split into three paragraphs by the targets.

A) Criticism of those who attributed to Paramārtha (真諦, 499-569).

B) Criticism of those who attributed to Xuānzáng 玄奘 (602-664) or Wŏnch’uk 圓測 (613-695).

C) Criticism of those who attributed to Ji.

In A), Paramārtha’s three-period teaching classification, probably taken from Wŏnch’uk’s commentary on Samdhinirmocana-sūtra, is quoted as follows:

When the first (turning of the) wheel of the dharma, Buddha (=Śākyamuni) at the Deer Park preached the Four Noble Truths for five monks. When the second wheel of the dharma, seven years after the Enlightenment (of Śākyamuni), at the river named Charity of Wisdom in the Kingdom of Śrāvasti being three li or more away from Anāthapindika, Buddha preached the emptiness of all dharmas and the sutras such as Prajñāpāramitā for bodhisattvas. When the third wheel of the dharma, thirty eight years after the Enlightenment, at the auditorium of the ogre king in Vaiśāli, Buddha preached the sutras such as Samdhinirmocana for a bodhisattva named Zhēnzhāng 真藏.

Paramārtha divided the teachings of Buddha only by period of time. The author(s) of Girin criticized Paramārtha for three reason: (a) The River named Charity of Wisdom cannot be found in Mahāaprajñāpāramitā. (b) In Mahāprajñāpāramitā, there were some groups of nuns who were not in existence for seven years after the Enlightenment. (c) According to Dàzhídī-lùn 大智度論, a part of Prajñāpāramitā was preached after the Lotus sūtra which had been preached just before the Nirvāṇa of Buddha. It is reasonable to suppose that criticism (c) was derived from Wŏnhyo’s Daehyedogyeong-jongyo 大慧度經宗要.
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In B), Girin criticized those who classify the teachings of Buddha only by place of sermon. It is likely that the target of the criticism was either Xuánzàng or his supporter Wŏnch’uk, based on Wŏnch’uk’s comment:

According to the three-dharma-wheel theory of (Master of) Tripitaka of Great Tang (=Xuánzàng), he claimed (the classification) based only on place of sermon, not on period of years or days. The place of the first wheel of the dharma is similar to Paramārtha mentioned above. The second wheel of the dharma was preached at four places and sixteen meetings (四處十六会) such as Mahāprajñāpāramitā... The third wheel of the dharma was preached at two places: pure and impure land.... It is clear that Vaiśāli which Paramārtha pointed out is an impure land, not the same place of (Samdhinirmocana-) sūtra (which was preached at a pure land).... The reason why the Lotus sutra or Huayan sutra is regarded as the third (wheel of the dharma) is (that both sутras are preached at pure lands such as) Mt. Grdhra-kūta or seven places and eight meetings (七处八会) ¹⁰.

The criticism in B) is based on two reasons. (a) According to a legend introduced by Jñānagupta 阇那崛多, not all Prajñāparamitā sutras were preached at four places and sixteen meetings. Lidài-sānbào-ji 历代三宝纪 quotes Jñānagupta’s words as follows:

Cakuka was more than 2,000 li to the southeast of Khotan. The king purely believed and respected the Mahāyāna teachings, and housed three great sutas: Mahāprajñāpāramitā, Dājī 大集 and Huayan in his palace.... In a deep and pure cave of a precipitous mountain being more than twenty li to the southeast of this country, the king put the twelve sutas such as Dājī, Huayan, Fāngdèng 方等 (Vaipulya?), Ratnakūṭa, Laṅkāvatāra, Fānguāng 方広 (Vaipulya?)... Mahāprajñāpāramitā, Prajñāpāramitā with eight sections and Mahāmeghasūtra... ¹²

Based on this legend, places of sermon besides four places and sixteen meetings of Mahāprajñāpāramitā can be expected¹³. (b) Bhāviveka’s Prajñāpradīpa mentioned a bodhisattva named Jīyōngméng 極勇猛 as a character in some Prajñāpāramitā sutras¹⁴. In Chinese translations of the Prajñāpāramitā sutas including Mahāprajñāpāramitā, however, this bodhisattva cannot be found. To sum up the criticism in B), Girin tried to point out the variation of the Prajñāpāramitā sutas, confronting those who tried to limit it to Mahāprajñāpāramitā. The method of criticism like this can be traced back to Wŏnhyo’s Daehyedogyeong-jongyo.

(Sutras named) ‘Mahāprajñāpāramitā’ are not single but various.... For example, (Dāzhidù-) lún says, "this sutra (=Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā prajñāpāramitā) has 22,000 verses. Mahāprajñāpā-
ramitā has 100,000 verses. The palaces of the Dragon King, Asura and Deva own (the Prajñāpāramitā sutras with) billions and billions of verses.” 15

At the beginning of B), Girin also says that the groups of the Prajñāpāramitā sutras are various. Although the evidential quotations of Girin and Wŏnhyo are different from each other, their purpose and method are common.

In C), in order to criticize those considering the Prajñāpāramitā sutras as the teaching of emptiness, Girin demonstrated that the Prajñāpāramitā sutras preach the teaching of not only emptiness but also the Middle way by quoting passages of Yogācāra texts such as Vasubandhū’s commentary on Mahāyānasamgraha, Madhyāntavibhāga and Asvabhāva’s commentary on Mahāyānasamgraha. Girin concluded that the Prajñāpāramitā sutras belong to both the second and third period of the classification. It is reasonable to suppose the target to be Ji, since he includes, for example, both the Prajñāpāramitā sūtras and the doctrine of the Mādhyamika among the second period, for the reason of their teaching of emptiness. However, the term ‘period’ (時) means a part of the lifetime of Buddha in common usage and according to Húizhāo 慧招, regarded as the head disciple of Ji in Japanese tradition, ‘period’ should be interpreted not only as a sequence of time (前後) but also as a sort of contents (義類) 16. The method of criticism like this can also be found in Daehyedogyeong jongyo. Wŏnhyo’s bases of criticism, however, are the Chinese translation of Pañcavimśatīhasrikā prajñāpāramitā and the Huayan sutra with sixty volumes, since it was probably still difficult for him to read the new translations of Xuánzàng at that time. As I pointed out in Moro [2002], Chikō 智光 (709-770 / 781) who was a well-known critic of the Hossō school based on Wŏnhyo and regarded as the greatest monk of the Sanron 三論 school in the Nara period quoted these new translations in the same way as Girin. Hence it is reasonable to think that Chikō’s criticism had also inherited from Girin.

4. Girin’s Classification

The second quotation of Girin, based on the criticism in the first quotation mentioned above, claims its classification of Buddhist teachings:

According to the abilities of (the people on) the three vehicles, (...) the teachings (of Buddha) should be (divided into) five periods, likewise the five-taste teaching (classification) of Mahāparinirvāṇa: “... for example, the milk comes from the cow, the yogurt (dadhi) from the...
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milk, the fresh butter (nava-nita) from the yogurt, the matured butter (ghila?) from the fresh butter, and the cream (manda) which is the most tasty from the matured butter ... By the same token, the twelve divisions of the canons (dvādaśa-anga) came from Buddha, sutras from the twelve divisions of the canon, vaipulya sutras from sutras. Prajñāpāramitā sutras from vaipulya sutras, and Mahāparinirvāṇa like the cream from prajñāpāramitā sutras. The cream is a metaphor of the Buddha nature. The Buddha nature is Tathāgata." 17) The twelve divisions of the canons are the teachings for śrāvaka... Sutras are the teachings for pratyeka-buddha... Vaipulya (sutras) are (the teachings of) Mahāyāna for a novice bodhisattva. Prajñāpāramitā sutras are (the teachings of) Mahāyāna for a proficient bodhisattva. Mahāparinirvāṇa unite all people on the three vehicles and let them enter into the great Nirvāṇa. The reason for the correspondence like this depends on the anterior passage (of the above quotation) : "The Buddha nature of śrāvaka is similar to the milk, the Buddha nature of pratyeka-buddha is similar to the yogurt, the Buddha nature of bodhisattvas is similar to the fresh and matured butter, the Buddha nature of Tathāgata is similar to the cream." 18) It follows from this that the first and second of the five (-taste) teaching (classification) correspond to the first of the three (-period) teaching (classification), the third to the second, and the fourth and fifth to the third. Since both the third of the three (-period teaching classification) and the fourth of the five (-taste teaching classification) compare to the matured butter, both Samdhinirmocana and Mahāparinirvāṇa include the same teaching of the Middle way... 19

By quoting the five-taste teaching classification of Mahāparinirvāṇa, Girin confirmed that Prajñāpāramitā sutras corresponded to the matured butter. Moreover, by quoting another passage from Mahāparinirvāṇa, Girin tried to demonstrate that Prajñāpāramitā sutras corresponded to the proficient bodhisattva and the third period of the three-period teaching classification, probably based on the paragraph from Samdhinirmocana quoted below.

At the first period, (...) only for those who aimed at the vehicle of śrāvaka, Buddha preached... At the second period, (...) only for those who aimed at the vehicle of Mahāyāna, Buddha preached... Now at the third period, for those who aim at any vehicle, Buddha preached... 20

We can express this relationship as in the following table :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-taste teaching classification</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Three-period teaching classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taste</td>
<td>Sutra</td>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>Twelve divisions of the canons</td>
<td>Śrāvaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogurt</td>
<td>Sutras</td>
<td>Pratyeka-buddha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although it is not clear why the matured butter and proficient bodhisattva are related to the third period, we can see that *Girin* tried to take the Prajñāpāramitā sutas for being the same rank of the highest sutas such as *Samdhinirmocana* or *Mahāparinirvāṇa*. This form of verification is also seen in *Daehyedogyeong-jongyoo*.

5. Conclusion

So far we have outlined the way and background in which the author(s) of *Girin* criticizes the three-period teaching classification of the masters before him. Based on this investegation, we would like to briefly examine (i) the position of the author(s) of *Girin* in the history of the East Asian Yogācāra and (ii) the background of Saichō’s quotation of *Girin*.

First on (i), according to the quotations, it is reasonable to regard the authors of *Girin* as those who belonged to the philosophical lineage of the Shilla Buddhism, especially Wŏnhyo. Although Ŭijŏk is not the author of the quotations studied above and is traditionally regarded as one of the disciples of Ŭisang 義湘, it is not groundless to think of Ŭijŏk also as a follower of Wŏnhyo.

Secondly on (ii), giving consideration to the influence of Wŏnhyo and *Girin* on the Japanese Sanron school, it could be possible to think of *Shugoshō* as a text written in the context of the controversy between the Sanron and Hossō school from Nara to early Heian period, since the leading characters were the Sanron monks of Daianji 大安寺 temple, a place connected with Saichō. From this point we might be able to go on to an even more detailed examination of the relationship between the Sanron-Hossō controversy and the Saichō-Tokuitsu dispute.

(Footnotes and bibliography are omitted for want of space. See my web site
http://www.ya.sakura.ne.jp/~morolo for the full text.)
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