

MINOWA Kenryō 袁輪顕量

The Tendai Debates of 1131 at Hosshōji

Debate was a key part of many monks' training. It also played a vital role in the competition between Buddhist schools. A good sense of how monks interacted can be gained by looking at one year, 1131, at the debates at Hosshōji. Tendai monks were paired with Nara monks, usually from the Hossō School, to consider various doctrinal issues. In some cases, the root text being discussed can be determined, but often the topic of debate remains obscure because of the terseness of the passage. Sometimes the winner of the debate is clear, but at other times, the outcome is less certain. The article concludes with a survey of other sources for debate.

KEYWORDS: debates—*Hosshōji mihakkō mondōki*—Tendai—Hossō—*Lotus Sutra*—Tokuitsu—Saichō

MINOWA Kenryō is a professor in the department of Indian philosophy and Buddhist Studies at the University of Tokyo.

IN THE HISTORY of Japanese Buddhism, debate was an important means of profoundly deepening monks' academic knowledge (KOMINE 1997; MINOWA 1997; ŌSHIMA 1997; YAMAZAKI 1997; TAKAYAMA 1997). The eightfold lectures at Hosshōji enable us to see how doctrinal study advanced on the basis of debate. The topics of their debates and the discussions that ensued can be investigated through the *Hosshōji mihakkō mondōki* 法勝寺御八講問答記, hereafter cited as *Record of questions and answers*. This article focuses on the debates associated with Tendai in the first year of the Hosshōji debates. These debates are then compared with those of the early Heian period.

The Tendai Debates of 1131

The actual topics of the first year (1131) of the Hosshōji debates are related in the first fascicle of the *Record of questions and answers*. The eightfold lectures were based on the *Lotus Sutra*. Thus the opening lecture concerned the opening *sutra* for that text, the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings* (*Wuliangyi jing*). The court invited monks, usually from the Nara temples of Tōdaiji and Kōfukuji and from the Tendai temples of Enryakuji (Hieizan) and Onjōji, to serve as lecturers. A Nara monk was usually paired with a Tendai monk when the positions of lecturer and questioner were assigned. The actual debates (as opposed to the lectures) ranged across doctrinal issues from the Hossō, Sanron, Tendai, Kegon, and Ritsu traditions, but here I focus on Tendai doctrines raised during the first year of the debates. Most of the debates were framed by the Hossō or *Lotus Sutra* doctrinal systems. The issue of what is meant by “Tendai debates” must be considered, particularly because both Nara and Tendai monks participated in these debates. For the sake of convenience, I use the term here to refer to those debates that arose only when a Tendai monk was lecturing or when debates clearly focused on Tendai doctrines. Hossō doctrines appearing in such texts as the *Jōyuishikiron honbunshō* 成唯識論本文抄 and *Jōyuishikiron dōgakushō* 成唯識論同学鈔 include topics such as whether Amida is a *saṃbhogakāya* or *nirmāṇakāya* Buddha (*Mida hōō* 弥陀報応),¹ or the existence of icchantikas of great compassion (*daihi sendai* 大悲闡提; T 65.411c18 and 66.27c9). These topics are related to Tendai doctrine, but to consider them under the rubric of “Tendai debate” seems excessive.

1. This is the title of the topic in Tendai sources. In the Hossō School's *Dōgakushō*, it was called *Annyō hōō* 安養報応 (T 66.585c17).

1. *Morning Session of the First Day*: On the first day, the lecturer was the Dharma-seal (*hōin* 法印) Greater Bishop Zennin 善仁 (1062–1139) from Onjōji and the questioner was Greater Dharma-master Gon'i 嚴意 (n.d.) from Tōdaiji. Their exchange is recorded as follows:²

Question: The sutra mentions, “The ocean-like emptiness of the flower-garland of the greater perfection of wisdom.” The teachers of our school have advanced three explanations of the phrase “ocean-like emptiness of the flower-garland.” How would you evaluate the third explanation?

Answer: I do not recall the three explanations with any certainty. What are they? If there are opinions, then we should critique them.

To proceed with the question: [In the *Fahua xuanyi*, fascicle 10], the first explanation refers to the principles of perfection of wisdom and entering the dharma-realm, and the second refers to the constant preaching of the *Huayan jing*. The third explanation refers to the Perfect-Sudden *Lotus Sutra*, but it is not clear. Now that the scriptural passage [is clear], how does this fit with the *Lotus Sutra*, particularly in light of the passage that [immediately follows], which “proclaims the practice of bodhisattvas over many eons”?

Question: According to fascicle fifty-seven of the *Yuqie lun*, are the two sense organs of nose and tongue established in the thirty-two marks of the Tathāgata?

Answer: The two sense organs of nose and tongue do not appear in the list of thirty-two marks.

Doubt: The three sense organs of eye, tongue, and body are mentioned in the thirty-two marks. Why aren't the ears and nose?

Answer: The organs themselves [composed of pure matter] receive sensory input, and the objects of perception are sensed through the physical organs. For proof, note that within the assisting [physical] organs, no distinction is found between the ears and the nose. Is this found through pure matter?

The structure of the debate is two questions and two answers. The first question is based on a passage from chapter 2, “Preaching,” in the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings*: “Next I preached the twelve types of *vaipulya* sutras, the great perfection of wisdom and the ocean-like emptiness of the flower-garland, and proclaimed the bodhisattva practices that require eons” (T 9.386b25–26, with

2. I have relied on materials printed by the “Research on Debates Group” (Rongi Kenkyukai 論義研究会) of the National Institute of Japanese Literature (Kokubungaku Kenkyū Shiryōkan 国文学研究資料館). Begun in 1995, the group had Yamazaki Makoto 山崎 誠 of the National Institute of Japanese Literature, Nagamura Makoto 永村 真 of Nihon Joshi Daigaku, and Komine Kazuaki 小峰和明 of Rikkyō Daigaku as its main members. Also participating were Kusunoki Junshō 楠 淳証, Sonehara Satoshi 曾根原理, Ebina Nao 海老名尚, Takayama Yūki 高山有紀, Hayashi Fumiko 林 文子, and Matsuo Kōichi 松尾恒一. The first part of this article is based on information from this group, in particular the identification of the scriptural sources for the debates.

changes based on the Song, Yuan, Ming, and palace canons). The respondent (lecturer) does not seem to understand the intent of the question. The questioner then follows up on the question, explaining that it is based on a passage from the *Fahua xuanyi* (T 33.806a1–12). He asks why the explanation of the teaching mentions eons of practice and yet refers to the Perfect-Sudden *Lotus Sutra*. Because the respondent's answer has been eliminated, we are not able to understand how it might have reconciled this discrepancy. Whatever the case, it clearly focused on the passage of the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings* that mentions great perfection of wisdom.

This passage had already been noted in Japan by Saichō in his commentary on the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings*:

The great perfection of wisdom belongs to the period of butter [the fourth of the five teachings]. The ocean-like emptiness of the flower-garland belongs to the time of the vows of Samantabhadra and the ocean-seal samādhi; it pervades the five time-periods. The entry into the Dharma-realm [here] is called the flower-garland. The ocean-seal samādhi is called ocean-like emptiness. The phrase, “proclaimed the bodhisattva practices that require eons” reveals that [Śākyamuni Buddha] had not yet explained the direct path.

(DZ 3: 639, lines 4–7)

No indication exists that this passage from the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings* was the subject of much attention at this time. Moreover, the respondent's difficulty in understanding the intent of the question suggests that it was not a frequent topic. However, because of its connection with a passage in the tenth fascicle of the *Fahua xuanyi*, it must have been related to the interpretation of this text and been a topic of discussion in China. It may have come to the attention of monks because of the oddity of lining up terms in a scripture that were used in the Tendai classification of five teachings, namely the perfection of wisdom (*Hannya*) and flower-garland (*Huayan/Kegon*).

The next question concerned the relation between the thirty-two marks of a Tathāgata and the six sense organs. The questioner asks whether some sense organs are not mentioned in the fifty-seventh fascicle of the *Yuqie lun*'s exposition of the thirty-two marks of the Tathāgata (T 30.619c14–26). The respondent replies that the nose and the tongue are not mentioned. The questioner then replies that, in fact, the eye, tongue, and body are mentioned, but the nose and ears are not, and then asks why this would be the case. The respondent had probably forgotten that the breadth and length of the Tathāgata's tongue are in fact described. Thus the questioner ascertained the status of the ears and nose in the record.

In these two exchanges, the respondent's answer is subject to further questioning or having the questioner further clarify his intention. Whether or not the

Tendai and Nara sides of the debate were able to reconcile their different stances in a convincing way is unclear. However, the records of the debate appear to represent the questioner as the winner in this session.

2. *The Evening of the First Night*: The lecturer was Supernumerary Master of Discipline Kakushin 覺心 (d. 1141) of Onjōji. The questioner was the Greater Dharma-master Han'en 範縁 (n.d).

Question: The teachers of our school cite the phrase, “entering the concentration in which all appears as an illusion” (*nyogen zanmai* 如幻三昧) from the *Yingluo jing*. Which of the ten grounds does one enter at that time?

Answer: Any of the grounds.

Advancing the question: According to the ninth fascicle of the *Mohe zhiguan*, “Entering the concentration in which all appears as an illusion occurs in the tenth ground.” But according to the *Yingluo jing* itself, one enters that concentration at the third ground. Why do these differ?

Answer: Because there are horizontal and vertical senses.

Question: Does the *Sutra of the Benevolent King* (*Renwang jing*) elucidate the mundane?

Answer: Three teachings are contained in the *Sutra of the Benevolent King*. The Pervasive teaching is mundane, but the Distinct and Perfect teachings are supramundane. In general, both the mundane and supramundane are fully elucidated.

Advancing the question: In the exposition of this issue, the mundane is not elucidated. But in regard to this, don't the passages from the sutra explain the mundane?

Answer: The Distinct and Perfect teachings are supramundane; thus the sutra elucidates the supramundane. The mundane is not the primary issue (*shōji* 正事). Can we say that the mundane is not explained in any of the three teachings?

The first question concerns which of the ten grounds one attains when one enters the concentration in which all appears as an illusion (*nyogen zanmai* 如幻三昧). This concentration is described in the first fascicle of the *Yingluo jing* (T 24.1015a2). The respondent replies: any of the grounds. The questioner then notes that although the ninth fascicle of Zhanran's commentary on Zhiyi's *Mohe zhiguan* states that the tenth ground is attained (T 46. 411c29), the *Yingluo jing* states that the third ground is attained. He then restates his question by asking why these claims differ. That is, the questioner is asking about the *Yingluo jing*'s position in light of the relevant passage from the *Mohe zhiguan*. In the second answer, the respondent reconciles the differing positions with the statement that both horizontal and vertical senses must be considered. The record ends at this point. In a horizontal interpretation, differing positions are juxtaposed without any hierarchical consideration. In a vertical interpretation, the differing posi-

tions are arranged hierarchically. This answer may have satisfied both the questioner and the respondent.

The second question concerns whether the *Sutra of the Benevolent King* is a mundane or a supramundane teaching, in other words, whether the teaching lies within or transcends the three realms of desire, form, and formlessness. In the four divisions used in Tendai's classification of doctrines, the first two are mundane and the last two supramundane. The respondent replies that because the teachings of the *Sutra of the Benevolent King* can be classified as Pervasive, Distinct, and Perfect teachings, the sutra's teachings are both mundane and supramundane. The questioner considers a different view, suggesting that mundane teachings are not elucidated, and then asks whether mundane teachings are put forth in the text. The respondent denies this, stating that it is a supramundane teaching, and that "mundane teachings are not primary." He thus slightly amends his first answer. This set of questions and answers is led by the questioner's position. When the term "primary" is used, it suggests that a secondary interpretation might exist and that this could be the respondent's means of reconciling the two views.

3. *The First Question of the Morning of the Second Day*: The lecturer is the Supernumerary Master of Discipline Ryūkaku 隆覚 of Kōfukuji. The questioner is the Greater Dharma-master Sonchin 尊珍 (b. 1306) of Enryakuji.

Question: This fascicle of the [*Lotus*] sutra includes the parable of the three carts and the burning house. For whom was the parable of the burning house preached?

Answer: In the scripture, it was preached for [Śākyamuni's] four great disciples or for those defiled beings who seek human or celestial power. The phrase "defiled beings who seek human or celestial power" is found in Vasubandhu's commentary (*upadeśa*). The issue is not clear. As for the single truth [inscribed on] the palm leaves of the *Lotus Sutra*, although remote from [the sutra's origins] in India and [from its Chinese translator] Kumārajīva, the praises of the seven parables of the *Lotus Sutra* have flourished in Japan. If we open the relevant fascicles and thoroughly investigate the context, wasn't the skillful parable of the burning house preached for those like Mahākāśyapa? These śrāvakas had spent a number of years in Mṛgadāva and realized arhathood in which their defilements were extinguished. When they went to Vulture's Peak, the goal was revealed. Now why would they have arrived at the goal of [rebirth as a] human or god? If the [parable were preached] primarily for the four great śrāvakas and secondarily for those who are defiled, then no passage is found in [Vasubandhu's] commentary indicating that it was preached for the four major śrāvakas. Was there a passage in the sutra indicating that the parable was preached for those seeking power that has been cut out?

Answer: The teacher from Zizhou 淄州 [Huizhao] offered two explanations.

The first is that the parable was offered for the four principal disciples when they sought [rebirth] as a human or god. It referred to expedient [teachings] of the past in speaking in this way. The second is that the passage was specifically for the four great disciples and secondarily for those who sought the human and divine vehicles [missing characters].

Several places in this record have missing characters, making the reading and interpretation of it difficult. The “Parable” chapter of the second fascicle of the *Lotus Sutra* contains the parable of the three-vehicles and the burning house, one of seven parables in the *Lotus Sutra*; this parable is the subject of this debate and it is connected with the three rounds of preaching (*sanshū seppō* 三周說法). The three rounds refer to events described in the “Expedient Means” chapter and “Parable” chapter of the *Lotus Sutra*. When Śākyamuni preaches the effectiveness of the wondrous Dharma to Śāriputra in the “Expedient Means” chapter and the first portion of the “Parable” chapter, he causes Śāriputra alone to enter and realize the one-vehicle; this is called the first round, or preaching through principle. The next round, preaching through similes and parables, is found in the chapters “Parable,” “Belief and Understanding,” “Medicinal Herbs,” and “Bestowal of Prophecies,” in which Śākyamuni preaches to his four great disciples, including Mahākāśyapa, leading them to realization of the one-vehicle. The third round, preaching through clarifying the Buddha’s connection to his disciples from prior lives, is based on the chapters of the “Conjured City,” “Prophecies of Buddhahood for the Five Hundred Disciples,” and the “Conferral of Predictions on Learners and Arhats,” by which all the remaining śrāvakas are led to realize the one-vehicle.

This form of analysis first appeared in Fayun’s 法雲 (467–529) commentary, the *Fahua yiji* 法華義記 (T 33.601a11–25), and was then picked up in Zhiyi’s *Fahua wenju* (T 34.45c15–48c12) and Cien’s *Fahua xuanzan* (T 34.694c23–695a4). Their understanding of these categories was generally similar.

In this portion of the debate, the questioner, speaking from the Tendai perspective, asked for whom was the parable of the three-vehicles and the burning house preached. The respondent replied that it was preached for Śākyamuni’s four great disciples and for those who seek the power of the human or celestial realms. This answer is based on the following passage from Vasubandhu’s commentary on the *Lotus Sutra*: “The seven parables are preached for the seven types of sentient beings who have defiled natures.... What are the seven types? 1. humans who seek power; 2. those who seek the deliverance of śrāvakas; 3. those who seek the Mahāyāna; 4. those who are fixed [in their pursuit of Hīnayāna]; 5. those who are not fixed [in following Mahāyāna]; 6. those who accumulate merits; and 7. those who do not accumulate merit” (T 26.17b23–29). The respondent chose to focus on those who seek the power of humans and gods in his answer. The questioner then stated that this was counter to the actual scriptural passage

and that the response had seemed odd. In other words, he noted that the four great śrāvakas are not mentioned in Vasubandhu's commentary, nor are those seeking the power of human beings and gods mentioned in the "Parable" and other chapters of the *Lotus Sutra*. The respondent then chose to rely on a passage from Zizhou Huizhao's 淄州慧沼 *Determining the doctrines of [Cien's] commentary on the Lotus Sutra* (*Fahua xuanzan yijue* 法華玄贊義決) for his second answer. The relevant passage is as follows.

Question: In the parable of the burning house, Śāriputra asks that it be preached for twelve hundred people, all of whom are arhats. Why does [Vasubandhu's] treatise state that it was preached for sentient beings on the path who are afflicted with defilements?

Answer: There are two explanations. One discusses the distant past [本] in order to preach the provisional [權]. The distant past refers to worldlings [in this case]. Now, revealing [what has been hidden in] the parable, [Vasubandhu] says it is for those beset with defilements. In other words, because it is discussing events of long ago, no contradiction exists. Second, in accord with the request of the śrāvakas, it is primarily for the arhats and secondarily for those still on the path; on the basis of the secondary [audience], we say it refers to worldlings. Arhats are referred to at the beginning of the passage; thus the commentary is abbreviated and does not explain this. The sutra's basic tenet is the elucidation of the one-vehicle. Shouldn't we know of the differences in vehicles from the "Medicinal Herbs" chapter? Because it explains a variety of vehicles, it takes śrāvakas who are still on the path and directs them to the Mahāyāna. This is known from the beginning of the passage and does not have to be explained in detail. (T 34.868a27–b6)

The respondent bases his answer on Huizhao's understanding, arguing that the statement that the parable of the three carts and the burning house was preached for those human beings and gods who sought power referred to a time in the past when the śrāvakas were worldlings. This debate uses a new perspective that situates the parable in the past to reconcile it with the Tendai view that the parable was preached for the four great śrāvakas.

4. *The Evening Session of the Third Day*: The lecturer was the Past Lecturer Gōkaku 豪覚 (d. 1135) of Miidera. The questioner was the Greater Dharma-master Ken'en 兼円 (d. 1132) of Kōfukuji.

Question: ([*Fahua*] *wenju* 8, "Devadatta" chapter passage). The teachers of our school suggest three explanations for the issue of whether the Nāga palace changes or not. What is the second?

Answer: The second is that it changes.

As for this [answer], it seems be no different from the first answer. What about this?

Answer: The second explanation is that earth is piled up to change it. Isn't this different from the first explanation?

Question: According to a source (*Yuqie lun*, fasc. 1), "In order to elucidate eyes, a variety of types are established." Is an explanation of ten types of eye established?

Further advancing the issue: Ten types of eye are not established.

In regard to this, the ten types of eye are established in the *Huayan jing*. How can you say [they are not established]?

Answer: How can you say this? Isn't it clear that no single intention for ten eyes is found?

A further criticism: When the various explanations are considered, we find three, five, nine, and eleven types of eyes, but no text with ten types of eyes.

Lecturer: The six types of sense organs generally refer to worldlings, but because the ten types of eye refer to the ultimate stages [of the path], perhaps they were not discussed.

The first exchange concerned whether the Nāga palace changed or did not. In the first question, the questioner had in mind a passage from the eighth fascicle of Zhanran's *Fahua wenju ji* (T 34.314a29–b13). In the "Devadatta" chapter of the *Lotus Sutra*, when Śākyamuni and Wisdom Accumulated Bodhisattva are sitting in space and Śākyamuni is preaching, Mañjuśrī appears from the "Nāga palace of King Sāgara in the ocean" (T 9.35a22–26). The Nāga palace is explained in three ways in Zhanran's texts. In the second, the palace is said to "change and yet to come from the unchanging" (T 34.314c5)—this becomes the focus of the debate topic. Because the realization of Buddhahood by the Nāga girl is usually the subject of discussions of the "Devadatta" chapter, the use of the palace as a debate topic is unusual. However, the way in which Zhanran sets it up in the *Wenju ji* as a question and answer suggests that it was already being discussed in China.

The first answer notes that the Nāga palace changed or transformed. The questioner counters this statement by asking how that would be any different from the first of the three explanations that Zhanran presented. The respondent notes that the second explanation indicated that the earth was measured and changed, and that this differs from the first explanation in which the ocean changed, thereby reconciling the views. The record of the exchange stops at this point, probably indicating that it stopped with this answer or that there was no possibility of developing the topic further. The lecturer's view is presented in a one-sided way; once the respondent accepted it, the debate probably ended.

The second question and answer are based on the third fascicle of the *Yuqie lun* (the *Record of questions and answers* mistakenly has this as the first fascicle), which mentions "many varieties of eyes" (T 30.292b14–29). The questioner asks whether ten types of eye are posited, and the answerer replies that this is not the case. The questioner then presses his case by noting a passage in the *Huayan jing*

that asserts that ten types of eye exist (T 9.616c23–26). However, the answerer does not seem to be able to adequately answer the question: “How can you say this? Isn’t it clear that no single intention for ten eyes is found?” The answer seems very ambiguous. In most cases, the exchange would have ended after two questions and two answers, but the questioner was annoyed and pressed further; the text describes this as “further criticism” and consists of the questioner again stating his intent. In the last answer, the respondent (in other words, the lecturer) suggests, “The six sense faculties are generally thought of in terms of the worldling, but the ten eyes concern the ultimate stages [on the path] and are thus not discussed.”

Although this exchange is not very impressive, several aspects of it deserve mention. Both the questioner and answerer are involved in the search for an answer, as is evident from the continuation of the discussion beyond the set format of two questions and two answers. If both knew the topic before the actual debate (through a dream [*yumemi no gi* 夢見の儀]),³ the exchange would probably not have developed in this fashion. Consequently, the Hosshōji debates of this period must have been stressful for the participating monks. Even in the final answer, both the questioner and respondent were seeking a convincing position in the acceptance of the differences between worldlings and very advanced practitioners.

5. *Morning Session of the Fourth Day*: The lecturer was Past Lecturer Benkaku 弁覚 (d. 1142), and the questioner was the Greater Dharma-master Myōkai 明海 (n.d.) of Kōfukuji.

Question: Was Kāśyapa present at the *Lotus Sutra* assembly? (*Wenju*, “Emerging from the Earth” chapter, number 9)

Answer: Both.

Advancing the question: In explanation [according to one text], “he had already heard about [the Buddha’s] long life in [the assembly],” but [he] is not mentioned in the assembly at the beginning of the sutra. Why did you not know this? Moreover, according to the *Nirvāṇa Sutra*, before, we were all called beings with wrong views. What about this?

Answer: We find one view in Zhanran’s explanation, particularly with the statement that “he had already heard about [the Buddha’s] long life.” Why must this necessarily be interpreted as referring to his presence in the *Lotus Sutra* assembly?

The Master of Discipline Kakuju 覺樹 stated: The statement “he had already heard about [the Buddha’s] long life in [the assembly]” sounds as if he were present. So what is the point of contention?

The lecturer said: Because he had already heard about [the Buddha’s] lifespan

3. The topic of debates was communicated beforehand through a dream ritual, a procedure that continues in the Assembly for Cien (Jion-e 慈恩会); see NAGAMURA 1994; MATSUO 1997.

in the *Lotus* assembly, then this is said not to have been a provisional place [in the assembly]. It should not be considered to be a second-hand account.

Zennin stated: In other *sutras*, he seems to have been at the *Lotus Sutra* assembly. We should not be arguing over how we interpret this.

Question: In the sixteen ways [of analyzing the four noble truths], what is classified as ultimate and what is mundane? (*Niepan shu* 7)

Answer: [none given]

Advancing the question: Guanding 灌頂 categorizes this matter as being without ultimate or mundane, but with the remainder as mundane [T 38.130a29]. As for this, doesn't the *Cheng[shih] lun* 成美論 clearly explain the sixteen aspects? As for distinguishing between the ultimate and the mundane, even if there is an explanation, there is no basis for this teaching. The sense of the treatise is [missing character; unclear meaning]. Are the teaching and practice of emptiness the same or distinct?

The Office of Monastic Affairs (Sōgō 僧綱) generally criticize this, saying that both the teaching and practice of emptiness are the same. Why should a distinction be made between them?

The lecturer says: They are distinct.

The first question concerns whether Kāśyapa is present when the *Lotus Sutra* is preached. The issue is whether or not Kāśyapa would have heard about the Buddha's immeasurable lifespan. On the basis of passages in Zhanran's commentary on Zhiyi's *Fahua wenju* (the *Fahua wenju ji* 法華文句記; the *Record of questions and answers* mistakenly gives the source as *Fahua wenju* itself), one could argue that he had done so (T 34.326c1–4), but on the basis of the *Nirvāṇa Sutra*, he would not have heard about it (T 12.648a27–29). An effort to reconcile these views is discussed in the debate. A particularly interesting aspect of the discussion is found in the way in which the debate is extended beyond the two sets of questions and answers found in most debates in the *Record of questions and answers*, as the Master of Discipline Kakuju (1081–1139), the lecturer Benkaku, and Zennin expressed their opinions.

The second question concerns classifying the sixteen aspects of realizing the four noble truths as ultimate or mundane [俗]. The content is difficult to understand, but after the two sets of questions and answers, someone from the Office of Monastic Affairs criticizes the lecturer's answer by maintaining that the teaching and practice of emptiness are the same. This demonstrates that the debates were not simply a formalistic exercise, but were constituted on the spot.

The preceding discussion has focused on those occasions when Tendai monks served as lecturers; the discussions often focused on resolving the contradictions between various scriptures and treatises. Debates of the early Heian period had often focused on the issue of whether the three-vehicles should be categorized as provisional and the one-vehicle as ultimate (the Tendai position),

or whether the one-vehicle should be categorized as provisional and the three-vehicles as ultimate (the Hossō position). In contrast, by the twelfth century, the debate topics were becoming narrower and more specialized, with the differences at times being nitpicking. When the Hosshōji's eightfold lectures with the participation of monks from both Tendai and the Nara schools are considered, some of the debates of 1131 (such as discussions of the ten types of eye) do not display much evidence of the long history of doctrinal debate between the two schools. In the next section, the 1131 debates are compared with those from the early Heian period.

Issues in Heian Period Polemics

Doctrinal disputes were common in the early Heian period. The dispute between Saichō and Tokuitsu 徳一 (approximately 760–840) is famous, but such debates seem to have continued, often under the title of “disputes” (*sōron* 諍論). For example, by imperial request in 824, the Sanron monk Gen'ei 玄叡 (d. 840) wrote the *Daijō Sanron daigishō* 大乘三論大義鈔 (Compendium of the great teaching of the Mahāyāna Three Treatises) in which he enumerated some of the points of dispute current at the time. The Tendai monk Enchin's 円珍 (814–891) *Shoke kyōsō dōi ryakushū* 諸家教相同異略集 (A brief compilation of the similarities and differences among the schools), the Sanron monk Dōsen's 道詮 (fl. 850–875) *Gunke sōron* 群家諍論 (Disputes among the schools), and the Tendai monk Annen's 安然 *Kyōjisō* and *Kyōji sōron* 教時争論 (Disputes over teachings and time periods) delineate some of these issues (SUEKI 1995). What sort of issues were discussed in these debates?

TOPICS OF DEBATE IN THE WORKS BY SAICHŌ, GISHIN, AND GEN'EI

In Saichō's polemical writings, the arguments focused on asserting that the three-vehicles are provisional and the one-vehicle true, over and against Hossō opponents who argued that the one-vehicle is merely provisional and the three-vehicles are true. Recent research has revealed that this debate was preceded by disputes within the Chinese Faxiang (Jp. Hossō) School (TOKIWA 1972; FUKIHARA 1988). When Xuanzang 玄奘 (602–664) returned from his studies in India, a court-sponsored translation project was established. Disputes began between some of the leading monks who were both disciples of Xuanzang and who participated in the translation projects. On one side were monks who valued the one-vehicle position presented in Paramārtha's (499–569) translations. On the other side were those who agreed with the three-vehicle position presented in Xuanzang's “new” translations. Examples are the disputes between Lingrun 靈潤 and Shentai 神泰 or between Fabao 法宝 and Huizhao 慧沼. Fabao's *Jiujing yisheng foxing lun* 究竟一乘仏性論 (Treatise on the Buddha-nature of the unsurpassed one-vehicle)

was long thought lost, but a group led by Asada Masahiro of Ryūkoku University discovered a copy at Ishiyamadera 石山寺. Scholars are in agreement that this has been a major contribution to our understanding of the dispute between Saichō and Tokuitsu (ASADA 1986a and 1986b; TAMURA 1992).

TAMURA Kōyū's research (1992) on the dispute between Saichō and Tokuitsu is particularly detailed (for an analysis of the contents of Saichō's *Shugo kokkai ron*, see 19–46). The characteristics of the debate can be indicated on the basis of Tamura's research, which shows that major themes served as the focus of the dispute. For example, the first fascicle of Saichō's *Shugo kokkai shō* 守護国界章 (Essays on protecting the nation) includes the following topics:

1. Refutation of the slanderer of the Dharma's shallow system of the [Hossō] three times and teachings
2. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the [Kegon] four teachings
3. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the eight [actually the Tendai five] teachings
4. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the [determined and] indeterminate teachings [in the four means of teaching]
5. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the principles [such as the interpretation of the four noble truths used in the Tendai] four teachings
6. Refutation of Tokuitsu's critique of the stages of practice of the four teachings
7. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken criticism of the differences [in the stages of practice] of the three teachings [Pervasive, Distinct, and Perfect]
8. Refutation of Tokuitsu's critique of [the faculties of those receiving] the four teachings
9. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the [classification of teachings based on the] five flavors
10. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the [*Mohe*] *zhiguan* ([The great] calming and contemplation)
11. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of ultimate calming and contemplation
12. Refutation of Tokuitsu's mistaken critique of the three virtues [liberation, wisdom, and dharma-body] associated with calming and contemplation
13. Refutation of Tokuitsu's [*Shikanron*], which mixes Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna calming and contemplation. (DZ 2: 151–52)

The topics of dispute listed here extend across a variety of subjects, including the three teachings, four teachings, eight teachings, and calming and contemplation, with their content being situated in the doctrinal disputes between Tendai and Hossō. According to Tamura, if we see them in light of the dispute over three-vehicle thought versus one-vehicle thought, Saichō's topics of debate can be said to focus on this main divisive issue between the two sects

(TAMURA 1992, 26). However we divide the topics, they clearly focus on major differences in thought.

Gishin's 義真 (781–833) *Tendai Hokke shūgishū* 天台法華宗義集 (Collection of doctrines of the Tendai Lotus School) also played a major role in early Tendai debates.⁴ Eight general categories were established in the text: the four teachings, five flavors, one-vehicle, ten such-likes, twelve causes and conditions, two truths, four types of samādhi, and three basic types of affliction. Most scholars believe that the system of topics (*gika* 義科) was further analyzed and organized around these eight topics sometime during or after the Kamakura period. Whatever the case, Gishin's text indicates the general outline of major debate topics before they were further divided.

In a similar fashion, Gen'ei's *Daijō Sanron daigishō* listed the topics of disputation:

Next, we correctly relate the issues under dispute. The differing teachings of the various schools are many and complex, but we can generally categorize them in ten groups: 1. disputes over emptiness and existence; 2. disputes concerning permanence and impermanence; 3. disputes over the status of the five types of nature; 4. disputes over having or lacking [Buddha-] nature; 5. disputes over whether beings have determined or undetermined natures; 6. disputes over rebirth through transformation; 7. disputes over which, between the three-vehicles and the one-vehicle, represents ultimate truth and which is merely provisional; 8. disputes over [whether the *Lotus Sutra* maintains the position of] three or four vehicles; 9. disputes over matching teachings with time periods; 10. disputes over what is taught and not taught. (BZ 75: 58a1–5)

Gen'ei focused on doctrine, specifically the areas on which the various schools disagreed. This is reflected in his notes concerning the monks involved in debates, such as “The questioner was from Hossō, the respondent from Sanron” or “The questioner was from Sanron, the respondent from Tendai.” We know that the participants came from a variety of schools; the performance of debates had not yet become formalistic and the questions and answers were exchanged in a free manner. For example, note the following debate over the issue of three versus four vehicles:

Question: The words “three-vehicles” are clearly stated in the scripture. Where is a scriptural passage supporting the four vehicles?

Answer: This is found in the *Lotus Sutra*, where it mentions a goat-cart, deer-cart, ox-cart, and white-ox-cart. This is because the first three carts are expedients; they exist in name, but not in reality. The last cart is real.

4. See the explanation (*kaidai*) in TENDAI SHŪTEN HENSANJO 1994, Ronsō 1 *Gika Rodan Hokke genji*. [Editorial note: for an English translation and discussion of the *Tendai Hokke shūgishū*, see SWANSON 1995.]

Question: How is the third cart, the ox-cart, different from the fourth, the white-ox-cart?

Answer: The third cart is drawn by a water-buffalo; its color is black.

(BZ 75: 99c9–14)

The debate took the traditional question-answer format, but the contents developed freely. However, no sections are found corresponding to formal phrases in the *Record of questions and answers* that begin with “As for this...” or “Advancing the argument...” In the *Daijō Sanron daigishō*, the differences between the Tendai and Sanron positions on the three and four vehicles are clearly stated, but there is not much sense of winning or losing the argument. Moreover, little evidence is found of efforts to find a position that transcends and reconciles those of the opposing schools.

As the foregoing analysis of the debates of 1131 demonstrated, participants focused on differences in thought, paying special attention to divergences and contradictions in texts. The *Record of questions and answers* has still not been completely investigated; a detailed study still must be done. However, in general the debates at Hosshōji seem to have aimed at some sort of reconciliation of the opposing viewpoints of the schools.

RELATION TO THE *TAISHŪ NIHYAKUDAI* 台宗二百題
(TWO HUNDRED TENDAI TOPICS)

Around the time of Ryōgen 良源 (912–985), a set of two hundred topics was compiled, thereby fixing the contents of the debates (OZAKI 1971). These can be compared with a text, the *Taishū nihyakudai*, compiled during the Tokugawa period (KOURA 1966). According to the introduction of that text, after Ryōgen had established the two hundred topics, three of his students—Genshin 源信 (942–1017), Kaku’un 覺運 (953–1007), and Kan’in 寬印 (n.d.)—took ninety of the most essential topics, classified them into groups, and called them the “essential points of the school” (*shūyō* 宗要). Later, these were further divided into *gika*, or debate topics—frequently those topics that could be contrasted with the positions of other schools—and *mon’yō* 門要, literally the “essence of questions” but treated as a category for supplementary questions. In 1711, the *Taishū nihyakudai* assumed the structure it has today (KOURA 1966, 13).

As for the Tendai debates of 1131, the topics from the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings* and the three rounds of preaching from the *Lotus Sutra* had long traditions behind them. Topics connected with the three rounds of preaching appear in the following sections of the *Taishū nihyakudai*: śrāvakas who remain as arhats or pratyekabuddhas without striving to surpass those stages (*jūka shōmon* 住果声聞, *shūyō* 48); whether those who hear the three rounds of preaching attain realization (*sanshū shōnyū* 三周証入, *shūyō* 49); whether those

who hear the three rounds have fixed natures (*sanshū jōshō* 三周定性, *shūyō* 53); the karmic connections of those who hear the three rounds (*sanshū kechien* 三周結緣, *gika* 14); and the strength of beginningless ignorance (*mushi mummyō kōhaku* 無始無明厚薄, *gika* 15).

As was mentioned above, the three rounds of preaching had been discussed by many since the time of Fayun. What sort of people discussed it and developed their own views of it in Japan? In *Tendai shoseki sōgō mokuroku* 天台書籍綜合目錄 (The comprehensive bibliography of Tendai documents), the following eleven authors are listed as having composed texts with the title *Private record concerning the doctrines of the three rounds* (*Sanshūgi shiki* 三周義私記): Annen, Anne 安慧, Yuimyō 惟命, Senkan 千觀, Kakuun, Shōhan 勝範, Shōseki 勝碩, Sange 山下, Jōchū 靜仲, Yakuchi 藥智, and Eshin 惠心. Other short explanations (*tanshaku* 短釈) with similar titles were compiled until the late medieval period, including the *Sanshūgi shaku* 三周義釈 in 1263, the *Sanshūgi shishō* 三周義私抄 and the *Sanshūgi shō* 三周義鈔 in 1286, the *Sanshūgi shō* 三周義抄 copied in 1417, the *Sanshū shōnyū* 三周証入 copied in 1424, the *Sanshūgi monshō* 三周義聞抄 copied in 1432, the *Sanshūgi shisō* 三周義私抄 copied in 1440, the *Sanshūgi shō* 三周義抄 copied in 1463, the *Sanshūgi shi yōi* 三周義私用意 copied in 1497, the *Sanshūgi shishō* 三周義私抄 composed in 1501 by Kenjō 賢盛, the *Sanshūgi shōan* 三周儀精案 copied in 1537, and others too numerous to mention.

An analysis of all of these would take too long, so I will limit my discussion to the relation of the *Sanshūgi shiki* by Eshin (also known as Genshin) and its relation to the *Record of questions and answers*. Genshin analyzed the three rounds into five components: preaching, understanding, ascertainment of the preaching, predictions of the realization of Buddhahood, and joy. These were discussed in terms of whether figures had determined or undetermined natures. However, in the *Records of questions and answers* the determinate or indeterminate nature of the audience for the parable of the three-vehicles and the burning house is not mentioned.

The passage from the *Sutra of innumerable meanings* is only discussed in passing in *Taishū nihyakudai* in a section on the extended preaching of the *Huayan jing* (*jichō kegon* 時長華嚴, *mon'yō* 43). The topic, however, had been important in Chinese Buddhist debates.

I would like to suggest a hypothesis concerning the titles of texts on debates. During the Heian period, both Tendai and Nara works on debate were called private records (*shiki* 私記). As HIRAI Shun'ei (1986) has suggested, this usage probably began with the Sanron monk Jitsubin 實敏 (788–858). Jitsubin's *Nitaigi shiki* 二諦義私記 (Private record on the doctrine of the two truths) has been printed, introduced, and studied by Irō Takatoshi (1979–1980). This was probably the first occasion for this usage of *shiki*, and it soon became used by both Tendai and Nara authors. However, at some point Nara monks came to favor the term “short explanation” (*tanshaku* 短釈) instead of *shiki*. Although I cannot

determine exactly when this occurred, Nara School discussion of debate topics are preserved today in materials with the title of “short explanation.” This change in titles would seem to reflect the tendency to delve into the minutest doctrinal details.

Conclusion

In this investigation of the Tendai debates of 1131 at Hosshōji, I have been able to determine the historical background of only two topics: a passage from the *Sutra of Innumerable Meanings* and questions concerning the three rounds of preaching from the *Lotus Sutra*. When these were compared with similar topics in the *Taishū nihyakudai*, differences in approach to debate could be discerned as approaches to debate evolved. The perspective in the *Record of questions and answers* was clearly influenced by the format of being based on questions asked after a lecture. When the various monks of the four major temples took part in the debates, they did so without basing themselves on the minutely detailed arguments used within their respective schools. This was one of the unique characteristics of focusing debates on questions posed after lectures.

Of course, the debate topics had long historical backgrounds. An example of this, which I was unable to explore in detail, is the discussion on the second day concerning the three rounds of preaching; these were related to the arguments on whether the teachings on the three-vehicles and one-vehicle should be considered provisional or ultimate. Even so, the contents of the *Record of questions and answers* seems to have a distinctive quality.

The eightfold lectures at Hosshōji consisted of monks from both the Nara and Tendai traditions advancing their views of Buddhist doctrine and displaying their learning. They discussed the contradictions they found in Buddhist scriptures, particularly the differences in the emphases of Tendai and the Nara schools, but then sought ways to resolve them. In any event, the impression remains that this was a very intellectual approach to Buddhism.

REFERENCES

ABBREVIATIONS

- BZ *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本仏教全書. Nanjō Bun'yū 南条文雄, Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, Ōmura Seigai 大村西崖, and Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, eds. Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1912–1922.
- DZ *Dengyō daishi zenshū* 伝教大師全集. Ed. Hieizan Senshūin Fuzoku Eizan Gakuin 比叡山專修院附属叡山学院. 5 vols. Tokyo: Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1989.

- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經. 85 vols. Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaigyoku 渡辺海旭, eds. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1932.

SECONDARY SOURCES

ASADA Masahiro 浅田正博

- 1986a Ishiyamadera shozō “Ichijō Busshō kukyō ron” kan dai ichi, kan dai ni no kenshutsu ni tsuite 石山寺所蔵「一乘仏性究竟論」巻第1・巻第2の検出について. *Ryūkoku Daigaku ronshū* 429: 75–79.
- 1986b Hōbō sen “Ichijō Busshō kukyō ron” kan dai yon, kan dai go no ryōkan ni tsuite 法宝撰「一乘仏性究竟論」巻第4・巻第5の両巻について. *Ryūkoku Daigaku Bukkyō bunka kenkyū kiyō* 25: 112–46.

FUKIHARA Shōshin 富貴原章信

- 1988 *Chūgoku Nihon bussō shisō-shi* 中国日本仏性思想史. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

HIRAI Shun'ei 平井俊栄

- 1986 Nanto Sanronshū shi no kenkyū josetsu 南都三論宗史の研究序説. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 44: 29–45.

ITŌ Takatoshi 伊藤隆寿

- 1979–1980 Jitsubin “Nitaigi shiki” no honbun shōkai 実敏『二諦義私記』の本文紹介. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō gakubu kenkyū kiyō* 37: 194–234; 38: 167–90.

KOMINE Kazuaki 小峰和明

- 1997 Chūsei no Hokke kōe 中世の法華講会. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 62: 58–64.

KOUDA Ryōsen 古宇田亮宣

- 1966 *Tendaishū rongi nihyakudai: Wayaku* 天台宗論義二百題一和訳. Tokyo: Ryūbunkan.

MATSUO Kōichi 松尾恒一

- 1997 Nanto Jion-e ni okeru yumemi no gi: Denshō to keisei 南都慈恩会における夢見の儀—伝承と形成. *Setsuwa denshōgaku* 5: 34–47.

MINOWA Kenryō 蓑輪顕量

- 1997 *Hokekyō rongi no sekai* 『法華經』論義の世界. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 62: 65–71.

NAGAMURA Makoto 永村 真

- 1994 Hōe to bunsho: Kōfukuji Yuima-e o tōshite 法会と文書—興福寺維摩会を通して. In *Chūsei jīn to hōe* 中世寺院と法会, ed. Satō Michiko 佐藤道子, 293–341. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.

ŌSHIMA Kaoru 大島 薫

- 1997 Chōken no *Hokekyō* kōshaku: “Daibabon” shaku o megutte 澄憲の法華

経講釈—「提婆品」釈をめぐって. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 62: 72–78.

OZAKI Kōjin 尾崎光尋

1971 *Nihon Tendai rongishi no kenkyū* 日本天台論義史の研究. Ōtsu: Hokke Daie Jimukyoku.

SUEKI Fumihiko 末本文美士

1995 *Heian shoki Bukkyō shisō no kenkyū* 平安初期仏教思想の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

SWANSON, Paul L., trans.

1995 *Collected Teachings of the Tendai Lotus School*. (English translation of Gishin's *Tendai Hokke shūgishū*) BDK English Tripitaka 97-II. Berkeley: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.

TAKAYAMA Yūki 高山有紀

1997 *Chūsei Kōfukuji Yuima-e no kenkyū* 中世興福寺維摩会の研究. Tokyo: Ben-sei Shuppan.

TAMURA Kōyū 田村晃祐

1992 *Saichō kyōgaku no kenkyū* 最澄教学の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TENDAI SHŪTEN HENSANJO 天台宗典編纂所

1994– *Zoku Tendaiishū zensho* 続天台宗全書. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TOKIWA Daijō 常盤大定

1972 *Busshō no kenkyū*. 仏性の研究. Reprint. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

YAMAZAKI Makoto 山崎 誠

1997 “Hokeyō” chūshaku no keifu 『法華経』注釈書の系譜. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kanshō* 62: 79–83.

[translated by Paul Groner]



Photo Archive of Japanese Religions

The Nanzan Institute has prepared an open-source collection of visual images related to Japanese religions, based on a donation of over 800 slides from Ian Reader, professor at Lancaster University. All images may be downloaded free of charge in two formats: one suitable for multimedia presentations and the other at high-resolution suitable for printing.

How to use:

<https://nirc.nanzan-u.ac.jp/en/activities/on-line-resources/>

Select an album from the Main Gallery.

You will be brought to a page with thumbnails of all the images in that album. There are two options here:

- (1) Clicking on any image will bring up a page with that image and related data.
- (2) Clicking on Start Slideshow will run you through the entire set of pictures. You can click on the circled images at the bottom to select another slide.

The menu bar at the top right of the slideshow gives you options for pausing and downloading. Clicking on the top left on the menu bar brings you back to the album's main page.

The search function in the menu bar covers all the data included in the descriptions.

When using an image for printed material, we ask that you add the following acknowledgement: "From the Photo Archives of the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, Nagoya, Japan."