



On the significance of the Daeseung saron hyeonui gi 大乘四論玄義記 for research on early Korean Buddhist thought

– Some initial observations focusing on hwajaeng

한국 고대불교사상사 연구에 있어서 《大乘四論玄義記》의 중요성 — 和靜사상의 배경에 대한 기초적 검토

저자 (Authors)	Jörg Plassen
출처 (Source)	한국사연구 , (136), 2007.3, 29–56 (28 pages) The Journal of Korean History , (136), 2007.3, 29–56 (28 pages)
발행처 (Publisher)	한국사연구회 The Association For Korean Historical Studies
URL	http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE01190726
APA Style	Jörg Plassen (2007). On the significance of the Daeseung saron hyeonui gi 大乘四論玄義記 for research on early Korean Buddhist thought. 한국사연구, (136), 29–56.
이용정보 (Accessed)	삼성현역사문화관 183.106.106.*** 2021/03/23 15:04 (KST)

저작권 안내

DBpia에서 제공되는 모든 저작물의 저작권은 원저작자에게 있으며, 누리미디어는 각 저작물의 내용을 보증하거나 책임을 지지 않습니다. 그리고 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물은 DBpia와 구독계약을 체결한 기관소속 이용자 혹은 해당 저작물의 개별 구매자가 비영리적으로만 이용할 수 있습니다. 그러므로 이에 위반하여 DBpia에서 제공되는 저작물을 복제, 전송 등의 방법으로 무단 이용하는 경우 관련 법령에 따라 민, 형사상의 책임을 질 수 있습니다.

Copyright information

Copyright of all literary works provided by DBpia belongs to the copyright holder(s) and Nurimedia does not guarantee contents of the literary work or assume responsibility for the same. In addition, the literary works provided by DBpia may only be used by the users affiliated to the institutions which executed a subscription agreement with DBpia or the individual purchasers of the literary work(s) for non-commercial purposes. Therefore, any person who illegally uses the literary works provided by DBpia by means of reproduction or transmission shall assume civil and criminal responsibility according to applicable laws and regulations.

<논 문>

On the significance of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* 大乘四論玄義記
for research on early Korean
Buddhist thought*
—Some initial observations focusing on
hwajaeng—

Jörg Plassen**

Some remarks on the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*
大乘四論玄義記 in the context of Chinese San-lun

The early history of San-lun in China was more complex than the

* This initial report on work in progress evolved from joint research with Prof. Choe Yeonshik 崔鉉植, Mokpo National University. The author should express his gratitude to the Secretariat for ASEM-Duo Fellowship in Seoul for a grant affording the opportunity for stays at each others' institutions. Furthermore, the author should like to express his deep gratitude to Prof. Ito Takatoshi 伊藤隆壽 for making available paper copies of the manuscript of the introductory section "Chojang jungga ui" 初章中假義(infra "Chojang jungga-ui Ms.") known to have been in the possession of Mr. Shiotome Masumi 潮留眞澄 from Osaka, and to Profs. Ishii Kosei 石井公成 and Choe Yeonshik 崔鉉植 for their kind intermediacy in this matter.

** Jun.Prof. Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

still widespread perception of a San-lun lineage originating with Seungnang 僧朗 and culminating with Chi-tsang 吉藏(549~623) suggests. Thus, the latter's teacher Fa-lang's 法朗(507~581) brandishing of two fellow-disciples as "Chung-chia shih" 中假師 ("Masters of the Middle and the provisional", adhering to a static dualism of reified "middle" and "provisional")¹⁾ also betrays the fact that what is known as the "San-lun lineage" only reflects the long-term success of the lineage claims of one among several more or less closely interrelated San-lun factions emerging in the 6th and 7th century. –In the light of the existence of these competing factions, the problem of the actual nature of the teachings propagated in Baekje San-lun and brought to Japan arises. Needless to say, the discovery of the origin of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* 大乘四論玄義記 gives important clues on this matter.

There have been various attempts to compare the contents of individual sections in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* with those of the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* 大乘玄論, a work usually ascribed to Chi-tsang. These comparisons have been triggered by obvious textual parallels and the circumstance that both texts –at first glance– seem to be of a rather similar encyclopedic nature, addressing a wealth of doctrinal issues. However, during our studies it became clear that, while the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* has been proven to be a collection of self-contained texts only loosely tied together,²⁾ the nature of the

1) As pointed out in a previous article, these tensions mirrored a conflict between non-meditators (notably, Fa-lang himself) and meditators (three of his fellow disciples –if you will, Süngnang's "true heirs"). Cf. this author's "Seung Dorang (aka. Seungnang, fl. 476?~512) from Goguryeo and his role in Chinese San-lun". *International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture*, vol. 5 (2005), 165–198.

2) Cf. this author's "Die Spuren der Abhandlung (Lun-chi): Exegese und

Daeseung saron hyeonui gi is vastly different in as much as—despite varying amounts of *gwon* recorded in the bibliographies— the extant fragments betray a rather monolithic structure. Thus, in the first section, labeled as “The meaning of the Middle and the provisional [according to] the ‘First stanza’” (“Chojang jungga ui” 初章中假義), the author Hyegyun 慧均 (n.d.) elaborates on the importance of the “Ch’u-chang” 初章 (Kor.: Chojang, lit. ‘First stanza’), a dialectical formula to be used especially in the initial phase of training in order to analyze (and deconstruct) pairs of seemingly opposed terms.

The formula is introduced in both a long and a short variant. As both basically follow the same line of reasoning, presently it may suffice to introduce the short one:

若言 有非有故有 有是不有有
亦言 他有有可有 有是有故有
今 有不可有 有是不有有也

If one says : “What has [characteristics] has [them] because it is not [something] that has”, [then] what has is [something] that has [and yet] does not have.

Also, [if] one says: “The others have [something] that has which can be considered [something] that has”, [then] what has [characteristics] has [them] because it is [something] that has.

Now, what has [characteristics] cannot be considered [something] that has. What has is [something] that has and yet does not have.³⁾

According to Hyegyun’s explanations, once this formula has been mastered a wealth of difficult topics may be readily understood:

Übung im San-lun des sechsten Jahrhunderts.” PhD diss., University of Hamburg, 2002. [2000], pp. 14–16.

3) *Chojang jungga-ui Ms.*, p. 1b.

… 若明了初章則二諦境智佛性二河感應等無相衆義易可解也

If one understands the “First stanza”, then scores of meanings without characteristics such as [those of] the “two scrutinies”, “object and wisdom”, “Buddha-nature”, “the two rivers”, “stimulus and response”, etc. easily can be unraveled.⁴⁾

At least part of these topics later reoccur as the headings of individual sections (appearing even in cross-references between these sections), and it may be surmised that the remaining ones were covered in the missing chapters. – Aside from the coherent nature of the text, which finds its expression also in cross references between the chapters,⁵⁾ the above passage moreover quite obviously indicates that the introduction to the application of the “Chojang” 初章 formula is an important theme running through the text.

If we compare the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* with those of Hyegyün’s *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* in terms of contents, it can be observed that – notwithstanding certain differences in the attention dedicated to different groups of opponents –⁶⁾ the basic attitudes towards the

4) *Chojang jungga-ui Ms.*, p. 1b. Also cf. Ôchō Enichi 横超慧日, “Siron gengi no Shoshō chūge gi” 四論玄義の初章中假義, in: *Iwai Hakushi shōju kinen ronbunshū* 石井博士古稀記念論文集, Tokyo: 1963, pp. 148–157, here p. 153, where the characters 無相 added at the side of the text are omitted.

5) Cf., e.g., the reference to the chapter “Beopsin ui” 法身義 in ZZ.74.79b.

6) Prof. Choe Yeonshik has observed a certain difference in as much as Hyegyün seems to pay somewhat more attention to the emerging She-lun/Seomnon faction, often referring to it as one of the already enumerated “four houses”. – Hence also the reference to the *saron* 四論 (“four treatises”) in the title of the work: As pointed out by Prof. Choe already in the initial stage of our project, in contrast to the case of Chi-tsang’s *San-lun hsüan i* 三論玄義, the title of Hyegyün’s work does not refer to the “dark” meaning contained in four authoritative texts, but a hidden meaning transcending those of four classes of treatises written by opponents (i.e., the adherents of the She-lun/Seomnon 攝論, Ti-lun/Jiron 地論, Ch’eng-

Buddhist Way, and the usual lines of argumentation are virtually the same: In fact, even much of the contents are more or less identical. These overall similarities, striking verbatim textual parallels, and—even more in the case of Hyegyun—by their frequency almost notorious references to Fa-lang’s dicta indicate how much both authors are indebted to the latter.

As shown in previous research, both the introductory section of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*, which as we have seen may be considered to provide the hermeneutic framework for the whole text, and the *Lun-chi* 論述, a *hsüan* 玄 on the *Chung-lun* 中論 constituting the last part of the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*,⁷⁾ are heavily indebted to a particular text written and used in a lecture by Fa-lang:

興皇師 太建六年五月 房內亦開六章 一破異明中 二成假不成假明中 三單復明中 四體用明中 五一二明中 六絕不絕明中也

Master Hsing-huang 興皇(Fa-lang 法朗) in the fifth month of the sixth year of T'ai-chien 太建(574) inside his room opened [a text in] six sections: First, explaining the Middle [with reference to] scattering the deviating teachings; second, explaining the Middle [with reference to] establishing and not establishing the provisional; third, explaining the Middle [with reference to] simple and double; fourth, explaining the Middle [with reference to] body and function; fifth, explaining the middle [with reference to] oneness and duality; sixth, explaining the middle [with reference to] cutting off and not cutting off.⁸⁾

shih lun/Seongsillon 成實論 and the Abhidharma).

7) T.1853.45.68a-77b.

8) *Chojang jungga-ui Ms.*, 29a, following Ito Takatoshi’s emendation of 太建 into 太建. Cf. Itō Takatoshi 伊藤隆壽, “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi(ka)” 三論教學における初章中假義(下), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgaku ronshu*, vol. 34 (1976), pp. 174-203, here p. 180. Also cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, p. 63.

There is little evidence for a mutual influence between both authors. Thus,

Gradual differences, however, can be seen in the composition of self-contained sections: While both authors usually begin with lengthy expositions of conflicting doctrinal positions, and then contrast these with a “correct”, non-abiding approach, the layout of Chi-tsang’s “Lun-chi” 論迹 is much more intricate, and at times consciously puzzling as it follows the “kathartic” purpose of “cleansing” the *dharmas* and restoring them to the “Middle” in a commentarial mode which might be labeled “exegesis als practice.”⁹⁾

Judging from the extant chapters, Hyegyun’s way of writing, by contrast, is somewhat less sophisticated and hence far more accessible. Not only the reference to the importance of the “Chojang” for the beginners and the wide range of topics addressed, but also the rather plain, straight-forward approach in which these topics are covered suggest that the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* was designed as an introductory work.

Much in the same vein, Hyegyun’s accounts tend to be more explicit, and thus present information not available through Chi-tsang’s extant works, such as additional names of individual monks, or information on their respective doctrinal positions. Most importantly, Hyegyun gives more explicit information also on analytic methods shared by both authors due to their common training under

Hyegyun hardly cites Chi-tsang, and these quotes might even refer to oral communication. Judging from this conspicuous absence of mutual quotes (in the works of both authors), it might seem reasonable to assume that they parted from each other soon after the fall of the Ch’en in 589 and at least some time before the mid-590s, around which time Chi-tsang began to establish himself as a writer of commentaries.

- 9) For an analysis of this kathartic way of writing, which can be observed also in other parts of the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, or texts such as the *Erh-ti i* 二諦義 and the *Ching-ming hsüan-lun* 淨名玄論, again cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, pp. 21-46.

Fa-lang.¹⁰⁾ Several of these methods even provide the sub-headings of different parts of the introductory section:

初章中假義有八重 第一明初章 第二論中假 第三辨疎密 第四明橫豎 第五論單複 第六辨雙隻 第七明通別 第八幾諸法

As for the “Meaning of the Middle and the provisional [according to] the ‘First stanza’” there are eight levels: 1. to explain the “First stanza”, 2. to discuss the “Middle” and the “provisional”, 3. to differentiate “open” and “secret”, 4. to explain “horizontal” and “vertical”, 5. to discuss “single” and “double”, 6. to differentiate “pairwise” and “single”, 7. to discuss “thorough-going” and “separate”, 8. diverse *dharmas*.¹¹⁾

In Japanese research, Hyegyūn’s apparent emphasis on the “Ch’u-chang chung-chia” 初章中假 formula has occasionally been viewed as a major difference as compared to Chi-tsang, likening the former to the “Chung-chia shih” so heavily criticized by the latter and their assumed common teacher Fa-lang (509~581) for falling into dualism.¹²⁾ That Hyegyūn is far from such an attitude becomes clear upon considering the following passage on the two meanings of employing the term “Middle”:

10) Thus, overt textual parallels between Chi-tsang’s *Lun-chi* 論迹 and the more explicative “Chojang jungga ui” 初章中假義 (which, as we have seen, is closely related to a lecture text by Fa-lang) enable us to trace important exegetic formulae employed by Chi-tsang back to Fa-lang’s thought. For details, cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, pp. 63-68.

11) *Chojang chungga-ui* Ms., 1a. Cf. Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日, “Shinshutsu Siron gengi no Shoshō chūge gi” 新出四論玄義の初章中假義, *Indogakku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū*, vol. 7 (1959), pp. 131-134, here p. 132.

12) This view already occurs in Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日, “Shinshutsu Siron gengi no Shoshō chūge gi” 新出四論玄義の初章中假義, p. 134. For Ito Takatoshi’s and Hirai Shunei’s 平井俊榮 somewhat more nuanced ideas on this matter, cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, p. 71.

一是 中 當 淨亦淨之中 有无 是 當二之假

The first is that the “Middle” corresponds to a middle in which the [act] of cleaning is clean, and that “What has and what lacks” [differentiating marks] corresponds to the “provisional” [belonging to] duality:

雖開中假 无假異中 无中異假 亦假亦中 如開虛空也

Although one opens up “Middle” and “provisional”, there is no provisional other than the Middle and there is no Middle other than the provisional –they are both provisional and Middle, such as when one opens up [the meaning] of the void emptiness.

二是 不二之中

The second is the non-dual “Middle”:

是 開中假兩義 有无則當假 理而論之 中亦是假

This is: If one opens up the two meanings of “Middle” and “provisional”, then “What has” and “what lacks” correspond to the provisional. If one discusses it from [the perspective] of the [underlying] structure, the “Middle” is also the provisional.

但? 中美々名々 強詔非中非假 之 絶絶与淨淨 之 處也

However, [this] is only a case of “cutting-off the [act of] cutting-off” or “cleansing the [act of] cleansing” in so far as the beautiful name of the “Middle” [in its capacity] as a beautiful name designates what is not the Middle and not the provisional.¹³⁾

In the last resort, the ‘Middle’ and the ‘provisional’ can be viewed as merely another pair of ciphers for duality and non-duality, which eventually are interchangeable and “without obstruction”:

13) *Chojang jungga-ui Ms.*, 19a–b, following Ito Takatoshi’s reading of an in the copy available to me unidentifiable character as 但? and his interpretation of 美々名々 as 美名美名. Cf. Ito Takatoshi, 伊藤隆壽, “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi (chū)” 三論教學における初章中假義 (中), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō*, vol. 33 (1975), pp. 194–218, here p. 207. The author is indebted to Dr. Mathias Richter for some helpful clarifications on the use of reduplication signs. For the implications of this passage, cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, p. 67.

今明 中亦是二 假亦是不二 二不二无碍也

Now, we explain: The middle is also what is dual, the provisional is also what is non-dual.

What is dual and what is non-dual is without obstruction.

體用 理教 本末 亦然 皆通

“Body and function”, “[underlying] structure and teaching”, “origin and end”

also [behave] in such [a way] and all communicate¹⁴⁾

In fact, if Hyegyun were to be criticised as a Chung-chia shih or Chungga sa, much the same would hold true for Chi-tsang himself: According to a remark in Chih-k'ai's 智凱(fl. 6. c.) biography in the *Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳, during Chi-tsang's stay in K'uai-chi 會稽(591 to 599) most students were troubled by the difficulty of grasping the process of “driving away the obstructions through double phrases of the ‘First paragraph of the Middle and the provisional’” (‘Ch’u-chang chung-chia’ fu-tz’u ch’ien chih 初章中假複詞遣滯), whereas Chih-k’ai reached exceptional mastery in this practice.¹⁵⁾ Considering Chi-tsang’s heavy use of the “Ch’u-chang chung-chia” 初章中假 formula in training his students, and the etymology of the “Ch’u-chang” 初章 formula as such, which in Hyegyun’s text is consistently explained as a device the students have to master in the initial phase of their training, it seems more appropriate to relate the emphasis on this formula to the introductory nature of the

14) *Chojang jungga-ui Ms.*, 35a. As might be anticipated, these statements afterwards are justified by applying the “Chojang” formula on duality and non-duality.

15) Cf. *Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳, T.2060.50.705a25ff., quoted in another context by Hirai Shun’ei 平井俊榮 in his *Chūgoku Hannyā shisōshi kenkyū* 中國般若思想史研究, Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1976, pp. 296f. For details on the shift in the attitude towards practice under Fa-lang and its textual background, cf. “Die Spuren der Abhandlung”, p. 71f.

Daeseung saron hyeonui gi than to what might be termed conflicting attitudes.

Thus it should have become obvious that it would be futile to search for major conceptual differences between the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* and Chi-tsang's works.—Quite to the contrary, the text is important also for research on Chi-tsang, as it provides significant material allowing us a better understanding of the decisive role of Fa-lang in the formation of its hermeneutics and exegetical techniques.¹⁶⁾

The influence of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*
大乘四論玄義記 on Early Korean Buddhist thought:
Focusing on Wonhyo's 元曉 *hwajaeng* 和諍 dialectics

The relevance of the text for studying Baekje Samnon

The identification of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* as a Baekje text of course is significant already in as far as it gives us important clues on how 6th c. San-lun Buddhism was brought to the peninsula. At the same time, it obviously provides some direct insight into the actual nature of the Samnon doctrines taught in Baekje and transmitted to Japan. As mentioned before, the contents the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*, contrary to some contrasting claims in Japanese scholarship, were not only based on the thought of Fa-lang, but also did not significantly differ from those perceived in Chi-tsang's works.

Thus it should not come to any surprise that according to a colophon to the *Nieh-p'an yu-i* 涅槃遊意, a somewhat spurious work

16) Again cf. "Die Spuren der Abhandlung", pp. 63-68.

possibly falsely attributed to Chi-tsang, at some point several texts written by Chi-tsang were brought to Baekje: When a certain Fa-jung (or: Beobyung) 法融¹⁷⁾ was roaming around as a student in the K'uai-chi region, he was told by the old eminent monks of that area that some monk from Baekje¹⁸⁾ had taken the *Nieh-p'an shu ki* 涅槃疏記¹⁹⁾ and further commentaries written by Chi-tsang with him when returning to his homeland, so that no copies of the text(s?) were left in the K'uai-chi 會稽region.²⁰⁾ If that mysterious Baekje monk in fact had been Hyegyun, it would be difficult to explain why he would not have quoted Chi-tsang more frequently, and referred to the texts as such. Also, granted that the report is veracious, the incident should have taken place some time after Chi-tsang left the region (599). Although the report thus more likely refers to a later, secondary transmission, it is noteworthy in as much as it seems to indicate that the first of Chi-tsang's writings to reach the peninsula arrived through the same 'distribution channels'.

17) The identity of this monk could not be established. It have been a monk from the Korean peninsula, but perhaps more likely the famous Fa-jung 法融 (594-657). The alleged founder of the famous Niu-t'ou Ch'an tradition had studied under Dharma master Ming 明法師, another famous disciple of Fa-lang, and is known to have studied in the K'uai-chi area. For Fa-jung's links to San-lun, cf. Yang Yongquan [Yang Yung-ch'üan] 楊永泉, *San-lun tsung yüan-liu k'ao* 三論宗源流考, Nanjing: Chiang-su ku-chi shih, 1998, pp. 429-445, and Hirai Shun'ei, *Chügoku Hannya shisöshi kenkyü* 中國般若思想史研究, pp. 327f.

18) Pai-chi seng 百濟僧, by Fa-jung himself reportedly more respectfully referred to as a "Hsien-che" 賢者.

19) A text not listed in the catalogues.

20) Cf. T.1798.38.239a3-6, quoted in Ishii Kōsei 石井公成, "Chōsen Bukkyō ni okeru Sanron kyōgaku" 朝鮮仏教における三論學, in: Hirai Shun'ei 平井俊榮 (ed.): *Sanron kyōgaku no kenkyū* 三論教學の研究, Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1990, pp. 459-483, here p.465.

Needless to say, this only would further corroborate that the Baekje San-lun circles are to be considered an integral part of the greater “transmission among the one house” (*i chia hsiang chuan/il ga sang jeon* 一家相傳).²¹⁾ At the same time, the reported incident cautions us that –notwithstanding the obvious importance of the newly situated *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*– we should not underestimate the influence of Chi-tsang’s writings on Baekje San-lun.

It need not be stressed that the contents of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* should be studied more carefully, in particular the passages directly or indirectly referring to competing schools of Baekje Buddhism. On the other hand, the text still awaits a more systematical exploitation of the important information it provides concerning the exegetical techniques used in the school²²⁾ of Fa-lang, a school transgressing the borders of Ch’en/Sui/T’ang and Baekje.

In view of both authors’ overt indebtedness to Fa-lang and the very nature of the exegesis of the “one house”, which does not aim at establishing ‘doctrinal contents’, but is designed to lead towards a state of non-abiding by scattering false views (*p’o-hsieh/pasa* 破邪) and cleansing the *dharmas* (*ching-fa/jeong beop* 淨法), it should be evident that any search for doctrinal deviations between Chi-tsang and Hyegyun going beyond very minor methodological differences would not make much sense. –To the contrary, we should utilize Hyegyun’s and Chi-tsang’s works as complimentary sources for the study of the thought and exegetical methods of the “one house”.

21) As might be expected, The term occurs both in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* and in the *Ta-sheng süan-lun* Cf. ZZ.74.17b, 100a, 107b, 129a etc. and T.1853.45.39b25.

22) The term “school” here being used in the narrow sense of a group of disciples centered around one teacher.

The general influence of the text on Wonhyo's hwajaeng thought

At least for the Korean context, it might be even more worthwhile to turn to the reception of the text in Silla. Thus, some years ago, unfortunately already having had presented a paper addressing among other things the similarities between Wonhyo's *Yeolban jongyo* 涅槃宗要 and a corresponding section in Chi-tsang's *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, I was both delighted and embarrassed to find some evidence that Wonhyo must have been aware of some very similar passages in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*. As to be seen somewhat further below, on the basis of this observation (which together with an oral communication of Prof. Ito Takatoshi to Prof. Choe on the possibility of the text having been written on the Korean peninsula were to become the point of departure for our project) it can be deduced that Wonhyo's *hwajaeng* 和諍 thought to some degree had been influenced also by the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*.²³⁾

Moreover, from the circumstance that Wonhyo had studied a Samnon text in which the term "Chojang" occurs most prominently, we now may more safely conclude that Wonhyo's usage of the expression in the title of his *Chojang gwanmun* 初章觀門 indeed refers to the formula Fa-lang taught to his disciples.²⁴⁾

23) I should express my gratitude to Prof. Kim Sang-hyun for pointing out that the pertaining textual parallels as such have been noted in Hyeobong Sangyeong 慧峰尙泳 (ed.) ; Ga'eun 嘉恩 (transl., ann.): *Gyojeong gugyeok Yeolban jongyo* 校訂國譯涅槃宗要. *Daeseong Hwajaeng guksa Wonhyo wonjeo* 大聖和諍國師元曉原著. Busan: Wonhyo sasang silcheon seungahoe, 2004. (Cf. in particular p. 153, n. 600). However, the truly erudite edition limits itself to presenting the parallels, and the significance of these textual parallels appears to have been overlooked in the academia.

24) A passage in the *Samguk yusa* entailing that Nangji 朗智 (n.d.) ordered Wonhyo to write this text might indicate that it was this monk who introduced Wonhyo to San-lun thought, and possibly also to the *Daeseung*

Furthermore, the fact that the text has been written in Baekje²⁵⁾ sheds a new light onto the background of Wonhyo's idea of *hwajaeng*. Thus, the tensions between *Samnon* and *Seomnon* exegetes in Baekje surfacing in the text definitely provide a much more immediate background for Wonhyo's seemingly artificial criticism of Mādhyamaka and Yogacāra in his *Gisillon byeolgi*: While some researchers, including myself, have become used to consider this dichotomy merely an abstract, reductionist analysis of major trends in continental Chinese Buddhism (in particular, a reflex on works by Hsüan-tsang 玄藏, 602?~664), the new information, although referring to a somewhat earlier period, gives somewhat more credibility to the thesis that Wonhyo at the same time was concerned about two opposing ideological camps on the Korean peninsula itself. Thus, contrary to what more recent attempts at dismantling political abuses of this view during the 20th century suggest, Wonhyo's *hwajaeng* thought in the end might have been more than an abstract hermeneutic approach and exegetic method for unifying different teachings of the Buddha, or a dialectic method resolving the perspectives of unity and duality: Quite in line with more traditional views, it might also have been an attempt to resolve concrete conflicts between two ideological parties in a new system of thought.²⁶⁾

saron hyeonui gi. On Wonhyo's relation to Nangji, and previous assumptions that the latter was an eminent San-lun monk, cf. Kim Sanghyun, *Wonhyo yeon'gu*, Seoul: Minjoksa, 2000, pp. 88f.

- 25) An assumption which Prof. Choe followed from an early stage on, bringing up much of the pertaining evidence until we finally were able to identify the name of one of the temples appearing in the text.
- 26) Thus, Uicheon's 義天 use of the "Hwajaeng guksa" 和諍國師 Wonhyo as a figurehead for his own attempts at founding a "catholic school" might not have been an abuse. Although it thus might be tempting to ponder about

The relevance of the text for Wonhyo's hwajaeng techniques

As indicated above, some passages in Wonhyo's *Yeolban jongyo* 涅槃宗要 entail that Wonhyo was aware of the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*. These passages, which deal with different interpretations of the meaning of "Buddha-nature" (*Bulseong* 佛性),²⁷⁾ have obvious precedents both in the chapter "Bulseong ui" 佛性義 in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* and a part of Chi-tsang's *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, which is likewise labeled "Fo-hsing i" 佛性義.²⁸⁾ The six positions discussed in Wonhyo's text more or less are a subset of ten plus one and eleven plus one²⁹⁾ definitions thematized in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* and the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, resp. Due to the comparably terseness of Wonhyo's discussion, at first glance it is difficult to decide on which, if any, text he bases his own survey on. However, in five cases he also lists the names of individuals, temples or groups (Pai-ma ssu Ai Fa-shih 白馬寺愛法師, Chuang-yen ssu 莊嚴寺, Kuang-chai Yün Fa-shih 光宅雲法師, Liang Wu Hsiao-yen 梁武蕭焉, Sinsa 新師) holding the respective views. While Chi-tsang lists none of these names, all but the "Sinsa" appear in the list of corresponding positions in Hyegyun's work.³⁰⁾ –To all likelihood, Wonhyo knew the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* when he wrote the pertaining passages.

This is significant because the discussion provides the starting

possible political intentions on the side of Wonhyo, we will refrain from any such speculations.

27) The passage on the meaning of Buddha-nature can be found in Cf. HPC 1.537c-545c, the relevant parts in 538a-539a.

28) Cf. ZZ. 86b - 136a and T.1853.45.35b-42b, resp.

29) Both texts introduce an additional 'correct' approach, clarifying that this is not to be seen on one level with the fixed views of the others

30) Cf. HPC 538a-b and ZZ.74.91b-92b.

point for one of the *loci classici* of research on Wonhyo's *hwajaeng*. Having discarded one theory after another by pointing out its failures, Wonhyo somewhat unexpectedly explains:

次判是非者

Next, classification as to “right” and “wrong”:

此諸師說皆是非

These sayings by the various masters are all right and wrong.

所以然者

佛性非然非不然故

Why this is such: because Buddha-nature is neither “such” nor “not-such”.

以非然故諸說悉非

非不然故諸義悉是

Because it is not “such”, all sayings together are wrong.

Because it is not “not-such”, all sayings together are right.³¹⁾

Although the following reinstitution of the individual statements as valid within their respective framework contains somewhat tedious details, it should be quoted in order to avoid the impression that the text consists only of logical formula:

是義 志云何

What is the intention of [establishing] this meaning? ...

六師所說不出二途

初一指於當有之果

後五同據今有之因

What the six masters say does not go beyond two paths:

The first one points at the fruit which will be there in future; the latter five are based on the reason which there is now.

此後五中亦爲二倒

後一在於真諦

31) Cf. HPC 538b.

前四隨於俗諦

[As for] these latter five there are also two contraries:

The latter one rests in the true judgement;

the former four follow the common judgement.³²⁾

俗諦四說不出人法

前一舉人後三據法 The four sayings [pertaining to] the common judgement do not go beyond “man” and *dharmas*;

the first one takes up “man”, the latter three are based on the *dharmas*.

據法三義不過起伏

後一種子前二上心

上心之內隨義異說耳

The three meanings based on the dharmas do not go beyond [the fallacies of] raising and subdueing,

The latter one [focusing on] the seed, the first two on the [meditation state] of the superior mind,

inside the [category of the] superior mind [there are] different sayings following the [different] meanings.³³⁾

In the end, however, Wonhyo returns to somewhat more abstract logics:

然佛性之體正是一心

Now, the [inner] body of Buddha-nature truly is the One Mind.

一心之性遠離諸邊

The nature of the One Mind is separate from all extremes.

遠離諸邊故都無所當

As it is separate from all extremes, there is nothing at all it would have to comply with.

無所當故無所不當

As there is nothing it would have to comply with, there is nothing it

32) The common translation “truth” should be avoided, as it suggests an objective truth, while the expression *je* 諦 rather refers to modes of perceptions, i.e., judgements.

33) HPC 1.538b-c.

does not comply with.

所以就心論 心 非因非果 非真非俗 非人非法 非起非伏

Therefore, to treat [the matter] with reference to mind, mind neither is cause nor result, neither truth nor the vulgar, neither man nor dharmas, neither raising nor subdueing.

如其約緣論 心 爲起爲伏 作法作人 爲俗爲眞 作因作果

If one treats [it] in relation to the conditioned, mind functions as the raising and functions as the subduing one, creates dharmas and man, functions as truth and functions as the vulgar, creates cause and creates result.

是謂 非然非不然義

This is called the meaning of “not-such and not not-such”.

所以 諸說皆非皆是

Therefore, the various sayings all are wrong and all are right. 34)

The above passage is immediately followed by another section, which basically restates the same idea in a slightly different fashion:

總說雖然於中分別者

Although if one speaks generally it is such,

[as for] seperating in [their] middle:

於一心法有二種義

Concerning the dharma of the One mind there are two meanings:

一者不染而染

二者染而不染

The first: Not defiled and yet defiled;

the second: defiled and yet not defiled.

染而不染 一味寂靜

不染而染 流轉六道

“defiled and yet not defiled” is of one taste and still;

“not defiled and yet defiled” rotates in the six ways [of existence]

如下文言

34) HPC 1.539a.

一味藥隨其流處有種種味
而其真味停留在山

Like a passage further below says:

The medicine of the “one taste” has all sorts of tastes according to the places it flows to, and yet its true taste rests on the mountain.

夫人經言

自性清淨心 難可了知 彼心爲煩惱所染 此亦難可了知

The Sutra of the Lady [Śrīmaldevī] says:

The pure mind of self-nature is difficult to understand;
if that mind is what is defiled by the vexations, this is also difficult to understand.

起信論中 廣顯是義

此者 真諦三藏之義

In the *Treatise on Awakening of Faith* [its author] broadly manifests this meaning.

This is the meaning [established by the] Tripitaka [master] Chen-ti (i.e., Paramartha).

第六師說真如佛性 得 於染而不染門也

前之五義 皆 在染門

The sixth master’s sayings on the Buddha-nature of true thusness attains to the gate of “defiled and yet not defiled”;

The former five meanings all rest in the gate of defilement.³⁵⁾

The text would continue by explaining how the five other masters each attains limited access towards truth, and then again summarize:

由是義故

六師所說

雖皆未盡佛性實體

隨門而說各得其義

For this reason

the six masters’ sayings,

35) HPC 1.538c.

although they not yet exhaust the real body of Buddha nature, said according to [different] access gates, they each attain their [own] meaning.

故下文說

Thus, a passage further below says:

如彼盲人各各說象

雖不得實非不說象

When those blind men each after each speak of the elephant, although they do not attain the reality, it is not that they do not speak of the elephant.

說佛性者亦復如是

Speaking about Buddha nature is also again like this:

不卽六法不離六法

It is not identical with the six *dharmas* and not separate from the six *dharmas*.

當知此中六說亦爾

[You] should know that the six sayings in here are also such like.³⁶⁾

Despite Wonhyo's reference to the One Mind (ilsim 一心) and his use of the metaphor of the blind men and the elephant from the *Nieh p'an ching* itself, the argument as such is based very much on San lun thought. Thus the Korean scholar Kim Hau already in 1982 drew attention to formulae such as *mu dang yeok mu so bu dang* 無當亦無所不當 and demonstrated that Wonhyo's frequent use of this and similarly structured statements, based on the notion that whatever "has" [marks, characteristics] (*yu* 有) at the same time is empty (*gong* 空) and vice versa, is heavily indebted to the *hsiang chi* 相卽 (Kor.: *sangjeuk*, commonly rendered as "mutual identity") pattern of thought employed by Seng-chao 僧肇(374~414) and Chi-tsang 吉藏(549~623).³⁷⁾ – This pattern, we may add, underlies also

36) HPC 1.539a.

37) Cf. Kim Hau. "Samnon gwa Hwa'eomgye (Wonhyo. Beopjanggye) ui

the “Ch’u-chang” 初章.

Almost in parallel, Ishii Kosei pointed out that the argument seems under the sway of both Chi-tsang and the *Chuang-tzu* 莊子. In fact, its logics bear a striking similarity to that employed in a passage in the “Fo-hsing i” 佛性義, which as already mentioned is contained in the *Ta-sheng hsüan-lun*:³⁸⁾

當知 平等大道 無方無住故一切並非 無方無礙故一切並得

[You] should know: As the equal great way is without corners and without abiding, all [statements] along each other are wrong. As it is without limits and without hindrances, all [statements] along each may be attained.

若以是爲是以非爲非者 一切是非並皆是也 若知無是 無非是 無非無不非 假名爲是非者 一切是非並皆是也

If one considers “right” as “right” and “wrong” as “wrong”, [then] all “right” and “wrong” along each other are right and wrong (i.e., vain quarrel). If one knows that there is no “right”, no “not right”, no “wrong”, no “not wrong”, and [thus] provisionally terms into “right” and “wrong”, [then] all “right” and “wrong” all along each other are right.

故知：上來十一家所說正因 以是爲是故 並非正因佛性 若悟諸法平等 無二 無是無非者 十一家所說並得是正因佛性

Therefore, you [should] know: As the direct causes pronounced by the above [mentioned] eleven masters consider “right” as “right”, their statements all along each other are not the Buddha nature as direct cause. If one awakens to the equalness and non duality of the dharmas, being without “right” and “wrong”, what is spoken

jeon’o bangsik” 三論과 華嚴系の 轉悟方式 . *Cheolhak yeon’gu* 7 (1982), pp. 5-32.

38) Cf. Ishii Kōsei. “Chōsen Bukkyō ni okeru Sanron kyōgaku” 朝鮮仏教における三論學, pp. 471f. Also, cf. the same author’s “Gangyō to Chūgoku shisō” 元曉と中國思想, *Indogakku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 31.2 (1983), pp. 164-166.

out by the eleven masters altogether may be reached to be the Buddha nature as direct cause.³⁹⁾

Quite obviously, in both texts the turn from apophasis towards kataphasis is achieved by means of statements expressing that the rather abstract notions of “Buddha-nature” or the “Great way” cannot be reduced to this or that fixed meaning, and for exactly the same reason may be thought to allow for all possible meanings.

This said, according to what has been stated so far on the relation of Chi-tsang’s and Hyegyun’s thought we should aspect that similar logics should be employed in the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*. And indeed, in the latter text a passage employing very much the same logics can be found:

...

若直於十說

自爲正因故 以道望無一爲是

善方便望之 十說無一爲非故

... If we [turn] straight to the ten sayings:

Because they consider themselves to be the correct reason [of Buddha nature],

with regard to the Way there is not one which is true;

looking at them as good adequate means,

there is not one which is false.

故未解中道之前

雖有諸說則皆非佛性義

Thus, before understanding the Middle way,

although there are all [these] sayings, all are not the meaning of Buddha nature.

若以正道望

則雖種種異不同皆是佛性

39) T.1853.45.42b.

If looked at from the Correct Way,
although kind by kind are different and not identical, all are Buddha
nature.

爲此故

望聖人反常合道故

思益經云

一切法正一切法耶也

又淨名訶斥須菩提云

耶見六師是汝大師 汝師若隨 汝亦應隨經意 若見汝是持戒外道非者 則
是二見

For this reason,

Because of regard to the Unifying Way which violates the common
[held by the] sages,

the *Sutra of Contemplating the Benefit* says: “All *dharma*s are correct,
all *dharma*s are heretic.” and Vimalakīrti, criticising Subhūti, says:

“The six masters [clinging to] heretic views are your great master.
if your master follows it, you should also follow the intention of the
sutra.”

If you see yourself as someone who holds to the precepts, and those
outside the way as not,
that is the [fallacy of the] view of duality.”⁴⁰⁾

Again, the basic idea is that if one proposes any own definition as
“the [solely] correct one”, it becomes wrong, but if merely used as
skillful means, any definition becomes correct. – While the wording of
neither passage bears striking similarities with Wonhyo’s, nevertheless
it should have become clear that Wonhyo’s apparent knowledge of
the *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi* would have sufficed to resort to these
logics (although there is some evidence that he also might have
known the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*).

Also, it should be noted that while all three authors use the

40) ZZ 74.134a.

suggestive terms *shih/si* 是 and *fei/bi* 非, Chi-tsang stands apart in so far as he more overtly resorts to phrases borrowed from the “Ch’i-wu lun” 齊物論 chapter of the *Chuang-tzu* 莊子 and the Kuo Hsiang 郭象 commentary, while Hyegyun and Wonhyo would not do so. Furthermore, it should not pass by unnoticed that the occurrence of the “six masters [clinging to] heretic views” (Sageon yuksa 邪見六師) in Hyegyun’s text very well might have been the inspiration for Wonhyo’s reduced list of six views.

key words : Hegyun, Fa-lang, Chi-tsang, Wonhyo, Baekje samnon, Hwajaeng, Ch’u-chang(Kor. Chojang), *Daeseung saron hyeonui gi*, *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, *Yeolban jongyo*, *Chojang gwanmun*, *Chojang jungga ui*, *Bulseong ui*

(투고일 : 2007. 2. 7 / 심사완료일 : 2007. 3. 5)

<국문초록>

한국 고대불교사상사 연구에 있어서
《大乘四論玄義記》의 중요성
— 和靜사상의 배경에 대한 기초적 검토 —

요르그 플라센

일반적으로 삼론학파의 계보는 僧朗에서 시작되어 吉藏(549~623)에서 완성되었다고 알려져 있는 것과 달리 중국 초기 삼론사상사는 상당히 복잡하다. 경쟁하는 분파들이 존재하였다는 점을 고려하면 삼론사상이 어떤 과정을 통해 백제에 전해졌는지의 문제는 별도로 하더라도 백제에 전래되고 다시 일본으로 전해진 삼론사상이 어느 분파의 것이었는지에 대한 검토가 필요할 것이다.

慧均의 《大乘四論玄義記》가 백제에서 찬술된 문헌으로 밝혀진 것은 이러한 문제들에 대한 중요한 단서들을 제공하는 것이다. 기존 연구들에서 검토된 것처럼 《대승사론현의기》의 내용은 길장의 저술로 전해지는 《大乘玄論》과 대단히 비슷하게 나타나고 있다. 특히 두 문헌 모두에서 나타나고 있는 法朗의 가르침에 대한 빈번한 언급은 두 문헌의 찬술자들이 동일한 스승의 제자로서 사상적으로 거의 비슷한 입장에 있었음을 보여주고 있다.

혜균과 길장 모두 法朗에 의하여 형성된 논리 형식인 ‘初章’을 강조하고 있지만 《대승사론현의기》 중의 <初章中假義>에서 길장의 이론과의 차이점을 발견한 일부 일본 학자들은 혜균의 사상이 法朗과 吉藏에 의해 비판되었던 中假師와 연결되는 것으로 간주하였다. 그렇지만 《대승사론현의기》의 내용으로 볼 때 혜균은 中과 假를 구별하는 中假師와는 전혀 다른 입장을 취하고 있으며, 《續高僧傳》의 기록에 의하면 길장 역시 혜균과 동일한 논리를 제시하였다. 따라서

혜균과 길장의 기본적 입장은 동일하였다고 할 수 있다.

《대승사론현의기》와 《대승현론》의 가장 큰 차이점은 다른 목적을 위해 찬술되었던 글들을 후대에 편집한 後者和 달리 前者는 처음부터 일정한 목적을 가지고 찬술되었다는 점이다. 결과적으로 《대승사론현의기》는 《대승현론》에 비하여 훨씬 알기 쉽고 명확하게 쓰여졌으며, 이런 점에서 초보자들을 염두에 두고 찬술되었던 것이 아닌가 생각된다. 그럼에도 불구하고 《대승사론현의기》의 작자를 비롯한 백제의 삼론학자들은 자신들을 陳-隋-百濟 등의 국경을 넘어 발전하였던 국제적 학파인 法朗을 계승한 “一家”의 일부로 간주하였고, 이는 정당한 인식이었다.

혜균과 길장이 모두 法朗의 사상에 의거하고 있고, 기존의 연구들을 통하여 밝혀진 것처럼 “一家”의 저술 태도가 ‘교학적 입장’을 제시하는 것이 아니라 무집착의 상태에 이르는 것을 목표로 하였다는 점을 고려한다면 혜균과 길장의 저술에서 사소한 방법론적 차이 이상의 사상적 차이를 발견하려는 어떠한 시도도 성과를 거두기 어려울 것으로 생각된다. 오히려 혜균과 길장의 저술은 “一家”의 사상과 논리적 틀을 연구하는데 있어서 서로 상보적인 것으로 활용되어야 할 것이다.

6세기 후반에서 7세기 초에 활동하였던 뛰어난 삼론학자인 혜균의 발견은 백제 삼론학뿐 아니라 元曉의 和諍 사상에 대한 이해에도 새로운 시사점을 제시하고 있다. 《대승사론현의기》에서 나타나고 있는 백제에서의 三論사상과 攝論사상의 갈등은 唯識사상과 中觀사상에 대한 원효의 비판이 단순히 추상적인 것이 아니라 보다 실제적인 배경을 갖는 것이었음을 보여주며, 이를 통하여 원효의 사상에서 화쟁사상이 강조된 것이 고려시대와 식민지시대의 정치적 관심사에 의한 왜곡에서 비롯되었다고 하는 견해들을 반박할 수 있게 한다.

원효는 실제로 《대승사론현의기》를 읽었던 것으로 생각된다. 원효의 《涅槃宗要》에 나오는 佛性の 본질에 대한 논의와 비슷한 내용이 《대승현론》 중의 <佛性義>에 나타나고 있다는 것이 이미 1980

년대 초에 지적되었지만 비슷한 내용이 《대승사론현의기》의 <佛性義>에도 나오고 있다는 사실은 최근까지도 간과되어 왔다. 《열반종요》에서 제시되고 있는 여섯 가지 입장은 《대승사론현의기》와 《대승현론》에 나오는 열 가지 혹은 열한 가지의 입장 중에서 선택된 것들이다. 《열반종요》의 내용이 간결하기 때문에 원효가 어느 문헌에 근거하여 서술하였는지는 쉽게 판단하기 어렵다. 하지만 원효는 여섯 입장 중 다섯 입장의 주창자들의 개인적 이름이나 주석했던 사찰의 이름을 -白馬寺愛法師, 莊嚴寺, 光宅雲法師, 梁武蕭焉, 新師- 제시하고 있는데, 이러한 이름들이 길장의 저술에는 전혀 보이지 않는 반면 혜균의 저술에는 新師를 제외한 나머지 다섯 이름들이 모두 나타나고 있다. 이로 보아 원효는 해당 부분을 저술할 때에 《대승사론현의기》의 내용을 알고 있었던 것이 분명하다.

이러한 사실은 두 가지 이유에서 중요한 의미를 갖는다. 첫째로, 원효가 《대승사론현의기》를 알고 있었다는 사실은 그의 저술인 《初章觀文》의 성격에 대하여 많은 것을 시사한다. ‘初章’이 《대승사론현의기》 전체를 관통하는 기본적 논리적 틀이라는 점을 고려하면 원효의 《초장관문》은 法朗이 제자들에게 가르친 내용과 관련된 저술일 가능성이 높다.

더욱 중요한 점은 《열반종요》에 나오는 佛性の 본질에 대한 여섯 가지 입장에 대한 논의가 원효의 화쟁사상에 대한 연구에 있어서 대단히 중요한 자료를 제공하고 있다는 것이다. 각각의 주장들의 결점을 지적하여 부정한 이후에 원효는 뜻밖에도 모든 주장들이 “옳기도 하고 옳지 않기도 하다”는 점을 설명하고 있다. 佛性이 “不然”이므로 각각의 주장이 모두 잘못되었고, “非不然”이므로 각각의 주장이 모두 옳다는 것이다.

기존의 연구들에서는 이와 같이 모든 것을 부정하는 것을 통하여 모든 것을 긍정하는 원효의 인식 방법을 길장의 <佛性義>에 나오는 논리와 연결시켜 이해하였다. 그렇지만 어떠한 견해를 “(오직 하나의) 올바른 것”으로 주장하면 그것은 곧바로 일방적이고 올바르지

않은 것이 되지만 道의 입장에서 방편으로서 견해들을 제시하는 것이라면 어떤 것이라도 올바를 수 있다는 화쟁의 기본적인 사고방식은 《대승사론현의기》의 입장에서든 나올 수 있는 것이다.

실제로 세 사람 모두 是와 非라는 용어를 사용하고 있지만 길장은 《莊子》〈齊物論〉에 대한 郭象의 주석을 직접 인용하고 있다는 점에서 그렇지 않은 원효나 혜균과 다른 모습을 보이고 있다. 또한 《대승사론현의기》에 보이는 ‘邪見六師’에 대한 언급은 원효가 佛性의 본질에 대한 주장들 중에서 여섯 가지의 견해들만을 제시하게 하는데 영향을 미쳤던 것으로 보인다.

원효는 혜균과 길장의 양 저술 모두를 잘 알고 있었을 것이다. 그렇지만 길장의 《대승현론》이 원효의 화쟁 이론에 영향을 미쳤다면 《대승사론현의기》가 원효의 화쟁 이론에 영향을 미친 증거는 더 크다고 생각된다.

주제어 : 慧均, 法朗, 吉藏, 元曉, 《大乘四論玄義記》, 《大乘玄論》, 《涅槃宗要》, 《初章觀文》, 百濟三論, 初章, 初章中假義, 和諍, <佛性義>