

Some remarks on the significance of the
Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki 大乘四論玄義記
for the reconstruction of
Fa-lang's 法朗(507-581) thought¹⁾

Joerg Plassen (The University of Bochum)

I. Introduction

The contents of Hye' gyun' s 慧均 (n.d.) *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* 大乘四論玄義記 show clear parallels with the contents of several works ascribed to the famous San-lun master Chi-tsang 吉藏 (549-623).

1) This article is based on the revision of a chapter of the author's doctorate dissertation "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 c. San-lun]. Diss., University of Hamburg, 2002 [2000] in the light of recent findings concerning the authorship of the text.

The author should like to express his gratitude to Prof. Ito Takatoshi 伊藤 隆寿 for making available paper copies of a manuscript containing the introductory section of the *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* 大乘四論玄義記, the "Ch'ojang chungkaü" 初章中假義 (infra "Ms."), known to have been in the possession of Mr. Shiotome Masumi 潮留眞澄 from Osaka, and to Profs. Ishii Kosei 石井公成 and Choe Yeonshik 崔鉉植 for their kind intermediacy in this matter.

Directly pertaining to the hermeneutic outlook and the methodology, and thus of particular interest are striking correspondences between the introductory section of the *Taesŭng saron hyŏnŭi ki* 大乘四論玄義記, the “Ch’ojang chung ka ŭi” 初章中假義 (“Meaning of the Middle and Provisional”), and the *Lun-chi* 論迹 (T.1853.68a-77b), a *hsü-an* 玄 type script of a lecture on the *Chung-lun* 中論 contained along with other similar texts within the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*.

Although most relevant passages from the “Ch’ojang chung ka ŭi” 初章中假義 have been introduced and discussed by the eminent Japanese scholar Itō Takatoshi in a series of articles,²⁾ the close relation of the exegetical approaches advocated in these two texts have not yet met due recognition.

As to be illustrated subsequently, internal attributions allow not only for identifying the two monk scholars’ common teacher Fa-lang 法朗 as the source of these striking similarities, but more specifically as the originator of a rather revolutionary cataphatic method of exegesis propagated in both texts.

2) Cf. Itō Takatoshi, 伊藤隆壽, “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shyōshyō chūge gi (jō)” 三論教學における初章中假義(上), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 32 (1974), pp. 263-280; “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shōshō chūge gi (chū)” 三論教學における初章中假義(中), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 33 (1975), pp. 194-218; “Sanron kyōgaku ni okeru Shyōshyō chūge gi (ka)” 三論教學における初章中假義(下), *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 34 (1976), pp. 174-203.

II. *The Lun-chi* 論述

The *Lun-chi* 論述, arguably one of the most sophisticated texts written by Chi-tsang - both in contents and structure -, relies heavily on juxtapositions of deviant expressions and apparently contradictory meanings in order to make the audience experience the perspectiveness and relativity of all verbal expressions, and thus to fluidify and dissolve all fixed meanings. A meta commentary by the author on his intention and technique can be found in the fourth section, which is dedicated to the explanation of the title *Chung kuan-lun* 中觀論:

... 故論非但盡言 亦復盡觀 觀非但盡緣 亦復盡論 中非但盡觀 亦復盡論

Therefore, the treatise does not only exhaust the words, it also again exhausts contemplation. Contemplation does not only exhaust the conditions, it also again exhausts the treatise. The middle does not only exhaust contemplation, also again it exhausts the treatise.

是故 今表中觀論名 只欲盡淨諸法 不如 人解以論欲釋中觀義 但欲盡淨諸法可爾

For this reason, [if] I now demonstrate the name *Treatise of the Middle contemplation*, I only wish to exhaust and cleanse the *dharmas*. This is not as [good as] the explanations by others, taking the treatise [while] wishing to resolve the middle contemplation. - Only [if] one wishes to exhaust and cleanse the

dharmas , such may be done.

今表一中 非但中是中 辨諸法皆中

[If] I now demonstrate the one middle, not only the middle is the middle: I differentiate that the *dharmas* all are [in the state of the] middle.

既善諸法中 復有何法可有 故表中則盡淨諸法 ...

Having said that all *dharmas* are [in the state of the] middle, which *dharma* again would [one] have that could be considered as “having”? Therefore: [If] one demonstrates the middle, then one exhausts and cleanses the *dharmas*... (T.1853.45.76b28-76c04)

While other exegetes boldly set out to explain the meaning of “middle contemplation”, the author thus in his explanation of the title merely aims at exhausting and cleansing the *dharmas*³⁾ - because, and this is the twist of the somewhat ironic statement, this exhausting and cleansing is the only possible avenue towards an apt understanding of the text.

This applies even to the very concept of the “one middle”: In differentiating the seemingly provisional *dharmas* it is to be made clear that each and every *dharma* corresponds to the middle. Thus, in the last resort all conflicting *dharmas* merge into the middle and at the same time

3) The term *dharma* in this context refers primarily to teachings.

vanish, as not a single *dharma* having characteristics delimiting it as an entity to be set apart from the middle would remain. Thus, in demonstrating the middle, the *dharmas* are exhausted and cleansed both in the sense that their inside meaning (the middle) is fully unleashed and in the sense that they are completely dissolved.

This approach towards exegesis provides the foil for the text as a whole, but deliberately is made explicit only towards the end of the fourth section: After in the preceding parts the audience has been subjected to a long and confusing interplay of diverging statements advocating this and then again that position under this or that perspective, only towards the end, when in the context of explaining the title *Treatise of Middle contemplation* all *dharmas* suddenly are designated as already being in the state of the middle, a sudden awakening towards the inner unity of all preceding statements is induced.

The intention to cleanse the misconstrued *dharmas* by reinterpreting them in light of the middle conforms to that of the *Chung-lun* 中論, the method applied, however, differs diametrically: The *Chung-lun* 中論 itself attempts to gradually lead towards a correct understanding of the emptiness of all *dharmas* through repeated rebuttal of misconstrued teachings by means of *prasṅga*, and hence by consequent apophasis. The *Lun-chi* 論述, by contrast, affirms all conflicting *dharmas*, eventually merging and at the same time dissolving them all in the middle and pushing cataphasis thus to a point where its effects meet those of apophasis.

The originality of this approach - although linked to MMK 24:18 (cf. Ms. 19b), but perhaps also influenced by the *Ti-lun* 地論 and *Hua-yen ching* 華嚴經⁴⁾ - becomes obvious by the fact that the author feels himself compelled to vindicate this departure from the strategy of the *Chung-lun* 中論. Thus Chi-tsang 吉藏 lets the opponent ask:

汝既依二夜經明一切諸法無非中者 論初何故 但用不生不滅為中
不取生滅為中

Since you have clarified based on the *sūtras* [spoken between] the two nights [of awakening and entrance into *nirvāṇa*] that among all dharmas there is none not [being in the state of the] middle - for what reason [then] does the first [chapter] of the treatise only employ “non-arisal and non-extinction” as the middle and does not select “arisal and extinction” as the middle? (T.1853.45.75b11ff)

The answer given is the following:

為對病故

For the reason of facing illnesses.

4) While the origins of the “Ch’u-chang” 初章 formula are clearly related to the former text, Chi-tsang’s use of formulaic expressions identifying the one and the many might hint to the latter as another major source of inspiration.

緣 多著生滅 只見生滅 不見不生不滅 是故成偏

The conditioned [beings] often adhere to “arisa and extinction”. They only see “arisa and extinction”, and do not see “non-arisa and non-extinction”. For this reason they bring about a bias.

今 對此生滅之偏故 說 不生不滅名為中 也

As one now faces this bias of “arisa and extinction”, one expounds that “non-arisa and non-extinction” are named as the “middle”.

然 釋中 有 三種

Thus, [in] resolving the middle there are three kinds:

一者 對偏

The first one: To face biases.

二者 對邪

The second one: To face oblique [views].

三者 實義 釋中

The third one: To resolve the middle [with reference to] the meaning of the “real”

(also: real meaning). (T,1853,45,75b13ff.)

What is striking about this passage is for one how casually the apophatic technique employed in the *Chung-lun* 中論 is reduced to a mere expedient means, and for another that the method of visualizing that all dharmas as being in the state of the “middle” apparently has to be equated with the explanation based on the meaning of the real, or - a double entendre obviously being intentional - the real meaning.

Although all three analytic forms in the last resort carry the same meaning (in as much as they serve to express the “middle”), the third method here is given special emphasis. Hence, further on we read:

... 過此二階 所以名實

... It goes beyond these two steps, therefore it is called “real”.

何故爾

For what reason is this such?

對偏說中 偏去中亦盡

Facing the biases, one expounds on the “middle”. The biases having been driven away, the middle has also been exhausted.

對邪說中 邪破中亦除

Facing the oblique [views], one expounds on the “middle”. The oblique [views] having been scattered, the middle has also been discarded.

不偏不中 不邪不正 過此二階 所以名實也

即是 實義釋中了

Not biased and not [in the state of] middle, not oblique and not straight, it goes beyond these two steps. Therefore it is named “real”. - [This] is immediately the completion of the explanation of the middle [with reference to] the meaning of the “real” (also: the real meaning). (T.1853.45.75b29ff)

While on the first two levels the “biased” and the “oblique” and the

“middle” as their antidotum eventually vanish altogether, the third approach refers to a “middle” which by itself already transcends all distinctions between “biased” and “middle”, or “oblique” and “straight”.

A follow-up question on how it is possible to say that the middle is real and at the same time maintain three meanings leads over to a clarification that these aspects are not to be viewed as different “middles”, but only as different modes of expressing the one middle:

答 中尚不可一 中復那可三
為緣故亦可一 為緣故亦可三
然雖有三 只是一義

Answer: The middle cannot even be made one. How again could it be made three?

Because of the conditioned [beings] it can be made one,
because of the conditioned [beings] it can be made three.

And yet, although there are three,
they are only of the meaning of the one.

舉例 如 十方諸如來同共一法身一心一智慧力無畏亦然
雖復十方諸佛 只同共一法身也

If one holds up an example, it is like all Tathāgatas of the ten directions commonly share the one *dharmakāya*, the one mind, the one knowledge, wisdom, energy and fearlessness also being like this.

- Although [being] the Buddhas of the ten directions, they

together only share one *dharmakāya*. (T.1853.45.75c5-9)

Although the explanation with reference to the “real” thus avoids the reification of a new middle, it nevertheless should have become obvious that the author deliberately attempts to apply a new method based on consequent cataphasis, and in doing so wants to transgress the limitations of the approach chosen in the text commented upon.

III. The *Ch’o-jang chung ka ūi* 初章中假義

In 1959, Ōchō Enichi first directed the attention of parts of the academe to the existence of a manuscript bearing the title *Taesŭng saron hyōnūi ki chōn* 大乘四論玄義記全, which contains the thitherto missing first part of Hye’ gyun’s 慧均 *Taesŭng saron hyōnūi ki* 大乘四論玄義記.⁵⁾

At the beginning of the first *kwōn* we find the label “*Taesŭng saron hyōnūi ki* 大乘四論玄義記, role number one, compiled by Hye Chōng 慧正”. At the end of the section we find the note “End of [number] one, meanings of the ‘First stanza’”. In the outline of the section as such, however, it is labeled “*Ch’o-chang chung-ka ūi*” 初章中假義.

The contents of the text appear to be at least partially related to a seminal lecture held in the year 574, as the following passage entails:

5) Cf. Ōchō Enichi 横超慧日, “Shinshutsu Siron gengi no Shoshō chūge gi” 新出四論玄義の初章中假義, *Indogakku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 7 (1959), pp. 131-134.

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 法朗) in the fifth month of the sixth year of [the reign period] T'ai-chien 太建 (574) in [his] room also opened [a text in] six sections:

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. 28l)

As demonstrated already by Itō Takatoshi, the individual items of Fa-lang's 法朗 text are subsequently taken up again in the “Ch'ojang chung ka ũi” 初章中假義. The chapter thus appears to be very much indebted to Fa-lang's text.

Likewise interestingly, already in the outline of the “Ch'ojang chung ka ũi 初章中假義” a whole series of categories frequently occurring also in texts ascribed to Chi-tsang 吉藏 can 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 the [diverse] *dhammas*. (Ms. 11)

In fact, the text contains a number of detailed explanations on terms and modes of exposition familiarity with which is assumed in the *Lun-chi* 論迹, and hence contributes greatly to our understanding of Chi-tsang’s text.

This is the case also for Chi-tsang’s somewhat peculiar analysis of the title(s) of the text (“Ssu ming shih *Chung-kuan lun ming* 四明釋中觀論名”, T.1853.45.73c14ff.), in which he not only gives two alternative titles (*Treatise of the middle contemplation* and *Treatise on the middle contemplation*), but associates the “middle” both with the “straight” (*cheng* 正), and the “real” (*shih* 實). - In order to give an impression of the detailed background information that may be gleaned from Hye’gyun’s 慧均 text, the pertaining passage shall be quoted at length:

問

Question:

中以何為義

What does the middle take as its meaning?

答

Answer:

中以實為義

The middle takes the “real” as its meaning.

亦言

Also one says:

中以正為義

The middle takes the “straight” as its meaning.

以正釋中

以實釋中也

By means of the “straight” one resolves the middle,

by means of the “real” one resolves the middle.

問

Question:

如斯釋出何典語耶

Such a resolution comes out of which canonical words?

答

Answer:

略出三證. 併以理明之

Abbreviatingly [explained], it comes out of three [points of] witnesses. I explain them together according to their [inner] structure:

何者

Which are they?

一者關中 二者論文 三者引證也.

First, [statements from the area of] Kuan-chung;

second, text passages [within] the treatises;

third, citation witness [from a *sūtra*].

關中者

As for Kuan-chung:

叡法師序中論意云 以中為名 照其實也

[In his] preface on the intention of the *Middle Treatise*, Dharma Master [Seng-jui [僧叡] says: “That one takes the middle as the name is [in order] to illuminate its realness”.

此是 以實釋中 中是實義也 -

This means: That by the “real” one resolves the “middle” is [because] the “middle” is of the meaning of the “real”.

問

Question:

照其實者 似釋觀義耶

“To illumine its realness”, does [this] resemble the resolution of the meaning of “contemplation”?

答

Answer:

照是顯義 顯其實錄也

“To illumine” is of the meaning of “to make visible”; one makes visible [the character of the treatise

as] a protocol [of what is] real,

又肇法師作涅槃論云 如正觀論中說

Also, Dharma-Master Chao in compositing the *Treatise on Nirvāṇa* says: “Like said in the *Treatise on the straight contemplation*”.

故 以正釋中 中是正義也

Therefore, that by means of the “straight” one resolves the “middle” is [because] the “middle” is of the meaning of the “straight”.

論文者

As for the text passages [within] the treatises:

論觀法品云 諸法實相云何入

答云 息我我所諸見故 得入實相 實相是中

In the “Chapter on the Contemplation of the Dharmas” it is said: “The real characteristics of all *dharmas*, how does one enter them?”

The answer says: “Because one lets all views pertaining to the ego and objects of the ego cease, one attains to entering the real characteristics. - The real characteristics are the middle.”

故 以實觀中 中是實義也

Therefore, that by means of the “real” one resolves the “middle” is [because] the “middle” is of the meaning of the

“real”.

又大論至難處指云 如正觀論中說也

Also, the *Great Treatise*, coming to an objection, in a reference says: “It is like expounded in the *Treatise of the right contemplation*.”

引證者

As for the citation witness:

大經云 無相之相乃名實相 如是無相 亦名第一義空 亦名中道也

In the *Great sūtra* it is said: The characteristics without characteristics then are named “real characteristics”. Such absence of characteristics is also called emptiness in the first meaning and is also named the middle way.

以理明之者 中是中實 故以實為義也 (文)

Explaining it with [reference to] the structure: The “middle” is the middle reality. Therefore it takes the real as [its] meaning.

(Ms. 24r-24l)

The same penchant towards more detailed explanations characteristic of Hye’gyun’s work can be observed in the following passage:

問

Question:

緣發於觀 觀發於緣 緣盡於觀 觀盡於緣 此是何言耶

The conditions evolve in contemplation; contemplation evolves in the conditions. The conditions exhaust themselves in contemplation; contemplation exhausts itself in the conditions.

- What does this wording stand for?

答

Answer:

緣有二種

若能所之緣 此是境智 明 境智相稱 因緣相發 義也

若顛倒之緣 此緣亦發菩薩正觀

As for the conditions, there are two kinds:

If it is the conditions as subject or object, this is the objects and [pertaining] knowledge and explains the meaning that objects and knowledge mutually give rise to each other, causes and conditions mutually evolve each other.

If it is the conditions who invert [reality, or the Dharma into its opposite], these conditions also evolve the straight contemplation of the Bodhisattvas.

然此兩種緣發義雖同 而有疎密之殊

前是密論相發

後是疎辨相發也

And yet, although the meaning of evolving conforms for both

circumstance that both texts focus on the same main issue, the relationship of the “middle” and the “provisional”. In fact, not only concerning the main issue as such, but also in its treatment significant parallels can be observed. Thus, already in the passages quoted by Itō Takatoshi we find a passage in which - just as in the *Lun-chi* 論述 - the various *dhammas* initially are treated as provisional, and then again as all pertaining to the middle:

一切諸法並是假 一切諸法悉是中

All *dhammas* along each other are the provisional, all *dhammas* entirely are the middle.

但諸佛菩薩 善巧方便 假名 名開 爲 中假

Yet, the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas [in their] skillful appropriate means, provisionally [assigning] names, [assign] names [in a way that they] open up in “middle” and “provisional” .

令悟入非中非假 故 言 有無是假 非有非無是中

As they cause to awaken and enter into towards what is neither “middle” nor “provisional”, they say that “having” and “lacking” (characteristics) are the provisional, and “neither having nor lacking” is the middle.

但此中有二義

Yet, there are two meanings in this:

一是 中 當 淨亦淨之中 有無 是 當二之假

The first one is that the middle corresponds to the middle, in which “cleansing” is also “cleaned”, and that “having” and

“lacking” are the provisional, which corresponds to duality.

雖開中假 無假異中 無中異假 亦假亦中 如開虛空也

Although one opens up “middle” and “provisional”, there is no “provisional” separate from the “middle” and there is no “middle” separate from the “provisional”; they are both provisional and [in the state of the] middle, just as if one opens up the “empty” and “emptiness”.

二是 不二之中

The second one is the non-dual middle.

是 開中假兩義 有無則當假 理而論之 中亦是假

This means: [If] one opens up the two meanings of “middle” and “provisional”, then “having” and “lacking” correspond to the “provisional”. [If] one treats [the matter] from [the perspective of the underlying] structure, [then] the middle also is the provisional.

但 中美名 美名強詔非中非假 之 絕絕與淨淨 之處也

[This] is only the case of cutting off [the act of] cutting off, and cleansing [the act of] cleansing, where the beautiful name “middle” [in its capacity as] a beautiful name forcedly [assigns] names to what is neither the middle nor the provisional. (Ms. 19r-19l)

Answering the question whether in addition to the middle provisional (*chungga* 中假) there also be a provisional middle (*kajung* 假中), Hye'gyun explains:

亦得之 而 中假假中 此二 言異者

One also obtains this, and yet: The middle provisional and the provisional middle, these two speak of different [things]:

若依語論之為便者 廣言中假

若破病語 則廣假中也

If one relies on words and treatises being expedient means, one speaks extensively of the “middle provisional”.

If one scatters words [amounting to] illnesses, one [relates] extensively to the “provisional middle”.

言中假為便者 中假是本末語 中則為本 假則為末

從非有非無之本 起有無之用 有無末故言中假 於言方就義理為便也

That one says that the middle provisional is an expedient means: The “middle provisional” is a word [related to] the origin and the end. [If] it is the “middle”, then [this] is the origin, [if] it is the provisional, then [this] is the end.

From the origin, which is neither “having” nor “lacking”, the function of “having” and “lacking” arises. Because of the end in “having” and “lacking”, one speaks of the “middle provisional”.

- In [relation] to [the] method of speaking and related to [the underlying basic] meaning and structure it is an expedient means.

假中是破病語者 人聞中則作中解 有此平等中道之理

That the provisional middle scatters words [amounting to] illnesses: [If] others hear of the “middle”, then they create an

understanding of the “middle”, and [to them] there is this [inner] structure of a universally equal “middle way”.

為破此見故 言假名為中 何曾有此中之可得 是故假中為破病也

Because of the reason to scatter this view, one says that the provisional names act as the middle. How could it any longer be the [case] that this middle could be obtained? For this reason the provisional middle acts [in a way that it] scatters illnesses. (Ms. 20r-20l)

On the one hand, in particular the last passage shows impressively that just as in the case of the *Lun-chi* 論迹 also in the “Cho’ jang chung ka ũ” 初章中假義 the principle of complementarity plays an important role. Above all, however, the passages clearly show that both authors turn against any hypostasis of the merely functional term “middle” into an isolated entity, and even apply very much the same method: the recontextualization of each and every *dharma* as the middle. Furthermore, the rhetoric question at the end of the passage reminds of the corresponding allusion to the beginning of the *Lao-tzu* 老子 found in the *Lun-chi* 論迹. Both texts at this point appear to rely on the same basis, possibly the text by Fa-lang mentioned by Hye’ gyun.⁶⁾

The most interesting passage for evaluating the influence of Fa-lang on this common approach, however, is located in the first of the

⁶⁾ It cannot, however, be excluded beyond any remaining doubt that Hye’ gyun 慧均 at this point also might have been influenced by the in this context somewhat more explicit *Lun-chi* 論迹.

segments excerpting the sections of the apparently seminal text which Fa-lang 法朗 in the fifth month of the year 574 presented “in his room” to what must have been a very small group of disciples:

第一 盡異明中者

First, clarifying the middle [by bringing to] exhaustion [that which] differs:

亦對他明之 只盡彼異法故 明中

Also one clarifies it facing others. Merely for the reason of [bringing to] exhaustion the differing *dharmas* of those [others], one clarifies the middle.

何者 是 盡異法

What does it mean to [bring to] exhaustion the differing *dharmas*?

人執有中有假 故責中不成 破假不立

無彼中無彼假 此中假畢竟盡淨 故目此為中也

The others grasp [the view] that there exists a “middle” and that there exists a “provisional”. Therefore, one objects against a “middle” [so that] it is not accomplished and one scatters the “provisional” [so that] it is not established.

The “middle” of those [people] does not exist, and the “provisional” of those [people likewise] does not exist. - Here, middle and provisional finally have been exhausted and cleansed. Therefore, one views this as the “middle”. (Ms. 28l.)

The correspondence of the basic position mirrored in the two passages quoted above with the meta statements in the fourth section of the *Lun-chi* 論述 should have become evident by now, although it perhaps should be mentioned that even the somewhat peculiar⁷⁾ phrase *chin ching/chin chōng* 盡淨 (“exhaust and cleanse”) appears in both texts.

What is most important about the last passage quoted, however, is that due to its immediate context it provides a direct link to Fa-lang as the common source of inspiration for the emphasis on transcending any dichotomy between “middle” and “provisional” shared by both texts.

IV. Conclusions

The similarities between parts of the *Ta-sheng hsian lun* 大乘玄論 and the *Ssu-lun hsian i* 四論玄義 in the secondary literature have been considered both as evidence for mutual influences between Chi-tsang 吉藏 and Hye'gyun 慧均 and as hints on a shared influence received from Fa-lang 法朗.

However, in the case of mutual influences between the disciples one would expect more references to each other. Thus, Hye'gyun 慧均 does quote his fellow disciple Chi-tsang 吉藏 quite respectfully as Tae

7) In fact, the combination of these two verbs might be considered somewhat awkward because for stylistic reasons one would rather expect a complement construction, i.e. *ching-chin /chōng ngjin* 淨盡.

Chang kong 大藏公, but without attributing important concepts or exegetical strategies to him.

On the other hand, the “Ch’ ojang chung ka ūi” 初章中假義 does not only refer to Fa-lang as the originator of concepts such as the “threefold” or “fourfold middle”, but explicitly refers to a text presented to a small group of disciples, an occasion apparently memorable enough to note the year and month of its occurrence. More importantly, the contents extracted from this text can be linked directly to the common concern of both texts to avoid any reification of the “middle” and transcend even the distinction between the “provisional” and the “middle”.

However, the quite congenial cataphatic approach advocated in both texts to achieve this end and similarities in the wordings of related core passages in my view do not only betray a common textual basis, but also the effects of a shared education in the course of which certain forms of analysis had been internalized and thus had become a shared legacy.

In sum, the parallels between the “Ch’ ojang chung ka ūi” 初章中假義 and the *Lun-chi* 論述 strongly suggest that the basic idea of Chi-tsang’s sophisticated text, the equation of all *dharmas* with the middle - vastly antedating the widely assumed shift towards a cataphatic mode in Chinese Hua-yen in the 7th century - originated with Fa-lang 法朗.

Abstract

법랑(法朗) 사상의 재구성에 있어서 대승사론현의기(大乘四論玄義記)의 의의에 대한 고찰

요르그 플라센

이토 다카토시(伊藤隆壽) 교수는 1974년부터 1976년까지 발표한 세 편의 논문을 통하여, 혜균(慧均)의 저작 가운데 서론 격인 초장중가의의(初章中假義) 부분을 담고 있는 사본에서 흥미로운 사료를 소개하였다(이 사료가 최초로 보다 광범위한 학계의 주목을 받게 된 것은 1959년 오초 에니치(横超慧日)에 의해서였다). 하지만 그 사료에 대한 접근이 제한되어 있었기 때문에 이 사료는 현존함에도 불구하고 불행하게도 충분히 광범위하게 후속적인 연구가 진행되지 못해왔다.

본 논문은 이토 교수가 보내준 필사본 영인본과 이토 교수의 논문에서의 인용문을 비교한 필자의 박사학위논문의 해당 부분을 수정한 것에 기반하여, 이 본문의 단락들을 유명한 중국인 주석가 길장(吉藏, 549-623)이 저술한 중론(中論)에 대한 정교하고 심오한 주석인 논적(論迹, T.1853.68a-77b)에서 상응하는 핵심 단락들과 더불어 논의하고자 한다.

여러 유사점 가운데에서도, 이 두 저서는 중관론(中觀論)이라는 제목과 중(中)과 가(假) 사이의 관계에 대하여 가장 현저하게 계통적으로 연관되어 있는 분석을 담고 있다. 두 저자는 중(中)과 가(假)의 분리에 대해서 철저하게 반대하고, 제법(諸法)을 중(中)과 일치시킴으로써, 일반적으로 당나라 시대의 회엄사상과 연관되는 현상긍정으로의(kataphatic) 전환을

이미 이루어내고 있다. 이러한 현저한 유사점은 또한 길장의 주석에 있어서의 접근 태도를 이해하는 데 극히 적절한 단락에 있어서도 적용된다.

초장중가의(初章中假義)는 574년에 해당하는 것으로 간주되는 년도의 5월에 “망 안에서” 제자 몇몇에게 법랑(法朗, 507-581)이 제시한 텍스트를 가리키는데, 두 텍스트의 흥미로운 내용과 주석적 기교는 최종적으로는 법랑의 텍스트와 강의에서 파생되는 것으로 확립될 수 있을 것이다. 달리 말하자면, 혜균(慧均)의 텍스트에 기반하여 우리가 추정할 수 있는 것은, 길장이 사용하고 있는 가장 난해한 기교의 상당부분에 있어서 중요한 부분이 실제로는 법랑에서 기원한다는 것인데, 초기 삼론 전통에 있어서 이러한 사실의 실질적인 중요성은 이제 막 드러나기 시작하고 있다.

● 주제어

초장중가의, 논적, 법랑, 혜균, 길장, 대승사론현의기

2009년 5월 15일 투고

2009년 6월 17일 심사완료