신학과 사회 33(4) 2019
pp. 63 – 104

Understanding of the 21 Letters Incantation of Tonghak and the Lord's Prayer, in View of Wŏnhyo's Hwajaeng Philosophy on Language*

Chong-Seong Cheong**

국문 초록

원효의 화쟁은 특정한 체계를 세우거나 특정한 주장을 우선시하는 입장을 결코 취하지 않으면서, 언어와 개념의 환상에서 벗어나, 일심 (一心)으로 돌아가게 하는 종교-철학적 해석학의 한 방법론이다. 본 연구는 원효의 화쟁 철학에서 추출한 일심의 해석학적 방법론을 주기도문과 동학의 21자 주문의 주요 언어와 개념 해석에 적용하면서, 각 기도문이 가지는 핵심가치와 지향점을 서로 비교 분석한다. 원효의 해석학적 방법론 적용을 통해, 기도문이 각자의 종교적 혹은 해석적 전통 속에서 어떠한 고유성과 지향점을 지니고 있으며 동시에 각자의 고유성을 뛰어 넘어 어떠한 보편성을 공통적으로 지니고 있는지를 비교 분석하고 있다. 주기도문의 자기 비움 혹은 자기 초월적 요청과 세상의 문제나 고통과의 연대라는 내재적 요청과, 동학 주문의 시천주조화정(侍天主造化定)과 지기(至氣)라는 역동적 실재에 대한 내면화와 책임인식 등이 서로를 끌어안고 함께 움직이듯 대화한다. 각각의 고유성이 훼손되지 않으면서 보편에 함몰되지 않는 동시에, 서로를 확장적으로 바라보면서 스스로를 변혁할 수 있는 기회를 갖게 된다. 각 기도문은 언어와 개념의 차이, 신과 궁극적 실재에 대한 인식과 이해가 언어와 문화적 개념의 차이에도 불구하고 종교적 인식을 넘어서서 오히려 인간의 고통 해소를 위한 책임적인 연대와 개입에 초점이 맞추어져 있다는 점을 드러낸다. 각 기도문은 특수한 문화적 역사적 상황 속에서 특정한 문화적 역사적 질문에 대한 반응과 해결책으로 주어진 것이지만, 일심의 해석학적 방법론으로 재정의해 본다면, 각

* This work is supported by 2019 Baeksuk University Research Fund.
** Baeksuk University/ New Testament Theology/ Associate Professor/ csngod4u@hanmail.net

www.kci.go.kr

기도문에서 인간의 처절한 고통 문제를 해소하려는 보편적 목소리를 발견하게 한다. 이 과정에서 본 연구는 우리 사회의 종교간 사회계층간 대화와 소통을 위한 한국적 성서해석학 방법론의 창조적 담론을 제시한다. 주기도문과 21자 주문은 텍스트 상으로 매우 다른 표현과 개념을 사용하고 있어 인간과 신성 혹은 궁극적 실재에 대한 감각과 인식에 있어서 서로 상반된 것처럼 보인다. 그러나 두 기도문 사이에 합일되고 있는 부분들이 있다고 한다면, 그것은 두 기도문이 공통적으로 "저 건너편"의 신적 존재를 전제하고 있으며, 또한 종교적 진리 주장을 학술적 교리체계로 표현하지 않고 실제 삶의 세계에 속한 평범한 일상 언어를 사용하고 있다는 점이다. 물론 공통적으로 각 기도문이 전제하고 있는 이면에는, 고통스런 삶의 현실과 도무지 이해할 수 없는 감추어진 신적 신비 혹은 궁극적 실재의 문제가 있으며, 또한 그럼에도 불구하고 끝까지 참고 인내하며 현실에 적극적으로 뛰어들어 개조해야 하는 책임적 존재임을 드러내주고 있다. 이러한 기도문을 통하여, 수행자는 초월과 내재, 타력구원과 자력구원이라는 개념적 언어함정에 빠지거나 환원되지 않으면서 동시에 자기 안에서 두 세계를 동시적으로 체험하게 된다.

주제어: 원효와 화쟁, 주기도문, 동학, 21자 주문, 언어의 본질.

www.kci.go.kr

I. Introduction

It must be a daunting task for both Christians and devotees to Tonghak (東學) to maintain a delicate balance between knowledge of God and incomprehensibility of him, between our human words and divine mystery. Probably, for the general Christians faith essentially meant a distinction between God the Creator and humans the creature; and for Buddhists, faith meant becoming one's own true self; and even for Tonghak followers, faith was none other than inner discipline of *susim chŏngki* (修心精氣, discipline with right Spirit), as well as outer *Tongkwi ilche* (同歸一體, returning to one body) by responsible engagement.[1] Hence, religious language is used in an overtly concrete or univocal manner, there must be a temptation to turn it into a power and coercive language. Such language does lead not only to the shackling of the abundant mystery of God but it leads surreptitiously to

1) John B. Cobb, *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 101. And if, for the Buddhists, enlightenment leads to the disappearance of faith or faith claim, whereas, for Tonghak followers, ultimate faith has to reveal in both ways, inner and outer mind, at least at the incipient stage.

www.kci.go.kr

shackling each other. Unfortunately, Christian language is said to be more concrete, precise, and literal in general, so that it often ends up as a danger to shackle on the rich and unfathomable mystery of God. Fortunately, however, the language of the Lord's Prayer seems to instantiate Jesus' mystical experience, avoiding from such shackles and dangers. Likewise, the 21 Letters Incantation with its primordial shamanistic spirituality, demonstrating its coherent mindfulness, empirically, not logically, delineates indispensable actions to substantiate salvific skills for the practitioners.

Notably, thought system of the Western populace had been traditionally constituted and facilitated by an ontological frame of reference (who is God; who am I; what's the end of history), whereas that of Asians was oriented more toward an epistemological discipline (i.e., how do I live; why do I suffer; what's the better way to keep a peaceful mind), such as in Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, and Korean Tonghak (東學). The Western ontological questions are eventually leading inquirers into the ethical problems of whether right and wrong, whereas the Eastern epistemological pursuers in general are inclined more toward the matters of probability. Such a unique hereditary also had characterized the way of seeking ultimate reality in transcendental or immanent sphere respectively, albeit difficult to sharply differentiate from each other in most cases. A seeming gap between these traditions, however, is not that big in reality as much we normally would imagine, since each had from the beginning surely been adjusted by key teachings such as Incarnation ("God is

www.kci.go.kr

reconciled to us") and *sichŏnju* (侍天主; "bearing God within"). These thoughts seem to share more or less with a similar expression that infinity to be understood always must reside in the realm of the finite human recognition.

In order to understand the connotation and its significance of the two prayers relevant to the society, mainly in terms of philological base including some of key concepts, this work will utilize Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng*, which was an extensive argument analyzing positions of the incongruents, showing their underpinnings and contextual framework leading to each position, wherein it created a commensuration of variant doctrines and interpretations. His *hwajaeng* is the ultimate task for the resolution of discrepancies to be undertaken, trying to reveal the truth by cutting off conceptual hallucination resorting to the words. As the Korea's leading Buddhist thinker and scriptural commentator, Wŏnhyo had never sectarian affiliation or took a sectarian-based approach to the interpretation of Buddhist doctrines.[2] Accordingly, quite contrary to the existing predominant doctrinal classification, *p'an'gyo* (判教; primary hermeneutic strategy of East Asian Buddhist scholars), to create a teleological edifice in which to pigeonhole texts and doctrines, he rather attempted to dig into the "assumptions, circumstances, and specific aims" of

2) Muller stresses this point that Wŏnhyo was "the only major commentator who was not a founding patriarch, or in the lineage of a distinct tradition, and thus he had no institutionally-motivated obligation to set one particular teaching on top and the others below." A. Charles Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization of the Mahayana Doctrines" *Acta Koreana* 18/1 (2015), 9-44, at 15.

www.kci.go.kr

writers of a given text, to clearly discern the "underpinnings of the divergence."[3] He tried to provide "an interface for mutual understanding between ostensibly incommensurate views" by paying great attentions to subtler disagreements between thinkers and scholars.[4]

II. Wŏnhyo's Perspective to Language in *Hwajaeng* Philosophy[5]

Out of his biography and extant works, it is no doubt that Wŏnhyo had great interests in other religions and diverse

3) Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization," 12–13.

4) Wŏnhyo's way of commensuration is attained through a detailed analysis of the various incongruents on the matter and then arriving to a deeper understanding of the issues involved (Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization," 22).

5) The English rendering of *hwajaeng* (和諍) has a potential of misleading that may make us astray from understanding the context of Wŏnhyo's project, mainly because harmonization of disputes could be probably assumed to be generated in milieu of a personal squabble due to personal propensities and agendas of scholars. In Wŏnhyo's works, this word *hwajaeng* was literally employed just twice: *Simmun hwajaeng non* (Ten Approaches to the Harmonization of Doctrinal Disputes; 十門和諍論) and the *Yŏlban chong-yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the Nirvana Sutra; 涅槃宗要). For example, in the section of *Yŏlban chong-yo*: H.1, 533a13–14, where Wŏnhyo explains the four attributes of the dharmakāya, we read: 第六, 四德分別, 略有四門. 一顯相門, 二立意門, 三差別門, 四和諍門 ("Sixth is the distinction of the four attributes, which are outlined into four approaches: (1) the approach of revealing their marks; (2) the approach of defining them; (3) the approach of distinguishing them, and (4) the approach of harmonizing them"). For retrieving Wŏnhyo's work, the classification system in this paper is based on the Archive Service System of Dongguk University, computerized from the *Han'guk Bulgyo Jŏnsŏ* (韓國佛教全書, Korean Buddhism Collection; Abbreviated by H.) in http://kabc.dongguk.edu.

www.kci.go.kr

thoughts, including Confucianism, Taoism, and other philosophical books that were widely understood and accepted in Silla society at that time, which had long been evinced by the phrase on the first part of *Kosŏn-sa Sŏdang hwasang t'appi* (Stele Inscription to Master Sŏdang [viz. Wŏnhyo] of Kosŏn-sa; 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑): 王城西北 有一小寺 □讖記□□外書等見斥於世□("There was a small temple in the northwest of the kingdom's capital. [In this temple Wŏnhyo read] the books such as prophetic books (讖記), □□ and apocrypha (外書) that [for ages] had been excluded from the world").[6] Wŏnhyo's liberal thoughts and concerns reached far and wider even outside of Buddhism.[7] The phrases in the first part on this monument "靑藍共體 氷水同源"(blue and indigo plants are one body; ice and water have the same source) is supposed to mean that, at the bottom of phenomenal differences, there is an reconciliatory aspect,[8] and that the range of harmonizing disputes include not only Buddhism but also all the differences of the world's religious philosophies.[9]

---

6) The four missing letters are retrieved as 看, 雜文, 久 in order, according to Park Sung-Bae, *Hanguk Sasang-gwa Bulgyo* [Korean Philosophies and Buddhism] (Seoul: Hyean, 2009), 23.

7) In particular, the apocrypha mentioned here is more likely to be Laozi (老子)'s *Dáodé jing* (道德經) that had widely permeated into all his works. Wŏnhyo's writing, primarily influenced by Mādhyamika, exhibits "a lyrical mode" emulating Daoist style, most notably the *Dáodé jing*, wherein he could powerfully and efficiently describe "something wondrous and inconceivable"(Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization," 17).

8) Park Sung-Bae, *Hanguk Sasang-gwa Bulgyo*, 25.

9) Kim Yong-pyo, "Wonhyo's Perspective on the Common Essence of Religions and Pluralistic Inclusivism," *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culturer* 20 (2013.9), 33-57, at 37-38. And even the next phrase "鏡納萬形"(a mirror reflects all forms) and "水分通融"(water divides and passes

www.kci.go.kr

His implicative principle was to embrace positively all the differences in the world and precipitate to "a certain spiritual stage transcending right and wrong." [10] His religious perspective is indeed pluralistic, at least in terms of his unique logic of reconciliation, that acknowledges every religious teaching as it is.[11] His ultimate concern and emphasis on his pursuit of reconciliation is to transcend even the boundaries of Buddhism, perfectly free from all obstacles to the truth. At the core of his *hwajaeng*, there is a unique and consistent formulation on language.

---

through each other) in the tower are also sustaining a similar principle.

10) Park Sung-Bae, *Hanguk Sasang-gwa Bulgyo*, 25-26. This is so reasonable for Wŏnhyo, because, first of all, according to his *Pŏphwa jong-yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the Lotus Sūtra, 法華宗要): H. 1, 489a, he had regarded "the immeasuable vehicle is the one vehicle"(謂無量乘皆是一乘故); "they came from Buddha-nature and there is not any other basis than that"(皆依佛性 無異體故). Interpreting both Buddhism and other religions as one truth, Wŏnhyo have intended to regard this "one vehicle"(一乘) as the whole, including non-Buddhists such as Sāṃkya (數論派 or 僧伽) or Jainism (尼乾子) at his time as well as the three vehicles (三乘) in the "Teaching that Conveys Believers to Liberation"(所乘法) of this book. He continually said, "[t]hough they [Sāṃkya and Jainists] have various different figures, they all must across the bridge of Buddha-dharma because there is no other crossing"(此諸外道善男子等, 雖行種種諸異學相, 皆同佛法一橋梁度, 更無餘度故: H. 1, 489a).

11) In that sense, Kim Yong-pyo defines Wŏnhyo's perspective as "pluralistic inclusivism" that encompasses the pluralism of the one vehicle and the discriminative inclusivism, citing Wŏnhyo, *Taehyedogyŏng jong-yo* [Doctrinal Essentials of the Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra, 大慧度經宗要]: H. 1, 480b; Kim Yong-pyo, "Wonhyo's Perspective," 41.

www.kci.go.kr

1. Hwajaeng and Ilsim (一心, one mind)

Language is only upāya, not svabhāva. For Wŏnhyo, returning to the "one mind"(一心) as the way of harmonizing disputes does indeed mean to cut off the illusive relationship between language and reality(*svabhāva*).[12] That is the key of his philosophy on language. As *piyŏn piburyŏn* (非然非不然) or simply *puryŏn kiyŏn* (不然其然, "not so and yet so") indeed, Wŏnhyo's "one mind" philosophy leaves words and goes beyond thoughts, since they are simply "concepts that are temporarily given without reality"(一切言說假名無實; *Taesŭnggisin non* H.1,11c).

This logic is paradoxical; Everything is fluid and flexible, and so the one-mind hermeneutics of Wŏnhyo does not judge according to the words and thoughts, but their meaning contexts.[13] In *Taesūnggisin non byŏlgi* (Expository Notes on the Awakening of Mahayana Faith; 大乘起信論別記), Wŏnhyo explicates it in a very subtle way (H. 1, 677c7-14):

> 然夫佛道之為道也 簫焉空寂 堪爾冲玄 玄之又玄之 出萬像之表
> 寂之又寂之 猶在百家之談 非像表也 [...] 將謂有耶 一如由之而空

12) Wŏnhyo differentiates "meaning words"(義語) with reality (實義) from "literary words"(文語) without it, that is, 文語非義 義語非文; *Kŭmgang sammae kyŏng non* H.1.653b1-17.

13) In that milieu, the paradoxical nature of the one mind that Wŏnhyo had in mind is quite similar to or undifferentiated from Laozi's *Dáo* (道) in the First Chapter of *Dáodé jing* that designated to transcend all dualistic discriminations between the subject and the object (道可道 非常道, 名可名 非常名; "If we define *Dáo* as *Dáo*, it cannot be the true *Dáo* [because it cannot be defined by any fixed word], and if we give a name to name, it cannot be a genuine name [because it cannot be named by any fixed substance"]).

www.kci.go.kr

> 將謂無耶 萬物用之而生 不知何以言之強為道.[14]
> "The nature of the Buddhist path is silent, empty, and profound, and clear, gentle, and deep, and thus deep and deep. How does it appear on the surface of all things? Being profound and profound, it contains the discourses of Hundred Schools [...] *We mean to say that it 'exists,' but while constantly working, it is empty, and we intend to say that it is 'nothing,' but everything originates from utilizing it.* We are forced to call it Dao (道) because we cannot know how to express it."[15]

Such an unfathomable and indiscriminate depth of the one mind is in fact denoting of the great awakening realm "to leave words and go beyond thoughts"(離言絶慮), which continues likewise analogically in his *byŏlgi* (H. 1, 677c16–18).[16] Therefore, as for Wŏnhyo, it can be said that the one mind embraces existence and nonexistence, true and common, and even transcends cause and effect, and nature and character.[17] Its wholeness and non-duality as supreme

14) Interestingly, in his *Gisinnon so* (Commentary to the Awakening of Mahayana Faith; 起信論疏 H. 1, 698) and *Daesūnggisinnon so gihwoibon* (大乘起信論疏記會本 H. 1, 733), the second half is different: "引之於有 一如用之而空 獲之於無 萬物乘之而生 不知何以言之 強號之謂大乘"(emphasis mine). It is also very close to the Chapter 25 of *Dáodé jing*.

15) Emphasis mine. Such logic is reminiscent of *Taehyedogyŏng jong-yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra; 大慧道經宗要): "Since there is nothing to attain, there is nothing that is not attained"(無所示故, 無所不示. 無所得故, 無所不得, H. 1. 480a16–17).

16) 有至公故 動靜隨成 無其私故 染淨斯融 染淨融故 真俗平等; ["The essence of the one mind is] movable and at the same time tranquil, since it is utterly just; clean and at the same time is dyed, since it is impartial; and the real and conventional is equal, since clean and dyed are united each other."

17) Kim Yeongil, "The Study on the Method of Wonhyo's Theory of Harmonization," 265.

www.kci.go.kr

religious experience to "return to the source of the one mind"(歸一心源) indeed became a dynamic force that it could excellently dissolve and unite all different arguments about truth within the single taste of enlightenment.

The thoroughgoing application of hwajaeng is comprehensively delineated by his work *Simmun hwajaeng non* (Ten Approaches to the Harmonization of Doctrinal Disputes; 十門和諍論),[18] which summarized the most disputed doctrinal controversies by ten themes that needed urgent reconciliation.[19] The preface of the *Kosŏn-sa Sŏdang hwasang t'appi* (Stele Inscription to Master *Sŏdang* [viz. Wŏnhyo] of *Kosŏn-sa*; 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑) which was built in the beginning of the ninth century CE, about 100 years after his nirvana, introduced the background of hwajaeng:[20] 空空之論雲奔, 或言我是, 言他不是, 或設我然,

18) The impact of *Simmunhwajaeng non* (hereafter, *SHN*) on the Silla Buddhism of Wŏnhyo's day was extensive, according to *Kosŏn-sa Sŏdang hwasang t'appi* (Stele Inscription to Master Sŏdang of Kosŏn-sa; 高仙寺誓幢和上塔碑), the earliest extant account of Wŏnhyo's life that just mentioned two of his works, the *SHN* along with the non-extant *Hwaŏm chong-yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the Flower Ornament. Sutra). Muller argues that Wŏnhyo's contemporaries regarded the *SHN* as his *magnum opus* (Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization," 10).

19) Just two themes are extant: ① 空有二執和諍門, harmonizing disputes on emptiness by Madhyamika and existence by Yogācāra; ② 佛性有無和諍門, reconciling disputes on the existence of tathāgatagarbha between Hinayana and Mahayana. The whole ten themes are retrieved by many scholarly researches, though not in certainty. See those ten themes in Kim Myong-Hee, "Hermeneutic Approach to the Hwajeng Idea of Wonhyo," 126-127.

20) Inscription from Park Tae-Won, *Wŏnhyoui Simmnunhwajaeng non* (Wŏnhyo's Ten Approaches to the Harmonization of Doctrinal Disputes; 十門和諍論) Seoul: Sechang Ch'ulp'an-sa, 2013), 239; Pak Chong-hong, "Wŏnhyo's Philosophical Thought," 54. Kim Myong-Hee retrieved its hypothetical text in her paper, "*Wŏnhyo Hwajaeong non ŭi Haesuk'hakjŏk*

www.kci.go.kr

設他不然, 遂成河漢矣 ("These vain theories diffused like clouds. Some claimed they were right while others were wrong, or that they were correct while others were incorrect. Thus these claims became more and more farfetched"). Among those disputing schools, two major doctrinal controversies between *Mādhyamika* and Yogācāra, mainly concerned Wŏnhyo who attempted to unify these disparate opinions and to resolve their controversies by his SHN and also by his *Taesŭng kisillon so/pyŏlgi* (Commentary and Expository Notes to the Awakening of Mahayana Faith; 大乘起信論疏/別記).

Particularly, the first chapter of *hwajaeng* in the SHN concerns "harmonizing disputes on 'emptiness' by *Mādhyamika* and 'existence' by *Yogācāra*"(空有二執和諍門; kong'yu izip hwajaeng mun), which was the most serious problem at Wŏnhyo's time that continually racked Silla Buddhism due to doctrinal controversies. In fact, this controversies was not basically concerning so much about ontological disputes on *kong yu* (空有; emptiness and existence) at modern times as the matter of breaking away from conceptual traps, that is, distancing from the words. [21]

---

jŏp'kŭn"[Hermeneutic Approach to the Hwajeng Idea of Wonhyo: focused on the theory of dialogues among religions], *Wŏnpulgyo sasang kwa Chonggyo munhwa* [Won-Buddhist Thought & Religious Culture] 38 (2008.2), 121-161, at 126-127; idem, "The Spirituality of Wonhyo's Hwajeng and Interreligious Dialogue: based on a comparison of the accommodation of Matteo Ricci and the mysticism of Enomiya-Lassalle," *Studies in Religion* 76/2 (2016), 1-50, at 24; Park Tae-Won, Wŏnhyo Sasang II: *Wŏnhyo ŭi Hwajaeng Sasang* [Philosophy of Wŏnhyo II: Hwajaeng Philosophy](Ulsan, Kor.: UUP, 2005), 26.

www.kci.go.kr

Due to the fact that he tries to reveal the truth by cutting off conceptual hallucination resorting to the words (引可言喩 難離言法, SHN: H.1, 838b9), Wŏnhyo denotes a contradictory propagation that "this existence, as I admit, does not differ from the emptiness"(此所許有 不異於空, H.1, 838a12).[22] Wŏnhyo's logic of the Great Affirmation seems to be generated by *Yogācāra* that attempted to explicate emptiness in the way of affirmation; and, on the contrary, the Great Negation is assumed from *Mādhyamika* that has written emptiness in a negative way.[23] The true-suchness (眞如),

21) The *kong-yu hwajaeng* (空有和諍) by Wŏnhyo is mainly discussed in *Pŏmganggyŏngbosalgyebon sagi* (梵網經菩薩戒本私記), *Muryangsugyŏng jong-yo* (無量壽經宗要), *Taesūnggisinnon byŏlgi* (大乘起信論別記), and SHN. For example, Wŏnhyo points out four problems on emptiness-existence disputes: *chŭng'ik* (增益, endless increase), *son'gam* (損減, endless decrease), *sang'wi* (相違, mutual opposition), *wuch'i* (愚癡, ignorance and stupidity) by falling into both extremes in *Muryangsugyŏng jong-yo*: H.1, 561b.

22) According to his *sagu nolli* (四句論理, four-phrase logic) in *Yŏlban chong-yo* H.1, 536a-537b (① *yu* [有, existence] or *yŏn* [然, being-so]; ② *mu* [無, no existence] or *piyŏn* [非然, not being-so]; ③ *piyu pimu* [非有非無, no existence and not no-existence] or *piyŏn pipuryŏn* [非然 非不然, not being-so and no not-being-so]; ④ *yŏg'yu yŏgmu* [亦有亦無, both existence and no existence at the same time] or *yŏg'yŏn yŏgpiyŏn* [亦然亦非然, both being-so and not being-so at the same time]), Wŏnhyo inculcates that existence and emptiness are different to each other, as well as not different at the same time, as if those different fingers to indicate the moon that already distanced them (如寄手指 以示離指之月; H.1, 838b8). Accordingly, the two seeming dualistic contradiction is ultimately harmonized by the Great Negation of the third (*daebujŏng*, 大否定), *piyu pimu* (非有非無, no existence and not no-existence), and the Great Affirmation of the fourth (*daegŭngjŏng*, 大肯定), *yŏg'yu yŏgmu* (亦有亦無, existence and no existence at the same time), because the two different conceptual logics are merely an expedient *upāya* to acknowledge and experience the truth of the one mind (假許是有 實非墮有 此所許有 非不墮有; SHN:H.1, 838a13-14) as not-two.

www.kci.go.kr

according to Wŏnhyo, transcends both existence and emptiness. The "existence"(有) in disputes simply means an arising (生) of phenomena with no reality, occurred in consort with changing conditions; whereas the "emptiness"(無) means a disappearing (滅) of phenomena with no reality, according to its occurring conditions.[24] In other words, they are one and the same, since both words are expressed by presupposing no existence of reality; existence and emptiness are one in the one network, the same in terms of mutually co-reliant relationship. So, he says, this not being-so is not different from being-so, as if existence is not different from emptiness (此之非然不異於然, 喩如其有不異於空, H.1, 838a18-19). Breaking away from conceptual delusion in order to reveal the reality, Wŏnhyo claims that advocating all of the four phrase logics on existence and emptiness is not contradictory and wrong (是故四句並立而離諸過失也, H.1, 838a20). His logic of negation is, therefore, not for the negation itself, but for the Great Affirmation, revealing the true-suchness. By breaking off the discriminative knowledge in controversies, therefore, Wŏnhyo utilizes his propagation of the Absolute Emptiness (*chŏldaemu*, 絶對無) for the Great Affirmation (*daegŭngjŏng*, 大肯定), negating such confrontation itself and harmonizing them.

23) Kim Myong-hee, "Spirituality of Wonhyo's Hwajeng," 29-30.
24) *Ibid.*, 29.

www.kci.go.kr

2. Hwajaeng and mal yŏin gŏt (離言之事)

Another caution is necessarily warranted concerning the nature of language that, although any thorough grasp of and detailed logical argumentation by citing canonical sources will be provided, true resolution of doctrinal disputes resides neither in accuracy and subtle analysis of preconceptions held by disputants, ie., logical reconciliation of their positions, nor in regarding all disputative doctrines to be subsumed in ilsim. Instead, Wŏnhyo argues that it does lie in the ability of those who can freely dissociate one's own mind from the words—"be able to step out into, and observe from a non-conceptualizing state."[25] Deeply acknowledging and experiencing such a non-linguistic domain of *hwajaeng*, one can ultimately get in the only true point of perceiving things the way they are. Concerning the imperfect and unobtainable nature of language grasping to the one vehicle, Wŏnhyo clearly makes a turning point in *Pŏphwa jong-yo* (H.1, 491a7-14, particularly 10-14):

> 若言寄言說無所得, 而非如言取於無得. 是故, 無得不入四句者, 他亦寄言假說一乘, 而非如言取於一乘. 所以一乘亦出四句. 是故當知, 遂言俱非. 不如言取, 二說無異;
> If, relying on words, we say it is unobtainable; this is not the same as language attaching to non-obtainability. Therefore the unobtainable does not fall within the four logical possibilities. There are other cases where one also relies on words to provisionally explain the One Vehicle, but this is not the same as language grasping to the One Vehicle. This is because the One Vehicle indeed falls outside the four possibilities. Therefore we should know that in pursuing words, both are wrong. If we

25) Muller, "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization," 34.

www.kci.go.kr

> are not attached to the language, there is no difference between the two explanations.

Any subtle logic of human language in itself, whatever profound it may be, will not faultlessly take the wholeness of Buddha nature, and at the same time any pursuing language in human co-dependant relationship also can provisionally grasp it. The point of his argumentation is to reject any illusive attachment to human language as final and conclusive one.[26] Here, Wŏnhyo's conclusion is crystal-clear in that no matter what position one takes regarding the disputes on existence and emptiness, the point is to learn how to think while maintaining a certain degree of *mal yŏin gŏt* (離言之事; "distance from the words").[27] If one removes illusive discrimination and attachment to it, he or she will taste thusness and reality free from language. So, distancing from the words means and is grounded by the recognition that, inevitably clinging to the words though, they are simply aspects having no *jasŏng* (自性, true nature).[28]

---

26) Such admonition in a more fully developed argument by Wŏnhyo is found in a comparative story *SHN*: H.1.838b11-18, particularly at 16-18: 離言之事, 如是空事. 隨其所應前時容受長短等色; "The situation of being free from language is like this situation of space, which adapts according to the size and shape previously occupied by various objects."

27) http://www.acmuller.net/kor-bud/simmun_hwajaeng_non.html. Access on Sept 29, 2019; See also *Daesŭnggisinnon* 11b: 是故一切法從本已來, 離言說相, 離名字相; "Essentially, all Dharmas are distancing words and names and aspects." The Korean rendering of "*mal yŏin gŏt*"(말 여읜 것) is attributed to Park Tae-won(*Wŏnhyo ŭi Simmunhwajaeng non*, 46).

28) *Taesŭnggisin non* (大乘起信論; Awakening of Mahayana Faith:11c-12b) repeatedly admonishes to avoid conceptual traps as Wŏnhyo does: 以一切言說假名無實, 但隨妄念, 不可得故. 言眞如者, 亦無有相. 謂言說之極, 因言遣言 [...]

www.kci.go.kr

Disconnecting from words, in point of fact, Wŏnhyo precipitates us to see beyond the linguistic differences and taking their underpinnings. It is because his ultimate purpose of harmonizing disputes cannot be achieved only philosophical and linguistic argumentation grounded on logical mastery on canons. Wŏnhyo reminds us that they cannot be key determinants. Here, Wŏnhyo tries to advocate dismantling of any extreme attachment to the disputant's position, in which human beings need to understand themselves and their world in a holistic way, that is, one mind two aspects. That's why his *hwajaeng* goes beyond logical or doctrinal supports, as exemplified in *Yŏlban jong-yo* (H.1.537b8-9): 定取一邊不當道里. 無障礙說 二義豈得者 ("Rigid attachment to one extreme is not the correct principle. If they are explained in a non-obstructive way, both interpretations are acceptable").

當知一切法 不可說不可念, 故名爲眞如 ("All words are concepts that are temporarily given without reality. They are simply following delusion, so that they cannot achieve [reality]. What we say thusness does not also hold any aspect, but it can express the ultimate meaning in that it distances the words by clinging to the words [...] It is to be acknowledged that all Dharma cannot be grasped by words and thinking, so that it is named as thusness"). The *SHN* H.1.838b4-10 gives a similar explanation by another parable of the "Bull's horn and Rabbit's horn": 牛角非有, 兎角不無. 故如汝所取 但是名言. 故我寄言說 以示絶言之法. 如寄手指 以示離指之月. 汝今直爾如言取義. 引可言喩 難離言法. 但看指端 責其非月; ["From the absolute perspective] the horns of a bull do not exist and the horns of a rabbit are not non-existent. Hence, you are only clinging to the words. Thus I rely on language to show the method of cutting off language. It is like relying on the finger to point to the moon, which is not related to the finger. You now simply grasp the meaning according to the words. When you rely on examples that are expressed in language, it is difficult to free oneself from the system of language. You simply look at the finger and criticize it for not being the moon."

www.kci.go.kr

The only real recourse to enter the domain of non-conceptual hwajaeng is none other than the experience of deep faith in Mahayana, as seen in *Muryangsukyŏng chong-yo* (Doctrinal Essentials of the Sutra of Immesurable Life; 無量壽經宗要; H.1.562a9-10): 只應信仰, 不可比量. 故名無等無倫最上勝智 ("One should just have faith, because it cannot be apprehended through reason. Therefore it is called the incomparable, unequalled, supreme cognitive faculty"). In this way, Wŏnhyo's hwajaeng surely turns out to purport not just for theory and learning but more rather for practice and experience in the one-mind living. To be sure, his harmonizing concern is on the religio-experiential dimension, arrival to the state of deep faith where words cannot gain any traction.

III. Understanding of the Lord's Prayer [29]

As an embodiment and epitome of the Christian good news,[30] the Lord's Prayer provides a new avenue for understanding the pinnacle and core of Jesus' Gospel,[31] that

29) For the constraints of space in this work, see the full discussion on the underpinnings and context of the Lord's Prayer in the writer's previous work, "Partaking of Jesus' Mystical Experience: Reading the Lord's Prayer in Jewish Wisdom Tradition" *KENTS* 48 (2017), 40-74.

30) Kenneth Stevenson, *Abba Father: Understanding and Using the Lord's Prayer* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 2000), 45.

31) The Lord's Prayer is very close to the first century synagogue *Qaddish* prayers. It is more possible for Jesus himself as devout Jew to have used traditional Jewish expressions for his prayer. In addition, another Jewish prayer having a possible impact on the Lord's Prayer is the "Eighteen

www.kci.go.kr

shows his mysterious articulation to his disciples in persecution and teaches their identification with human reality as it is with his foremost concern.[32] Through his refurbished, final, and messianic interpretation of Torah, which had long been expected by Judaism of coming Messiah, the Lord's Prayer essentially taught what he hinted, in the sense that the individualized, interiorized aspects of ordinary life become the core formula of his gospel.

As its context, the Sermon on the Mount introduces the overarching structure of Jesus' teachings as his moral vision within the Gospel of Matthew,[33] which depicts Jesus as radical, essential, and a liberal interpreter of Torah who upended sectarian and casuistic argumentation of Jewish authorities. In it, Jesus' Eight Beatitudes[34] was imbued with much more essential, radical, and universal spirit in nature. It hinted his constituency of the Kingdom of God, in which the individualized, interiorized, and practical aspects of ordinary life would become a core formula of new gospel, shockingly

---

Benedictions," sharing similar content, similar endings, and similar structure.

32) The last doxology is by scholars commonly regarded as late and not original, surely absent from the oldest manuscripts, which is also lacking completely in Luke. John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans; Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 293.

33) Scot McKnight, *Sermon on the Mount* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013), 20. The Sermon on the Mount is the first of five sets of discourse in Matthew, which ends in 7:28, a commonly sharing formula. Nolland, *Matthew*, 190-91.

34) By Jesus, eight blessings are propagated to the poor in spirit, meek, sorrowing, thirst for righteousness, merciful, pure in heart, peace-making, and persecuted (Matthew 5:3-12).

www.kci.go.kr

different from the contemporary system by the Pharisees. In particular, it revealed that becoming a member of the Kingdom would not mean so much for its own benefit, but more for the sake of the other and the whole world, in which those members would totally commit and empty themselves. This is crystallized in his Sermon on the Mount, particularly through the Lord's Prayer. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' diatribe against the Pharisaic claims is more clearly understood by six antithetical statements on anger, adultery, oaths, revenge, love and hate (Matthew 5:21−47), radically getting to their roots. Jesus' pungent criticism over Pharisaic dogmatism is all clearly and richly summarized by one sentence: "Be perfect as your heavenly father is perfect"(5:48). Jesus' radicalness in interpreting Torah has common propensities of demanding "interior disposition corresponding to out action" (in the cases of anger and adultery, 5:21−30), "absolute adherence rather than a mitigating casuistry"(in the cases of oaths and divorce, 31−37), and going beyond the letter of Torah (in the cases of revenge and love of enemies, 38−48), all of which represent the righteousness surpassing that of the Pharisees and scribes (5:20).[35]

As the iconic Christian prayer, the Lord's Prayer is framed in three parts (Matthew 6:9−13):[36] Opening phrases about

35) Johnson, *Writings of the New Testament*, 201.

36) The Lukan version of the Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:2−4) is simpler than Matthew's as it concludes without doxology. It simply starts with "Father." Luke does not have the Matthean third Thou−petition (6:10b, "your will be done on earth as it is in heaven").

www.kci.go.kr

addressing God as Father; the body that lays out Jesus' teaching in accordance with the Father and human beings; and a concluding sentence known as "doxology," which was probably used as part of the Eucharistic liturgy. Of significance is that with the Sermon on the Mount as its context, the Lord's Prayer provides a new avenue for understanding Jesus' gospel in that it offers an understanding of our human being as his foremost concern. Jesus taught his disciples what he practiced and also modeled what he taught.

The first word "Father" who Jesus called to is the very heart of the Lord's Prayer.[37] His call to Father actually spelled out the whole meaning and significance of the Lord's Prayer.[38] It is because the wisdom motif of Jesus' rejection and death is deeply penetrated by his call to Father into the Lord's Prayer, particularly toward Jesus' disciples as "wandering preachers" who were persecuted and harassed by the Jewish mainstream. Much dismayed by the "silence of God" in Book of Job and Qoheleth, they probably looked so bewildered and shocked, so as to ask Jesus how and what to pray to God.[39] Hence, they were desperate in need of a resolution from their teacher. Not surprisingly, however, the

37) For classical discussions on "Father"(*'abbā'*) in the Lord's Prayer, see Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1967); idem, "Abba," *The Central Message of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1965), 9-30.

38) Sung Jin Song, "Theological Understanding on the Lord's Prayer," *Theology and the World* 78 (2013.12), 81-111, at 84,85.

39) Chong Seong Cheong, "Partaking of Jesus' Mystical Experience: Reading the Lord's Prayer in Jewish Wisdom Tradition," *KENTS* 48 (2017), 40-74, at 55-57.

www.kci.go.kr

returning answer for them to listen to was "neither a promise of his powerful protection nor of the divine engagement and revenge, but instead a call to their total obedience to the will of Father,"[40] that is, to be ready not to disappoint and give up their faith. For such unexpected difficulties, they were asked to be prepared,[41] as it was what Jesus himself had exemplified by his esoteric experience as embodied in the Lord's Prayer. Already in the context of Q, Jesus' '*abbā*' in the Lord's Prayer explicitly sounds the serious motifs of his rejection and death in relation to the disciples,[42] further reflecting his own mystical experience of God.

In the Lord's Prayer, however, Jesus' immediate and intuitive awareness of God did not mean that the ever-present human reality of suffering could be alleviated, suffering which was to be likewise assumed by his disciples. God's kingship would be crystallized only by man's absolute surrender and the emptying of himself, i.e., freedom from all desires and fears, a freedom that Jesus was able to foretaste on the cross: "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit"(Lk 23:46). Jesus' self-negation is commensurate with his willingness to abandon his attachment to himself and his self-centered pride. Through this complete detachment from the self, his self-denial conversely aligned him to be "mystically one" with the Father, that is, to "go beyond." Becoming one with God, in which the individuality completely permeates into the

40) *Ibid.*, 57-58.
41) *Ibid.*, 58.
42) *Ibid.*, 56.

www.kci.go.kr

entirety, is the fundament of the Lord's Prayer as a Jewish wisdom prayer, particularly in milieu of the incomprehensibility of God, which is connotatively similar to the "*hebel*" of Qoheleth in the Hebrew Bible.[43]

If the three "Thou" petitions in the first half are related to the Absolute God, in which the humans must totally empty themselves to be one with the father, then the next three "we" petitions in the latter half are concerned with communal solidarity through care for immanent problems. By assimilating to God and forming a union with him, all devout practitioners following Jesus become likewise unified with all things from the father's perspective. In Jesus' eyes, transcendence and immanence, heaven and earth are not discrete.[44] Indeed, Jesus taught that the two are inseparable and co-dependent, which is culminated by this prayer. It is only when the faith of Jesus' followers takes both modes that it becomes truly efficacious.[45]

43) Qoheleth's cry of hebel connotes 'mysterious' or 'incomprehensible' rather than 'vain.'

44) Cheong, "Jesus' Mystical Experience," 65-66; Jonathan T. Pennington, *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew* (SNT 126; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 247.

45) Cheong, "Jesus' Mystical Experience," 66.

www.kci.go.kr

IV. Understanding of the 21 Letters Incantation in Tonghak

The first Tonghak patriarch, Su-un Ch'oe Che-u (水雲 崔濟愚, 1824-1864), briefly explicates the meaning of his chumun (呪文, incantation) in *Nonhakmun* (論學文, Discussion on Learning) no.11 of *Tonggyŏng Taejŏn* (東經大全, Great Scripture of Eastern Learning; hereafter "TT"):[46]

> 曰呪文之意何也 曰 至爲天主之字故 以呪言之 今文有古文有.[47]
> They asked, "What is the meaning of incantation?" I answered, "The incantation is the words that honor the Heavenly Lord with the utmost sincerity. There are incantations today as there were incantations in the ancient times."[48]
> *Si ch'ŏnju chohwa chŏng yŏngse pulmang mansa chi* (侍天主 造化定 永世不忘萬事知).
> Bearing the Heavenly Lord, I shall become one with all creation; remembering the Lord forever, I shall discern the essence of all things.[49]
> *Chigi kŭmji wŏnwi taegang* (至氣今至 願爲待降)

---

46) The TT, complete works of well-organized essays, was written by *Ch'oe Che-u* in the classical Chinese in order to explain the teachings of Tonghak systematically, and by doing so to persuade the intellectuals (Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," *Tonghak hakpo* 20 (2010.12), 119-155, at 127).

47) *Nonhakmun* (論學文) no.11 in TT.

48) Kim Yong Choon tr. and ed., *Chondogyo Scripture: Donggyeong Daejeon* (*Great Scripture of Eastern Learning*) (University Press of America, 2007), 10. The following English version of TT is quoted from this book, and otherwise any personal translation will be remarked with.

49) Paul Beirne, *Su-un and His World of Symbols: The Founder of Korea's First Indigenous Religion* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 118.

www.kci.go.kr

The 21 Letters Incantation(hereafter, "TLI") is formulated in the context of Tonghak,[50] a religious sect initiated by *Su-un* in 1860,[51] when he had a profound experience with the deity after his illness. At that time, he also received a *yŏngbu* (sacred talisman or diagram, 靈符) to rescue people from disease and the divine commission to teach *chumun* and the new truth. On recovering from his illness, he began to preach his new teaching, Tonghak, to his family and friends and then more widely throughout the southern provinces of Kore a.[52] Such an intense experience of Su-un (which is called *Gyŏngsinnyŏn ch'ehŏm*; 庚申年 體驗) had finally culminated in founding a new religious movement occurred in April 5, 1860 (庚申年, *Gyŏngsinnyŏn*). Along with such a mysterious narrative, healing ceremonies and incantations surely precipitated the common people to be attracted by Tonghak. His influence is indeed prefaced with the idea that such a

50) The core ideas and identity of Tonghak are, however, not unanimous among scholars, that is, remaining complicated and, particularly, its religious character seems to be also elusive in a certain way (Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," 122). My work is, therefore, simply to concentrate on the meaning and its specific context of *chumun* from the point of Tonghak's own nature, instead of introducing to a contour-chasing description of its history.

51) Su-un was "a frustrated intellectual by the distorted social system" in *Chosŏn* (朝鮮) period. As a son of a remarried widow, he could not apply for a civil official. His father, however, a reputed scholar, recognized his son's intelligence begetting in his later years and gave him opportunities to be educated. Such estrangement, particularly between his ability and social restraints, probably made him unsettled (Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," 128).

52) Beirne, *Su-un and His World of Symbols*, 37-50; George Kallander, *Salvation through Dissent: Tonghak Heterodoxy and Early Modern Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013), 58-61.

www.kci.go.kr

mystical experience by him is located "within authentic human religiosity."[53]

At the time of the early 1860's, Su-un was desperately attempting to counter the influence of *Sŏhak* (西學, Western Learning) and also to give support and comfort to the people. His main writings, including TT and *Yongdam Yusa* (龍潭遺詞, Memorial Songs of *Yongdam*; hereafter "YY"),[54] thus articulates such a sense of growing national anxieties and distresses created by the incursion of Western religion.[55] His trenchant criticism and lamentation on this is particularly toward the imperialistic *Sŏgyo* (西敎, Western Learning, that is, Catholicism at that time), as far as national crisis is concerned, remarked in *Nonhakmun* (論學文, Discussion on Learning) and *Podŏkmun* (布德文, Propagating the Truth) of TT, respectively.[56]

---

53) Moon Myongsook. "Donghak and the God of Choe, Je-u: Through the *Donggyeong Daejeon* and the *Yongdam Yusa*," *Catholic Theology and Thought* 79 (2017.7), 218-260, at 225.

54) The YY, an anthology of popular-style songs with four-foot in a verse, was also written by *Su-un* in vernacular Korean for the full understanding of general public (Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," 127).

55) Moon, "Donghak and the God of Choe, Je-u," 219.

56) 夫庚申之年 建巳之月 天下紛亂 民心淆薄 莫知所向之地. [...] 都緣無他 斯人 道稱西道 學稱天主 敎則聖敎 (論學文 4); 又此挽近以來 一世之人 各自爲心 不順天理 不顧天命 心常悚然 莫知所向矣 (布德文 4); 是故 我國惡疾滿世 民無四時之安 是亦 傷害之數也 (布德文 8); "The country was in chaos in April 1860, and the minds of people were confused, and no direction or solution was known. [...] The reason is none other than the way that they call the Western way, the learning that they call Catholicism and the religion that they call holy religion (*Nonhakmun* 4). However, in current times the people of the world have selfish minds, and do not follow the Principle of Heaven nor care for the Will of Heaven.

www.kci.go.kr

His extensive worry and criticism seems to first point to the problem of gap between the rhetoric about a God-centered life promoting common good and the selfish life living only for oneself. Concerning about people's selfishness (各自爲心, *kakjawisim*) that does not keep the heaven's principles and mandates and regarding it as a great evil, Su-un urges them to stop such selfishness and instead to respect *Hanullim* with reverence (爲天主). In it, he is concerned more about the Western imperial aggression according to what he observed to be the "irrational and illogical emphasis on outward religious conformism."[57]

In that milieu, the key doctrine of Tonghak as a religious sect is said to acknowledge human beings as a higher being and all people's right to be equal on earth. Tonghak (later, *Ch'ŏndogyo* [天道教] as well)[58] had profound views of human nature expressing in two key phrases, "*sich'ŏnju*"(侍天主; simply, "human beings bear divinity") and later "*innaech'ŏn*" (人乃天; "human beings are none other than heaven," formally propagated by the third patriarch, ŭiam Son Pyŏng-hŭi [義菴 孫秉熙, 1859-1922]). Put differently, human beings are one with God in essence and in potentiality, and

Therefore, my mind is always anxious and fearful, and I don't know what will happen in the future (*Podŏkmun* 4). Recently, our country has been filled with evil things. The people live in a time without peace. This is an indication of the bad fortune of our nation (*Podŏkmun* 8).

57) Moon, "Donghak and the God of Choe, Je-u," 219.

58) *Ch'ŏndogyo* (天道教, literally, religion of heavenly way) is the modernized version of Tonghak, which nevertheless cannot be often asserted to completely take over the predecessor's thoughts (Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," 122).

www.kci.go.kr

they can fulfill such oneness in practices of sincere faith and morality, which clearly reflects mystical as well as humanistic characteristics. Since they believed that humans are essentially divine, they must treat others with the utmost concern, respect, sincerity, dignity, equality, and justice.

Their similar and more expanded injunction of "*sain yŏch'ŏn*"(事人如天, "serve people as God") by haewŏl Ch'oe Si-hyŏng (海月 崔時亨, 1827-1898), the second official patriarch of Tonghak, whose democratic propagation was in practice revolutionary in the context of the nineteenth-century feudalistic Korea, even boldly taught that natural processes are none other than parts of God, thus strengthening immanent features of Tonghak.[59] No doubt, proper behaviors by human beings naturally would be the way to show their respect for God. This thought is also linked resultantly with the combined problem of serving God and treating creation and other people at the same time. It is the very practical manifestation of serving people as God. Accordingly, *sain yŏch'ŏn* also naturally leads to the ideal concepts of *samgyŏng* (三敬, the three respects), which involves *kyŏngch'ŏn* (敬天, respecting heaven), *kyŏngin* (敬人, respecting people), and *kyŏngmul* (敬物, respecting things). Only by serving and respecting other human beings and creation, one can truly be said to respect the Heaven in practice, not least because they are none other than "physical manifestation of the Heaven" or God.[60]

59) Hwang Sŏn-hŭi, *Korea's modern thought and the national movement* ["Han'guk kŭndae sasang kwa minjok undong"] (Seoul: Hyean, 1996), 70-76.

www.kci.go.kr

Significantly, the key thought of Tonghak's "*sich'ŏnju*" and "*innaech'ŏn*" was unfathomably activated and expanded mainly due to its radical attitude in social revolution, which was explosively germinated by the local Tonghak leader Chŏn Pong-jun (全琫準, 1855-1895). Discontent with Tonghak's derogatory status, escalated by the general peasant demands for reform of governmental corruption and improper taxation,[61] let alone the long-lasting feudal discrimination of people, Confucian segregation between man and woman and aristocrat-centered socio-economic system unavoidably inflamed the Tonghak Peasant Revolution in 1894.[62] Chŏn

60) Carl Young, *Eastern Learning and the Heavenly Way: The Tonghak and Ch'ŏndogyo Movements and the Twilight of Korean Independence* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014), 144-145.

61) Suh Yŏng-hee, "*kaehangki ponggŏnjok kukkajaejŏng ŭi uikiwa minjung sutal ŭi kanghwa*"[The Financial Crisis of Feudal State at the Port-Opening Period and Repressive Exploitation of People" in *1894 nyŏn nongmin chŏnjaeng yŏnku* [A Study on the 1894 Peasant Revolution I] (Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏng sa, 1992), 126-169.

62) *Tonghak Peasant Revolution* (TPR) includes the first civil revolt in *Chŏlla* district, occurred in January, March and April of 1894, and the second revolt in *Ch'ungch'ŏng* district since October. Cheong Chong-seong, "*1894 nyŏn tonghak nongminhyŏkmyŏng kwa Pokŭmsŏ ŭi Pittang'gam e taehan Pikyŏ yŏnku*"[A Comparative Study on Debt-Reduction in 1894 Donghak Peasant Revolution and the Gospels] *KENTS* 13 (2014.6), 270-305, at 270-271; idem, "*Tonghak undong ŭi kwanjŏm esŏ salpyŏbon Nuka ŭi ch'ŏngjiikipiyu ŭi kong'gong haengbok yŏnku*"[A Research on the Principles of Public Happiness in Luke's *Shrewd Steward* Parable in view of Donghak Movement] *Theological Thought* 167 (2014.12), 71-115, at 71-72; Kim In-gŏl, "*1894 nyŏn Nongmin hyŏkmyŏng ŭi Ilch'a pongki*"[The first Revolt of 1894 Peasant Revolution] in *1894 nyŏn nongmin hyŏkmyŏng yŏnku* [A Study of the 1894 Peasant Revolution IV] (Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏng sa, 1995), 83-114; Suh Yŏng-hee, "*1894 nyŏn Nongmin hyŏkmyŏng ŭi ich'a pongki*"[The Second Revolt of 1894 Peasant Revolution], idem, 141-166.

www.kci.go.kr

Pong-jun was the charismatic leader of Tonghak's *Namjŏb* (Southern Assembly, 南接) who had already led the Tonghak army to significant victories over government troops to a powerful extent that they successfully took control of the most southwestern Korea,[63] and so that the Korean government could not but appeal for Chinese troops to help put down the rebellion, resultantly attributing to Japanese intervention at the same time.[64] In the Fall of 1894, Chŏn Pong-jun and Ch'oe Si-hyŏng together led a renewed rebellion over the increasing concern about enlarging Japanese influence on Korea. After initial rebels success, the joint forces of government and Japanese soldiers ultimately suppressed the rebellion and exercised a violent crackdown against Tonghak. Chŏn Pong-jun and other key rebel leaders were captured and executed, while Ch'oe Si-hyŏng and other Tonghak leaders fled for hiding.[65]

63) The time of TPR is *kap'onyŏn* (甲午年, year of 1894), and its thought ground is Tonghak, and its initiative force is the peasants, and its characteristic is revolution as a continuing movement. Kim Jin-yŭn, "*Kap'o Tonghak Nongmin Undong ŭi Mokpyo wa Panghyang ŭrosŏ ŭi P'yejŏng Kyehyŏk An*"[The Reformation Bills as the Goal and Way of Kapo Tonghak Peasant Movement] *Minjok sasang* 5/3 (2011), 135-186, at 182.

64) Japanese military government sent troops to protect its interests in Korea and quickly took over the capital of Seoul, which incident had ultimately led to the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 and thus became instrumental in expanding Japan's empire in East Asia (Kallander, *Salvation through Dissent*, 117-121; Young, *Eastern Learning and the Heavenly Way*, 21-25).

65) Kallander, *Salvation through Dissent*, 95-96. *Ch'oe Si-hyŏng* also oversaw the compilation and publication of his predecessor's teachings. These became two distinct volumes, the TT in classical Chinese, and the YY, in vernacular Korean. These form the foundational canon of the Tonghak scriptures and were published in woodblock form in the early 1880's. He

www.kci.go.kr

Right through his conceptuation of *sichŏnju* as such, Su-un mysteriously reveals to substantiate paradoxical and intrinsic relationship between the subject and the object, humans and God, that cannot be discriminated as a disparate entity, the relationship of *p'oham* (包含, mutual inclusion) that is different from *p'oham* (包涵, subordination or inclusive penetration) in a contradictory and bipolar relationship.[66] Here, Su-un's thought is obvious to an extent that humans are to be subsumed by God, but nevertheless not subordinated; that is, not *yangdanjŏk* (兩斷的, two different essence in bipolarity) but *yangdanjŏk* (兩端的, one essence with two ends),[67] in which Tonghak devotees could be

---

also elucidated his own discourses on Tonghak doctrine that later became an important part of Tonghak scripture.

66) Cheong Chong-Seong, "*Tonghak undong ŭi kwanjŏm*," 99; Kim Sang-il, *Suwoon and Whitehead* (Seoul: Chisik sanŏp sa, 2003), 50-52. Su-un's such an original thought is succeeded by the third patriarch *Son Byŏng-Hee* by an expanded key concept of *innaechŏn* (人乃天, human is none other than Heaven), which may have a slightly different nuance from *Hae wŏl*'s *insichŏn* (人是天, human is Heaven). The predicate "*nae*" (乃) in Son Byŏng-Hee's *innaechŏn* (人乃天) is a subtle way to remark that, in such adoption of a specific word, he also cannot sharply discriminate them as the subject and object, though not identical, either. The rendering of Sino-Korean word "*nae*"(乃) into English is not easy, since it sustains a connotation of immediacy and directness without gap. Nevertheless, however, it still maintains within it a slight sense of breakage between the two, that is, still not equivalent. The "*si*"(是) signifies equivalence.

67) That's why Su-un vehemently criticize the Western religion as bipolar in *Nonhakmun* 9: "有形無迹"(*yuhyŏng mujŏk*; There is form but not substance). Conversely, Su-un advocates the character of Tonghak as "*muhyŏng i yuchŏk*"(無形而有迹, There is no form but substance). Cheong Chong-Seong, "*Tonghak undong ŭi kwanjŏm*," 103; Kim Sang-il, *Suwoon and Whitehead*, 53-57.

www.kci.go.kr

energized to be a revolutionary force against the late *Chosŏn* dynasty. In other words, Su-un's personal awakening of self that he had experienced was totally different from any precedent Korean patriarchal scholars ever before, to the extent that this concept of self in Tonghak helps each devotee to likewise sustain self-awakening and thus triggers a series of nation-wide movements for revolution.[68] This is both the indicative and imperative of Tonghak's teaching that *Hanullim* is "carried within the human heart" and also infused all of creation.[69] The human beings are, therefore, conceived as important vessels for Heaven's work "through their service and promotion of well-being, equality, and social justice."[70] Unlike metaphysical chŏlli (天理, heavenly principles), *chŏnmyŏng* (天命, heavenly order), *sŏng* (性, nature), *Do* (道, way) and even *pŏpsŏng* (法性, Dharma), his *Hanullim* is experienced as the very personal "Thou," in which such spirituality could precipitate followers to overcome any improper and oppressive attitude to human body and instead to realize the human body as the integrated reality that cannot be divisible by soul and flesh, metaphysical and physical.[71] Hence, the importance of "body" is specifically

68) Park So Jeong, "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," 125.
69) Beirne, *Su-un and His World of Symbols*, 62-63, 171.
70) Young, *Eastern Learning and the Heavenly Way*, 149-152; Kim Hyŏng-gi, *Huch'ŏn kaebyŏk sasang yŏn'gu*, 69-71.
71) Cheong Chong-Seong, "*Kidokky wa Tonghak ŭi Taehwa: Luk 10:25-26 ŭi 'Hannim sarang-iut sarang' kwa Su-un ŭi 'sichŏngju-koajŏng' e taehan pikyo yŏnku*"[Dialogue between Christianity and Donghak: Comparative Study on Jesus' "Double Love Command"(Lk 10:25-26) and Suwoon's "Shi-Chun-Ju" and "Go-Ah-Jung"] *Theological Forum* 81 (2015.09),

www.kci.go.kr

focalized by Su-un's concept of "*si*"(侍, *mosim* in Korean; bearing),[72] and so it is therefore to be called a "theology of *mom*"(i.e., body; sōma), according to Kim Kyŏng-Jae. Here, the body does not simply mean the flesh (sarks) mobilized by physical and chemical energy but "beingness" of the body, that is, a holy sanctuary and internalized *Hanullim*.[73] It is likewise Su-un's own enlightenment hearing the heavenly voice on Sept 21, 1860, "My mind is not other than yours" (吾心卽汝心).[74]

331-60, at 350-352; Kim Kyŏng-Jae, "*Su-un ŭi sichŏnju ch'ehŏm kwa Tonghak ŭi sinkwan*"[Su-un's Experience of *Sichŏngju* and Tonghak's Perspective on Deity] *Tonghak Yŏnku* 4 (1998), 23-43, at 37-38. Significantly, however, Tonghak's perspective on God had been gradually transformed since the time of its founder *Su-un* through *Haewŏl* and *Ŭiam* consecutively for some reasons. Those successors had a tendency to focus more on its nature of immanence reducing its personality and transcendence. Kim Yong-hwi, "*Tonghak sinkwan ŭi chaegŏmto*"[Reexamination of the Perspectives on Deity in Tonghak] *Tonghak hakpo* 9/1 (2005), 331-363, at 331-332. Therefore, whereas Su-un's *sichŏnju* has a uniqueness in terms of his religious experience as confession of personal faith, then *Haewŏl* and *Ŭiam*'s *Innaechŏn* is a result of religio-philosophical or ideological transformation from Su-un's primitive experience and confession of faith. See Kim Kyŏng-Jae, "*Su-un ŭi sichŏnju ch'ehŏm kwa Tonghak ŭi sinkwan*"[Su-un's Experience of Sichŏngju and Tonghak's Perspective on Deity], 24.

72) The sino-Korean "*si*"(侍) had a broad and honorific connotation, assuming to carry, accompany, wait on, bear within, welcome, and even enshrine and worship (Moon, "Donghak and the God of Choe, Je-u," 226).

73) Cheong Chong-Seong, "*Kidokkyo wa Tonghak ŭi Taehwa*," 352; Kim Kyŏng-Jae, "*Su-un ŭi sichŏnju ch'ehŏm kwa Tonghak ŭi sinkwan*," 27; Lee Kil-Yŏng, "*Hananim narawa sichŏnju*"[The Kingdom of God and Sichŏnju] *Tonghak hakpo* 17(2008), 265-288, at 277-283; Kim Yong-hwi, "*Tonghak sinkwan ŭi chaegŏmto,*" 339.

74) *Nonhakmun* no.6 of TT.

www.kci.go.kr

V. Conclusion

Disconnecting from words, Wŏnhyo precipitates us to see beyond the linguistic differences and taking their underpinnings. It is because the ultimate purpose of religious canons cannot be achieved by only philosophical and logical mastery on them. Language itself is not something that saves us if we know or identify with it, but always skillful means to an end. Significantly, language is not only subordinate to a higher end, but also often inadequate and even dangerous to its pursuit. Ultimately, language falls short of the extraordinary experience of awakening and may even become an obstruction to awakening itself. Indeed, recognizing such shortcomings and dangers in language will help the practitioners not to fall into the pitfall of absolutizing religious concepts and even their understanding of religious claims to the truth, like transcendence and immanence, self-power and other-power, and salvation and awakening.

Indeed, language is just what we humans make it to mean; any language in the world whatever it is does not sustain reality but simply point to. Therefore, this work could explore that the self-emptiness and solidarity with the others including the nature in the Lord's Prayer and *sichŏnju* ("bearing God within") along with *chohwa chŏng* (造化定; "becoming one with all creation") are not necessarily contradictory to each other but rather can be complementary in overcoming the incomplete state. Even, they can cross-fertilize and

www.kci.go.kr

dynamically transform themselves to each other. Significantly, in such a holistic and fundamental unity of God, human beings and all creation by right teaching, moral behavior, and cultivation of spiritual life, Christians and Tonghak followers truly believed and thus attempted to awake people to realize a justification for self-improvement (e.g., Matthew 5:20), let alone its emphasis on the necessity of active engagement into the social reality, in which thus God's virtue could also illuminate the world. This teachings of Christianity and Tonghak that God resides in the human heart and pervading all of the creation is further consolidated by their successors. In fact, the key teachings both of Christianity and Tonghak always commonly acknowledge human beings as a higher being and all people's right to be equal on earth, if they could go beyond their shackles of language. As Wŏnhyo was assured, true meaning does not lie in the word (i.e., *ŭi ŏ pimun*; 義語非文).

Particularly, on the matter of divine mysteries, my implied Christian readers have often struggled to admit that such mysteries were unfinalizable, unknowable, and ineffable, but rather simply triggering of awe and fear, and humbleness and silence, as distressfully illustrated in Job and Qohelets. As a matter of fact, the first and foremost concern of the Christian Scripture both the Old and New is to pulverize all idolizing efforts by humans blocking the freedom of God, which is right the core teaching of "Thy Kingdom come!" and "Thy will be done on earth as is in heaven!" in the Lord's Prayer, let alone the First in the Ten Commandment. They are surely

www.kci.go.kr

based on Jesus' awareness and rigorous practice of dislodging his attachment to anything but the father in the Lord's Prayer. Jesus' practice and teaching, as well as his suffering of Cross, is nothing but a leap beyond ordinary reasoning, a total submission to the divine mysteries.

www.kci.go.kr

Reference Works

Allison, Dale C. *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. New York; Corssroad Publishing, 1999.

Beirne, Paul. *Su-un and His World of Symbols: The Founder of Korea's First Indigenous Religion*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Byargeon, Rich W. "Echoes of Wisdom in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:9-13)" *JETS* 41/3 (1998): 353-365.

Cheong, Chong Seong. "Partaking of Jesus' Mystical Experience: Reading the Lord's Prayer in Jewish Wisdom Tradition," *KENTS* 48 (2017), 40-74.

_____. "*Tonghak undong ŭi kwanjŏm esŏ salpyŏbon Nuka ŭi ch'ŏngjikipiyu ŭi kong'gong haengbok yŏnku*"[A Research on the Principles of Public Happiness in Luke's Shrewd Steward Parable in view of Donghak Movement] *Theological Thought* 167 (2014.12), 71-115.

_____. "*1894 nyŏn tonghak nongminhyŏkmyŏng kwa Pokŭmsŏ ŭi Pittang'gam e taehan Pikyŏ yŏnku*"[A Comparative Study on Debt-Reduction in 1894 Donghak Peasant Revolution and the Gospels] *KENTS* 13 (2014.6), 270-305.

_____. *A Dialogic Reading of the Steward Parable(Luke 16:1-9)*. New York et al: Peter Lang, 2001.

_____. "*Kidokky wa Tonghak ŭi Taehwa: Luk 10:25-26 ŭi 'Hannim sarang-iut sarang' kwa Su-un ŭi 'sichŏngju-koajŏng' e taehan pikyo yŏnku*"[Dialogue between Christianity and Donghak: Comparative Study on Jesus' "Double Love Command"(Lk 10:25-26) and Suwoon's "Shi-Chun-Ju" and "Go-Ah-Jung"] *Theological Forum* 81 (2015.09): 331-60.

Cobb, John B. *Beyond Dialogue: Toward a Mutual Transformation of Christianity and Buddhism.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Crump, D.M. "Prayer," *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Ed. by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown, and Nicholas Perrin. Second Ed, Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013, 684-692.

Fitzmyer, Joseph. *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. New York et al: Doubleday, 1983.

Hwang, Sŏn-hŭi. *Han'guk kŭndae sasang kwa minjok undong* [Korea's modern thought and the national movement] Seoul: Hyean, 1996.

www.kci.go.kr

Hick, John. *The Metaphor of God Incarnate: Christology in a Pluralistic Age*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Prayers of Jesus.* London: SCM, 1967.

Johnson, Luke T. *The Writings of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Kallander, George. *Salvation through Dissent: Tonghak Heterodoxy and Early Modern Korea.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Kim, In-gŏl. "1894 *nyŏn Nongmin hyŏkmyŏng ŭi Ilch'a pongki*"[The first Revolt of 1894 Peasant Revolution] in 1894 *nyŏn nongmin hyŏkmyŏng yŏnku* [A Study of the 1894 Peasant Revolution IV]. Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏng sa, 1995, 83-114.

Kim, Jin-yŭn. "*Kap'o Tonghak Nongmin Undong ŭi Mokpyo wa Panghyăng ŭrosŏ ŭi P'yejŏng Kyehyŏk An*"[The Reformation Bills as the Goal and Way of Kapo Tonghak Peasant Movement] *Minjok sasang* 5/3 (2011), 135-186.

Kim, Kyŏng-Jae. "*Su-un ŭi sichŏnju ch'ehŏm kwa Tonghak ŭi sinkwan*"[Su-un's Experience of Sichŏngju and Tonghak's Perspective on Deity] *Tonghak Yŏnku* 4 (1998), 23-43.

Kim Myong-Hee, "*Wŏnhyo Hwajaeong non ŭi Haesuk'hakjŏk jŏp'kŭn*"[Hermeneutic Approach to the Hwajeng Idea of Wonhyo: focused on the theory of dialogues among religions] *Won-Buddhist Thought & Religious Culture* 38 (2008.2), 121-161.

_____. "The Spirituality of Wonhyo's Hwajeng and Interreligious Dialogue: based on a comparison of the accommodation of Matteo Ricci and the mysticism of Enomiya-Lassalle," *Studies in Religion* 76/2 (2016), 1-50.

Kim, Sang-il. *Su-un kwa Whitehead*. Seoul: Chisik sanŏp sa, 2003.

_____. *Tonghak kwa Sinsŏhak* [Tonghak and New Western Learning]. Seoul: Chisik sanŏp sa, 2000.

Kim Yong Choon. Tr. & Ed. *Chondogyo Scripture: Donggyeong Daejeon*. Great Scripture of Eastern Learning. University Press of Ameriaca, 2000.

Kim Yong-il, "*Wŏnhyo ŭi Hwajaeng nonpŏp yŏnku: Hwajaeng ŭi sillye rŭl chungsim ŭro*"[The Study on the Method of Wonhyo's Theory of Harmonization, Concentrated on the

www.kci.go.kr

Cases of Harmonization]. Ph.D Thesis. Graduate School of Dongguk University, 2008.

Kim, Yong-hwi, "Tonghak sinkwan ŭi chaegŏmto"[Reexamination of the Perspectives on Deity in Tonghak] *Tonghak hakpo* 9/1 (2005), 331-363.

Kim, Yong-pyo. "Wonhyo's Perspective on the Common Essence of Religions and Pluralistic Inclusivism," *International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culturer* 20 (2013.9), 33-57.

Lee, Kil-Yŏng. "*Hananim narawa sichŏnju*"[The Kingdom of God and Sichŏnju] *Tonghak hakpo* 17 (2008), 265-288.

Marshall, I. Howard. *Commentary on Luke*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

McKnight, Scot. *Sermon on the Mount*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2013.

Moon, Myongsook. "Donghak and the God of Choe, Je-u: Through the Donggyeong Daejeon and the *Yongdam Yusa,*" *Catholic Theology and Thought* 79 (2017.7), 218-60.

Muller, Charles. "Wŏnhyo's Approach to Harmonization of the Mahayana Doctrines" *Acta Koreana* 18/1 (2015), 9-44.

_____. http://www.acmuller.net/kor-bud/simmun_hwajaeng_non.html. Access on Sept 29, 2019.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans; Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005.

_____. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. WBC 35B, Edited by Ralph Martin. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993.

Pak, Chong-hong. "Wŏnhyo's Philosophical Thought," Trans by Robert Buswell, Jr. *Philosophy and Culture* 5 (2008.6), 53-95; *Hankuk sasangsa: Pulgyo sasang p'yŏn* [History of Korean Thought: Buddhism]. Seoul: Sŏmundang, 1972.

Park, So Jeong. "Individual and Entirety in Donghak Thought," *Tonghak hakpo* 20 (2010.12), 119-55.

Park, Sung-Bae. *Hanguk Sasang-gwa Bulgyo* [Korean Philosophies and Buddhism]. Seoul: Hyean, 2009.

Park, Tae-Won, *Wŏnhyoui Simmnunhwajaeng non* [Wŏnhyo's Ten Approaches to the Harmonization of Doctrinal Disputes]. Seoul: Sechang Ch'ulp'an-sa, 2013.

_____. *Wŏnhyo Sasang II: Wŏnhyo ŭi Hwajaeng Sasang*

www.kci.go.kr

[Philosophy of Wŏnhyo II: Hwajaeng Philosophy]. Ulsan, Kor.: UUP, 2005.

Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew.* SNT 126. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007.

Song, Sung Jin. "Theological Understanding on the Lord's Prayer," *Theology and the World* 78 (2013.12), 81-111.

Suh, Yŏng-hee. "*kaehangki ponggŏnjok kukkajaejŏng ŭi uikiwa minjung sutal ŭi kanghwa*"[The Financial Crisis of Feudal State at the Port-Opening Period and Repressive Exploitation of People" in *1894 nyŏn nongmin chŏnjaeng yŏnku* [A Study on the 1894 Peasant Revolution I]. Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏng sa, 1992, 126-69.

_____. "1894 *nyŏn Nongmin hyŏkmyŏng ŭi ich'a pongki*"[The Second Revolt of 1894 Peasant Revolution]. Seoul: Yŏksa pip'yŏng sa, 1995, 141-166.

Young, Carl. *Eastern Learning and the Heavenly Way: The Tonghak and Ch'ŏndogyo Movements and the Twilight of Korean Independence.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Yun, Sŏk-san. *Tongkyŏng Taejŏn* [Great Scripture of Eastern Learning] Seoul: Tonghaksa, 2004.

www.kci.go.kr

Abstract

Understanding of the 21 Letters Incantation of Tonghak and the Lord's Prayer in View of Wŏnhyo's *Hwajaeng* Philosophy on Language

Chong-Seong Cheong
(Baeksuk University/New Testament)

Wŏnhyo's hwajaeng is an extensive argument analyzing positions of the incongruents, showing their underpinnings and contextual framework leading to each position, wherein it creates a commensuration of variant doctrines and interpretations. His *hwajaeng* is the ultimate task for the resolution of discrepancies to be undertaken, trying to reveal the truth by cutting off conceptual hallucination resorting to the words. Utilizing Wŏnhyo's *hwajaeng* philosophy as methodology to interpret the Lord's Prayer and Tonghak's "21 Letters Incantation" which appear to be very different from each other in forms and contents of the texts. They have their own divergent views on humanity and the sense of divinity. Going beyond their literal formulation, however, this work explores that there are not a few convergencies between them: they commonly comprise dual aspects of transcendence and immanence, God and humanity, individual

www.kci.go.kr

and entirety, not attempting to truth claims through scholastic dogmatization, but instead seeking the practice of their respective faiths within their mundane life, particularly at the time of suffering and incomprehensibility of God. If the Lord's Prayer impels its devotees into the active engagement by self-denial and compassion toward everyday people in specific time and place, then the 21 Letters Incantation likewise concerns desperately pleading humans, as well as such God who dwells and is worshipped within their bodies at the same time. Through a mature understanding on the nature of language by Wŏnhyo's hwajaeng, it is never opaque for the practitioners to commonly experience both dimensions of heaven and earth, other-power and self-power. In it, sich'ŏnju characterized God as dwelling in the heart of every person, as well as the spiritual energy prevalent in the world, which is convergently assumed in both prayers to some extent, though its wording is not identical.

Key words: Wŏnhyo and *Hwajaeng*, Lord's Prayer, Tonghak (東學), 21 Letters Incantation, nature of language

논문투고일자: 2019. 10. 30
논문수정일자: 2019. 11. 20
게재확정일자: 2019. 11. 20

www.kci.go.kr