



Some Further Reflections on Hyegyun's Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki and Its Place within East Asian Buddhism

A Note on the Explanations of the "Ch'ojang" Formula, and Their Possible Implications

저자 (Authors)	Jorg Plassen
출처 (Source)	International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture 26(1) , 2016.06. 55-74(20 pages)
발행처 (Publisher)	동국대학교 불교학술원 Academy of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University
URL	http://www.dbpia.co.kr/journal/articleDetail?nodeId=NODE07087434
APA Style	Jorg Plassen (2016). Some Further Reflections on Hyegyun's Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki and Its Place within East Asian Buddhism. <i>International Journal of Buddhist Thought and Culture</i> , 26(1), 55-74
이용정보 (Accessed)	삼성현역사문화관 183.106.106.*** 2021/07/13 10:01 (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.

Some Further Reflections on Hyegyun's *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* and Its Place within East Asian Buddhism:
A Note on the Explanations of the "Ch'ojang" Formula,
and Their Possible Implications

Jörg PLASSEN

Jörg PLASSEN is a professor of East Asian Religions at Ruhr-Universität Bochum. Before taking up his current position in 2009, he had worked for a decade in Korean studies. While a his PhD dissertation ("Die Spuren der Abhandlung- Exegese und Übung im San-lun des 6. Jahrhunderts," Hamburg 2002 [2000]) dealt with the Chinese exegete Chi-tsang, his work ever since has concentrated on early East Asian Buddhism, in particular Samnon and Hwaŏm, from a [proto-]Korean perspective. Currently, he is putting the finishing strokes on a translation of Hyegyun's *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki*.

E-mail: joerg.plassen@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture Vol. 26. No. 1 (June 2016): 55–74.

© 2016 Academy of Buddhist Studies, Dongguk University, Korea

<http://dx.doi.org/10.16893/IJBTC.26.03>

The day of submission: 2016.3.14.

Completion of review: 2016.5.16.

Final decision for acceptance: 2016.6.15.

Abstract

The Taesŭng saron hyōnūi ki 大乘四論玄義記, authored by the [Sŭng] jōng (“Superintendent”) Hyegyun 僧正慧均 (n.d.) from Paekche, is of crucial importance for the understanding of medieval East Asian Buddhist thought. As shown in previous research, the text contains important information on the history of San-lun 三論 thought of the Southern Dynasties not available from other sources. In particular, a comparison with works ascribed to his fellow student Chi-tsang 吉藏 (547–623) allows to reconstruct important facets of Fa-lang’s 法朗 (507–581) thought and practice.

Some hitherto rather neglected passages in the “Ch’o-ang chungga ūi” section, preserved in a manuscript first introduced by Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日 in 1959, contain interesting explanations of the ch’o-ang 初章 (“First stanza”) formula. These explanations not only give detailed information on the origin and meaning of the ch’o-ang formula in the San-lun (Kor. Samnon) 三論 context (as shown by Ōchō Enichi and Itō Takatoshi 伊藤隆壽), but also an important clue for the reconstruction of Wōnhyo’s 元曉 (617–686) understanding of the term ch’o-ang. Focusing on the character “a” (a cha 阿字), they also appear to have exerted some influence on the notion of the t’olonimen (Kor. tarani mun) 陀羅尼門 (dhāraṇī gate), which Chih-yen 智儼 (602–668) and, with even more emphasis, Ūsang 義湘 (625–702) and his followers consider the fundamental approach underlying the Hua-yen ching 華嚴經.

Key words: Samnon, Hyegyun, Hwaōm, Wōnhyo, “Ch’u-chang” (Kor. Ch’o-ang) Formula, Siddham Character “a”, Dhāraṇī

Introduction: The Text

In 1959, Ōchō Enichi first directed academic attention to the existence of a manuscript containing the thitherto missing first part of Hyegyun's 慧均 *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* (Ōchō 1959, 131–134). At the beginning of the manuscript one finds the label “*Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* 大乘四論玄義記, roll number one, compiled by Hye Chōng 慧正,” and at the end of the first section the note “End of [number] one, Meanings of the ‘First stanza’ (初章義).” In the outline of the section as such, however, the manuscript is labeled “Ch’ojang chungga ŭi” 初章中假義.

As Choe Yeonshik and myself have argued more recently, following a suspicion raised earlier by Itō Takatoshi, the text seems to have been authored by a monk from Paekche. Most evidently, however, the text is closely related to works ascribed to the San-lun 三論 exegete Chi-tsang. Already in the outline of the “Ch’ojang chungga ŭi,” a whole series of important shared categories may be discerned:

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 第八夷諸法

“The meaning of the middle and the provisional of the First stanza” has eight levels:

First, illumination of the “First stanza”; second, treatment of the middle and the provisional; third, differentiation of “open” and “secret”; fourth, illumination of “horizontal” and “vertical”; fifth, treatment of “simple” and “complex”; sixth, differentiation of “pairwise” and “single”; seventh, illumination of “pervasive” and “separate”; eighth, tearing down all *dharmas*. (Ms. 11)

As pointed out already by Ōchō, at the same time at least parts of the text appear to be related to a seminal lecture held by their common mentor Fa-lang in the year 574. Thus, the manuscript contains the following passage:

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 三單複明中 四體用明中 五一二明中 六絕不絕明中也

Master Hsing-huang 興皇 (Fa-lang), in the fifth month of the sixth year of the T'ai-chien 太建 [reign period] (574), also opened [a text in] six sections in [his] room:

First, clarifying the middle [with reference to] scattering the deviant [teachings]; second, clarifying the middle [with reference to] bringing about the provisional and not bringing about the provisional; third, clarifying the middle [with reference to] “single” and “double”; fourth, clarifying the middle [with reference to] body and function; fifth, clarifying the middle [with reference to] oneness and duality; sixth, clarifying the middle [with reference to] cutting off and not cutting off. (Ms. 281)

The related parts of the manuscript again bear striking parallels to an originally independent text transmitted under the section title “Lun-chi” 論迹 as a part of the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* 大乘玄論 (45, 68a–77b), a compilation of independent texts attributed to Chi-tsang. Most relevant passages from the “Ch’ojang chungga üi” were introduced and discussed by the eminent Japanese scholar Itō Takatoshi in a series of articles some four decades ago (Itō 1974, 263–280; 1975, 194–218; 1976, 174–203). Through Itō Takatoshi’s work, it became clear enough that both texts must be intimately related.

In fact, in conjunction with the above quoted reference to Fa-lang’s presentation of his own text before a small group of disciples the strong textual parallels sufficed to make it apparent that both texts in their hermeneutics and exegetical methods are heavily indebted to Fa-lang’s, who thus must have been the real master mind behind the new style of exegetical praxis of the San-lun school (Plassen 2002 [2000], 63–68). However, only when through the kind intermediacy of Professor Ishii Kosei the manuscript finally was made available beyond the Japanese academe and the texts could be compared in full extent (and thus with certainty about the textual progression), the influence exerted by Fa-lang could be fully verified.

The perhaps most important invention displayed in both texts applies to the use of a rather revolutionary model of a thoroughly soteriologically oriented exegesis: Elaborating on the terms *chung* (Kor. *chung*) 中 and *chia* (Kor. *ka*) 假, or “middle” and “provisional,” the texts do not aim at carving out the meaning of these terms in the *Chung-lun* 中論, but rather at cleansing them of any fixed reference in order to convey the one non-dual middle beyond all terms: Under Fa-lang’s influence, both authors turn against any hypostasis of the

merely functional term “middle” into an isolated entity, and rather emphasize an all-encompassing unitary “middle” beyond any distinction of “middle” and “provisional.” In order to overcome any dichotomy, their exegesis, setting out to exhaust and cleanse *chin ching* (Kor. *chin chōng*) 盡淨 the various (verbal) *dharmas*, has to leave also the boundaries of mere *prasāṅga*: As the meta-statements entail, all *dharmas* are identified both as “provisional” and then again as “middle.” Thus, the method applied comprises both universal apophasis and cataphasis, and effectively anticipates the commonly assumed turn to apophasis among Hua-yen circles by several decades.

As this overall technique¹ and its indebtedness to the *Chuang-tzu* 莊子 and the Kuo Hsiang 郭象 (d. 312) commentaries have been discussed elsewhere,² we will not reiterate the pertaining findings, but rather concentrate on the major rhetoric device facilitating this cataphatic speech beyond discrimination.

A Detailed Explanation of the “Ch’u-chang” Formula

The “Ch’u-chang” (Kor. Ch’ojang) 初章 formula must have been a crucial element within San-lun training. According to a remark in Chih-k’ai’s 智凱 (fl. sixth century) biography in the *Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳, during Chi-tsang’s stay in K’uai-chi 會稽 (591–599) the students were troubled by the difficulty of grasping the method of “driving away obstructions through double phrases of the ‘first paragraph of the middle and the provisional’” (*Ch’u-chang chung-chia’ fu-tz’u ch’ien chib* 初章中假複詞遺滯).³

The “Ch’u-chang” formula in fact appears passim in Chi-tsang’s works, yet there is little explanatory information about it. The explanation of the basic formula in Hyegyun’s “Ch’ojang chungga ūi” manuscript are rather detailed, and even introduce an “extended” and an “abbreviated” version:

釋初章自有廣略

略之者

若言

有非有故有 有是不有有也

亦言

他有有可有 有是有故有

今有不可有 有是不有有也

Analyzing the “First stanza” by itself has an extensive and an abbreviated [form]: The [form] abbreviating it: If one says: “‘Having’²⁴ ‘has’ because it is not ‘having,’ ‘having’ is a ‘having’ that does not have, or one says”: “The others have a ‘having’ that can be considered ‘having,’ [their] ‘having’ ‘has’ because it is ‘having.’ In [our case] now ‘having’ cannot be considered ‘having.’ ‘Having’ is a ‘having’ that does not have.”

廣者

若有是可有

 无是可无

无是可无 則不由有故无

有是可有 則不由无故有也

The extensive [form]: If “having” is [something] that can be considered “having” and “lacking” is [something] that can be considered “lacking”: [If] “lacking” is [something] that can be considered “lacking,” then it does not lack because of “having.” [If] “having” is [something] that can be considered “having,” then it does not have because of “lacking.”

若有不可有

若无不可无

 无不可无 由有故无

 有不可有 由无故有也

If “having” cannot be considered “having” and if “lacking” cannot be considered “lacking”: “Lacking” cannot be considered “lacking”—because of “having” it lacks. “Having” cannot be considered “lacking”—because of “lacking” it has.

若不由无故有

 不由有故无

不由有故无 无是自无

不由无故有 有是自有也

If it has not because of “lacking” and it lacks not because of “having”: It lacks not because of “having”—“lacking” is “lacking by itself.” It has not because of “lacking”—“having” is “having by itself.”

若由无故有
由有故无
由有故无 无不自无
由无故有 有不自有也

If it has because of “lacking” and it lacks because of “having”: It lacks because of “having”—“lacking” does not lack by itself. It has because of “lacking”—“having” does not have by itself.

若有是自有
无是自无
无是自无 无非有有
有是自有 有非无有也

If “having” is “having by itself” and “lacking” is “lacking by itself”:
“Lacking” is “lacking by itself”—“lacking” is not “lacking that has.”
“Having” is “having by itself”—“having” is not “having that lacks.”

若有非自有
无非自无
无非自无 无是有有
有非自有 有是无有也
故有也

If “having” is not “having by itself” and “lacking” is not “lacking by itself”:
“Lacking” is not “lacking by itself”—“lacking” is “lacking that has.”
“Having” is not “having by itself”—“having” is “having that lacks”; Thus it “has.”

若有是无有
无是有无
无是有无 无是不无无
有是无有 有是不有有也

If “having” is “having that lacks” and “lacking” is “lacking that has”:
“Lacking” is “lacking that has”—“lacking” [*is*]⁵ “lacking that does not lack.”
“Having” is “having that lacks”—“having” is “having that does not have.”

此廣略語

若相對而辨 卽是廣初章
若
 他有有可有 有是有故有
 今有不可有 有是不有有等
此是略初章

These extensive and abbreviated words,
if they are discussed in opposition to each other, then this immediately is the
“Extensive First stanza.”

If [it is] “The others have a ‘having’ that can be considered ‘having’—[their]
‘having’ is a ‘having because of having.’ [In our case] now, ‘having’ cannot be
considered ‘having’—‘having’ is a ‘having that does not have.’” etc., this is the
“Abbreviated First stanza.”

Concerning the “abbreviated” version, again “single” and “double” variants are
distinguished:

就略語中 有複單
若約略語 卽是複語
 具明性假故 是複也
單者
 直言有不可有 有是不有有
 直約假邊 故 是單也

In relation to the “abbreviated word” there is a “double” and a “single” [one]: If
related to the “abbreviated word” it immediately is a “double word”: Because it
completely illuminates “nature” and “provisional” it is immediately the “double
[one].”

The “single [one]”:

One straightly says: “‘Having’ cannot be considered ‘having’—‘having’ is a ‘having
that does not have.’”—Because it is related straightly to the “provisional” side, it
is the “single [one].”

今亦問
 人人不知何物語 爲是初章
 爲當是中假

Now [one] also asks: “No one knows what thing or word is considered the ‘First

stanza' and [what] is apt to be the 'middle and provisional?'"

今廣略複單 並是初章
中自有兩種也

Now [in our case] "extensive" and "abbreviated," "double" and "single" all in line are the "First stanza." The "middle" by itself has two kinds.

As should have become evident through Hyegyun's explanations, the "Ch'u-chang" (Kor. Ch'ojang) formula actually provides the fundamental structure of a whole set of related formulae. In fact, this set may be extended even further: While the formula in its "standard" versions evolves around *yu* (Kor. *yu*) 有 ("having") and *wu* (Kor. *mu*) 無 ("lacking"), Chi-tsang's use of the formula in texts like the *Erb-ti i* 二諦義 indicates that also other pairs of opposites, e.g. *chung* (Kor. *chung*) 中 and *chia* (Kor. *ka*) 假, or *se* (Kor. *saek*) 色 and *k'ung* (Kor. *kong*) 空, may be negotiated. Quite obviously, the base formula and its derivatives served as standardized meditational devices for practicing a non-dichotomizing use of language.

The factual origins of the basic structure of the "Ch'u-chang" formula can be traced more or less directly to texts commonly ascribed to Seng-chao 僧肇 (374–414), the *Pai-lun hsü* 百論序, *Pu chen k'ung lun* 不真空論 and *Po-jo wu chih lun* 般若無知論, as well as T'an-ying's 曇影 (n.d.) *Chung-lun hsü* 中論序.⁶

Following convention, i.e. drawing the necessary authority for innovations of Fa-lang and his San-lun school⁷ from "Indian" precedents, Chi-tsang in his *Erb-ti i* rather casually links the formula to Vasubandhu's *Shih-ti lun* 十地論 (cf. T 45, 89b). Again, Hyegyun's text provides much more detailed and revealing insights:

問
此初章中假語
出何經文證 自心作耶

Question: From which passage in the *sūtras* does this "middle and provisional of the 'First stanza'" come from?—Or, is [this s.th.] made up by your own mind?

答
華嚴經第十九十地品歡喜地

解脫月菩薩請說十地文言

Answer: In the *Hua-yen ching* 華嚴經, no. 19, “Chapter on the Ten Stages,” stage of joyfulness,⁸ the Bodhisattva Moon of Deliverance says:

譬如

所有經盡皆 入初章所攝

初章爲本 无有一字不入初章者

如是 佛子 十地者[*是] 一切佛法之根本

菩薩具足行 是十地 得一切智慧

By way of comparison, it is like⁹ the existing *sūtra* writings¹⁰ all entering into what the “First stanza” comprises. That the “First stanza” is the basis, there is not a single character that does not enter into the “First stanza”: Like this, Sons of the Buddha, the ten stages are¹¹ the root of the Buddhadharma. [Once] a Bodhisattva completely practices these ten spheres, he attains all [forms of] wisdom.¹²

Until this point, Hyegyun’s text does not add much information on intertextual relations that cannot be gleaned also from Chi-tsang’s *Erb-ti i*. In what follows, however, the comparison moves away from the ten stages, and the text evolves into a lengthy exposition on the character “a,” which does not find a parallel in the co-disciple’s texts:

大經文字品 迦葉問

云何如來說字根本

佛言

初說半字 以爲根本

持 諸 識記 異論 呪術 文章 諸陰界 入實法

凡夫之人 學是字本

然後能知 是法非法

[In] the *Ta-[pan nieh-p’an] ching* 大[般涅槃]經, “Chapter on Characters,” Kāśyapa asks:¹³ “Why does the Thus Come speak on the roots of the characters?” The Buddha says: “First, I expound the ‘half character’ [by the way of] making it the root [so that you] grasp the hidden realms and the *dharmas* for entering the real [within] the prognostic records, tales of the abnormal, magic spells, and literary

works. Common men learn this root of the characters and [only] afterwards can realize what is [in accord with] the Dharma and what is not [in accord with] the Dharma.”¹⁴

以此元初 根本 呪術文章
類此以爲初章 會成十地之名
此根本卽是十四
十四音名 以阿字爲初
阿字義卽是不壞不流无作

With [reference] to these original, fundamental magic spells and literary works, by analogy to these one considers the “First stanza” to bring together and establish the names of the ten stages. This root then immediately are the fourteen: The fourteen names of sounds take the character “a” as their first one. The meaning of the character “a” is “not spoiling,” “not drifting away,” “without production.”

又大品經云
卅二字門 復阿字爲初
釋阿字義卽是初不生故名爲阿字
以阿爲初 故名爲一切言義之根本
出生 方等 言句 大小乘 无量无边義
而 終還 只是 阿字者 阿字貫始終

Furthermore, the *Ta-p'in ching* 大品經 says: “[In] the gates of the forty-two characters, again the character ‘a’ constitutes the first one.”¹⁵ Because [of the fact that if] one explains the meaning of the character “a” then it is “the initial non-arising,” one names [it] the character “a.” Because the “a” constitutes the first one, one names it the root of all sayings and meanings.¹⁶ That it brings forth the words and sentences of the broad and universal [class of *sūtras*] and the immeasurable boundless meanings of the Great and Small vehicles, and yet at the end again merely is the character “a”: The character “a” passes through [like a thread] from beginning to end.

所以 菩薩句義 名爲 无句義
无句義 是 菩薩句義
如鳥飛空跡 不可尋

皆是无得无住之語

Therefore, the bodhisattvas' sentences and meanings are named “not to have sentences and meanings,” and “not to have sentences and meanings” is [the same as] the bodhisattvas' sentences and meanings. [Just] as the traces of the birds flying through the void cannot be fathomed, all are words lacking anything to obtain and lacking anything to abide in.

故 大品經 發軔初 明

以不住法住般若波羅蜜 中 終訖乎无所得

Thus, the *Ta-p'in ching* at the beginning of the [chapter] “Strong Unfolding” illumines: By not abiding in the *dharmas* and abiding inside *prajñāparamitā* one at the end finishes with not having anything to obtain.

故 龍樹 釋名 爲二法印

初卽不住 終乎无得

故 關中舊釋影 嘆大品云

不住 表其始 无得 結其終也

Thus, Nagārjuna explains the names making two *dharma* seals: “The first then is non-abiding, and it ends in not having [anything] to obtain.”¹⁷

Thus, in the old explanations on the *Ta-p'in [ching]* 大品 from Kuan-chung 關中¹⁸ it is said: “Non-abiding’ manifests its beginning,” “not having [anything] to obtain’ joins its end.”

且 有无兩字攝之罄 无不盡也

故今初章之義 只是 不住无得之語

其意 包含 明 一切法无生

Moreover, the encompassing chiming stones of the two characters “having” and “lacking” have nothing they would not exhaust.¹⁹ Thus, the meaning of the “First stanza” now only is a word for “non-abiding” and “not having [anything] to obtain,” their intention by implication clarifies that all *dharmas* lack birth.

故知

初章義 義理孱然也

故 阿字爲根本

阿者只是无

Thus, you should know: The meaning of the “First stanza”—[its] meaning is elusive.

Thus, the character “a” is the root. “A” only means “lacking.”

今明

有是不有有 无是不无无

不有有非有 不无无非无

此即是入无生生之觀

即是阿字故 得爲初章也

Now, I elucidate: “Having” is a “having that does not have,” “lacking” is a “lacking that does not lack.” A “having that does not lack” is not a “having,” a “lacking that does not lack” is not a “lacking.” This then is the contemplation of “arising without arising.” As [this] is immediately the character “a,” it comes to being the “First stanza.”

The idea of the comparison should be more than obvious: The character “a” is the first character of the Siddham alphabet, and ubiquitously pervades all texts. At the same time, it is the *alpha privativum* and hence negates everything. Thus it symbolizes both the dependent arising and the ultimate emptiness of all *dharmas*. Analogously, the “Ch’u-chang” (Kor. Ch’ojang) is the first dialectic formula the adept has to master, and, although capable to exhaust any subject, it consistently signifies the contemplation of birthless birth. In other words: The “Ch’u-chang” provides a way of cataphatic speech that amidst all verbosity from the very outset consistently negates itself, and thus does not arouse a single verbal *dharma*, but to the contrary returns all distinctions to emptiness.

Although named the “First stanza,” the “Ch’u-chang” is not confined to an incipient stage of the Hīnayāna. However, it is brought forward only to oppose the misconceptions of others:

問

彼經言 十四音爲根本 即是半字義

若爾 初章是半字 應解小乘耶

Question: [If] that *sūtra* says that the fourteen sounds are immediately the root,

then this is the meaning of the “half character.” If it is such, is the “First stanza” [then] a “half character” and should it explain the Small vehicle?

答

若明 初止心初住

不明 其 出生具足

可是半字小乘

今成中假 故 具足 半之與滿 大小兩乘

故八重之意 開釋大小乘經宗也

Answer: If one explains the first [arousal of the] mind and the first abode and does not explain [the state of] their outgrow being completely endowed, this may be the “half character” or the “Small vehicle.” As we now establish the “middle and provisional,” [this] is completely endowed with the “half” and the “full,” the Great and the Small vehicle. Thus, the intention of the eight levels opens up and explains the ancestral [point] of the *sūtras* of the Great and the Small vehicle.

一家 作 四對 如前

他有 有可有 他无 无可无

亦對他則 應 語 今

乃至 盡於四句 皆言他言今也

於以他今 相對明之

The one house²⁰ creates four oppositions as the before [stated] “Those have a ‘having’ which may be considered ‘having’; those have a ‘lacking’ which can be considered ‘having,’” and in contrast to them then correspondingly phrases “[we] now,” up to [the point of] exhausting the four phrases [note: i.e., the tetralemma] [and with regard to] all saying “those” and saying “[we] now.” With reference to “those” and “[us] now,” one illumines in mutual opposition.

Further Implications

There is intriguing link to Wŏnhyo’s 元曉 (617–686) writings: According to the *Samguk yusa* 三國遺事, while staying at Pan’gosa 磻高寺, Wŏnhyo would frequently visit a certain Nangji 朗智 (n.d.) and in this context compose an

(unfortunately lost) *Ch'ojang kwanmun* 初章觀文 (T 49, 1015b). As well testified by other borrowings, Wŏnhyo knew Hyegyun's text well and directly employed the latter's rendition of Fa-lang's dialectics faithfully in his own approach.²¹ Hence, it is not mere conjecture to assume that the contents of the "Ch'ojang chungga ūi" section should give us a certain idea of what the *Ch'ojang kwanmun* must have been like.

Needless to say, the link between the "First stanza" and the sound or character "a" in Hyegyun's text quite obviously anticipates a well-known signature of eighth/ninth century "Tantric" Buddhism. However, what might be even more interesting—at least for the student of Hwaōm 華嚴 thought—is that the "Ch'ojang chungga ūi" links the origins of the apophatic and yet cataphatic approach openly not only to *Prajñāparamitā* and *Nirvāṇa*, but also to exegesis on the *Ti-lun* 地論 and *Hua-yen ching*.²² The all-pervasive sound "a" and the characters composed by means of it subsequently play an important role also in Chih-yen's 智儼 (602–668) explanations on the *t'oloni men* 陀羅尼門 (*dhāraṇī* gate) in the *Hua-yen wu-shih yao-men* 華嚴五十要問 (Fifty Essential Gates of Hua-yen). Thus, "Ch'ojang" can be more or less directly associated with the the "*dhāraṇī* gate," and thus with the very concept Chih-yen's and, even more so, Ūisang 義湘 and his followers considered fundamental for the *Hua-yen ching*.

Although Chih-yen in his pertaining explanations refers exclusively to the "Siddham tract" (*Hsi-t'an chang* 悉曇章),²³ in the *Pōpkyedo ki ch'ongsurok* 法界圖記叢髓錄 we find a quote from the *Pōpki* 法記 that directly relates to the "Siddham tract" and the "Ch'ojang" formula:

法記云 七處八會及品類不同而唯在地品 所以者何 以是根本得法盡故者 如悉曇章 一切諸字初章為 本如 是世出世間一切諸法十地為本 故云攝法盡也

The *Pōpki* says: "The seven locations, eight assemblies and the chapter classifications do not conform and yet [Sudhāna] only stays at the chapter of stages. What is the [reason] for which [one arrives at this]? That it is because this is the fundament and one obtains [the insight] that the *dharmas* are exhausted: It is like [in] the 'Siddham tract' [where for] all characters the 'First stanza' serves as the root. Like this, [for] all mundane and supramundane *dharmas* the ten stages are the root. Therefore, it is said: 'It comprises the *dharmas* exhaustively.'" (T 45, 742b)

Of course, Hwaõm scholars here as elsewhere should be more indebted to the (at this point, however, less explicit) *Shih-ti ching lun* 十地經論, which also equates the characters of the Ch'ojang with the “*dhāraṇī* gate,”²⁴ and together with Ching-ying Hui-yüan's 淨影慧遠 (523–592) commentaries seems to have provided the basic source of inspiration not only for Hyegyun, but also for Chih-yen. Nevertheless, it seems not totally unfounded to assume that the prominent use of *dhāraṇī* 陀羅尼 in Silla Hwaõm ultimately has to be understood not only on the backdrop of the *Shih-ti ching lun* and Ching-ying Hui-yüan's interpretation of the “Siddham tract,” but also with reference to the “Ch'ojang chungga ũi” section of the *Taesŭng saron hyõnŭi ki*.

Notes

- 1 For a more detailed discussion on these and some related passages, cf. Plassen (2009, 117–141).
- 2 Cf. Ishii (1990; 1983, 164–166), and, with reference to Hyegyun, Plassen (2007, 29–52).
- 3 On the formula, cf. Hirai (1976, esp. 427ff; 442ff). For the quotation, cf. *Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳 (T 2060, 705a25ff), quoted by Hirai (1976, 296f).
- 4 “Having” and “lacking” here are used in the same way as the noun “being,” which may refer not only to the act of being, but also to the totality of existing things. Analogously, “having” here should be understood as referring to everything that has differentiating characteristics, i.e. the world of appearances, while “lacking” is synonymous with that which is empty (*kong* 空), i.e. the realm of emptiness. The somewhat awkward rendition of the noun *yu* 有 as “having” has been preferred over “that which has” in order to reduce (otherwise extreme) sentence complexity and preserve the formulaic structure of the original. Its opposite *mu* 无 here is rendered with the even more awkward “lacking” in order to avoid further confusion with *pul yu* 不有 (“not having”).
- 5 Addition of *si* 是, which most obviously has been dropped erroneously.
- 6 Cf. Plassen (2002 [2000], 53–58). For T’an-ying, cf. Hirai (1976, 116).
- 7 The expression “school” here refers to a group formed by a teacher and his disciples, and by no means is meant to anachronistically hypostatize a San-lun tsung (Kor. Samnon-jong) 三論宗 before Chi-tsang’s time.
- 8 It remains unclear which recension is quoted as both role (23) and chapter nos. (22) in Buddhahadra’s translation deviate. Cf. *Ta fang-kuang Hua-yen ching* 大方廣華嚴經 (T 9, 542a1ff).
- 9 Not constituting a whole line, the interlinear addition 諸文字皆攝在初章諸佛功德智十地為根本故一家相傳云 should be discarded as a rather clumsy explanatory insertion, because it cuts right through the quotation. (See T 9, 543c: 薩最上所行, 得至一切諸佛法故。譬如一切文字, 皆初章所攝, 初章為本, 無有一字不入初章者 如是佛子十地者 是一切佛法之根本 菩薩具足行是十地 能得一切智慧.)
- 10 The use of the visually similar character *chin* 盡 apparently reflects a scribe’s error.
- 11 Both Buddhahadra and Kūmarajīva have *shih* (Kor. *si*) 是, which—idiomatically necessary for both translators as well as for Hyegyun—is more likely to have been dropped by a scribe (possibly feeling uncomfortable with the different uses of the character in the same passage) than already in the original quotation. The case of a likewise omitted *neng* 能 before *te i-ch’ieh chih-hui* 能得一切智慧, which again both sources attest to, is even more difficult to decide. Hence, in the latter case a more conservative reading has been preferred.
- 12 The following insertion 別釋初章意 又 again most likely should be discarded as it seems to be necessitated by the introduction of the “tradition of the one house” in the previously discarded addition.

- 13 We decide to omit the insertion preceding this sentence as it seems to disrupt the sequence of a general and a more specific textual legitimization.
- 14 Cf. *Ta-pan nieh-p'an ching* 大般涅槃經 (T 12, 413a; T 12, 653c). Both passages read *chu yin shih fa* 諸陰實法, omitting the two characters *chieh* (Kor. *kye*) 界 and *ju* (Kor. *ip*) 入.
- 15 This again appears to be a paraphrasing quote from memory very loosely based on T 8, 256a-b.
- 16 The actual passage quoted could not be identified, and the exact end of the quotation remains unclear.
- 17 Cf. *Ta-chih-tu lun* 大智度論 (T 25, 228c): 初有不住 後有不可得.
- 18 Again, an interpolation referring to [T'an]-ying 曇影 (n.d.) seems to be explanatory and hence is discarded.
- 19 Note the corresponding content in *Wei-mo ching lüeh-shu* 維摩經略疏, (T 38, 594b): 此十四句 及无量句 罄无不盡 故 初阿字門 具四十一字 四十一字 亦具初門.
- 20 As in the works attributed to Chi-tsang, *i-chia* (Kor. *il ka*) 一家 here is to be understood as a self-designation of the *San-lun* branch constituted by Fa-lang and his disciples.
- 21 Cf. PLASSEN (2007, 29–52). [Abstract: 53–56, trans. Prof. Choe Yeonshik.]
- 22 In this context, it should not pass by without notice that the expression *a-tzu* (Kor. *aja*) 阿字 does occur in the *Hua-yen ching*, but not in the *Ti-lun* exegesis.
- 23 The character *chang* 章 here does not refer to a short text, hence the deviating translation.
- 24 Cf. T 26, 126b: 七者辯才淨 善知陀羅尼門不相違故 如經善得陀羅尼門不壞故 於中所有初章字者是陀羅尼門 一字門攝持無量名句字身故不壞者前後不相違故.

Abbreviation

T *Taishō shinsbū daizōkyō* 大正新修大藏經 (Japanese Edition of the Buddhist Canon). Edited by Takakasu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 et al. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924–1935.

References

- Hirai, Shun'ei 平井俊榮 1976 *Chūgoku Hannyā shisōshi kenkyū* 中国般若思想史研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Ishii, Kōsei 石井公成 1983 “Gangyō to Chūgoku shisō” 元曉と中国思想. In *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 31(2).
- 1990 “Chōsen Bukkyō ni okeru Sanron kyōgaku” 朝鮮仏教における三論学教. In *Sanron kyōgaku no kenkyū* 三論教学の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Itō, Takatoshi 伊藤隆壽 1974 “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi (jō)” 三論教学における初章中假義 (上). *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 32.
- 1975 “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi (chū)” 三論教学における初章中假義 (中). *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 33.
- 1976 “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi (ka)” 三論教学における初章中假義 (下). *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū kiyō* 34.
- Ōchō, Enichi 横超慧日 1959 “Shinshutsu Siron gengi no Shōshō chūge gi” 新出四論玄義の初章中假義. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 7.
- Plassen, Jörg 2002 [2000] Die Spuren der Abhandlung (Lun-chi)—Exegese und Übung im San-lun des sechsten Jahrhunderts. [The Traces of the Treatise (Lun-chi): Exegesis and Practice in 6th Century San-lun]. PhD diss., University of Hamburg.
- 2007 “On the Significance of the *Taesūng saron hyōmūi ki* 大乘四論玄義記 for Research on Early Korean Buddhist Thought—Some Initial Observations Focusing on *hwajaeng*.” *Han'guksa yōn'gu hwibo* 136(3).

- 2009 “Some Remarks on the Significance of the *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* for the Reconstruction of Fa-lang’s (507–581) Thought.” *Critical Review for Buddhist studies* 5.