

Sŭng Tonang (僧 道朗) (a.k.a. Sŭngnang (僧朗), fl. 476?-512) from Koguryŏ and his Role in Chinese San-lun

Joerg Plassen

I. Introduction

Notably through T'ang Yung-t'ung's monumental portrayal of the history of Chinese Buddhism from the Han to the Northern and Southern Dynasties, but ultimately due to the lineage constructed by Chi-tsang (吉藏, 549-623), a certain Sŭngnang (僧朗) from Koguryŏ has been widely known as the first patriarch of the San-lun (三論) tradition South of the Chiang River.¹ This tradition in turn has been considered

Joerg Plassen is an Assistant Professor of the Department of Ostasienwissenschaften at Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

This article is a revised version of a paper presented at the First World Congress of Korean Studies, Academy of Korean Studies, Sŏngnam, July 18-20, 2002.

International Journal of Buddhist Thought & Culture February 2005, Vol. 5, pp. 165~198.
© 2005 International Association for Buddhist Thought & Culture

the earliest predecessor of the T'ang dynasty lineages (Hurvitz, 1975:361-388). Sŭngnang thus would become the first patriarch of the great doctrinal schools on Chinese soil.

Several renowned Korean scholars of the 20th century showed interest in Sŭngnang: Drawing from Japanese research, already Yi Nŭnghwa (1868-1945) adduced some of the sources indicating Sŭngnang's eminent role in Chinese San-lun in his *Chosŏn Pulgyo T'ongsa* (1918). Of lasting impact, however, proved to be the famous literate and historian Ch'oe Namsŏn's (1890-1957) article "*Chosŏn Pulgyo. Tongbang munhwasa innŭn kŭ chiwi*" (Korean Buddhism and its role in East Asian cultural history), originally written as a paper to be presented at a Pan-Pacific conference on Buddhism held 1930 in Hawai'i: With a most obviously political agenda, Ch'oe Namsŏn considered Sŭngnang the first true patriarch of San-lun, on grounds that he based himself solely on the *Three Treatises*, i.e. *Chung-lun* (中論), *Pai-lun* (百論) and *Shih-erh men lun* (十二門論), and raised his voice against *Ch'eng-shih lun* (成實論) studies. Even more: Ch'oe labeled Sŭngnang a birth helper of East Asian Buddhism (*Tongbang Pulgyo*) (Ch'oe, 1974:546-572, esp. 549).²

Ever since, and this holds true also decades after the liberation from Japanese colonial rule, scores of Korean researchers have considered Sŭngnang one of the most prominent examples of Koreans influencing Chinese and East Asian intellectual history.

Perhaps for similar reasons, several Japanese and Chinese scholars have questioned the importance of Sŭngnang, in particular raising objections against a suspected direct influence on the lay scholar Chou Yung's (周顥) (fl. late 5.c) famous *San-tsung lun* (三宗論). The main argument later was taken up by Robert H. Robinson (cf. below), and thus has become current also in Western research. However, another

1 The author apologizes for the exclusive use of Wade-Giles for all transcriptions of Chinese names, texts and terms. - The use of Korean transcriptions would have been inappropriate in the given context, and a systematical addition of the Korean equivalents would have rendered the text even less readable.

2 The article originally appeared in *Pulgyo*, Vol. 74 (1930.8), pp. 1-51, and the passage in question is quoted in *Kim* 1998 (p. 25). - For the impact of this paper on modern Korean Buddhology cf. *Shim* 1989, pp. 147-157.

look at quotations from nowadays lost sources, which have been preserved in the biographical collection *Sanron soshi den shū* (三論祖師傳集) and Anchō's (安澄, 763-814) *Chūron shoki* (中論疏記), provides somewhat better insight into Sūngnang's sojourn in the South and thus serves to dispel most remaining doubts. And yet, the very same quotations might necessitate a reassessment of our perception of Sūngnang's role in Chinese San-lun.

II. The Biography and the Tradition: Sūngnang and Chou Yung

Biographical information on Sūngnang is scattered through a variety of works. Following principal sources have been quoted in the secondary literature:

- the *Kao-seng chuan* 高僧傳 (Entry Fa-tu 法度), 2059.50.380c15-18.
- Chi-tsang's Works, esp. *Erh-ti i* (二諦義), T.1854.45.108b, *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* (大乘玄論), T.1853.45.19b6-11, *Chung-kuan lun shu* (中觀論疏), T.1824.42.26b22f. and 29b28-c6.
- The *Ch'i-hsia ssu pei-wen* (棲霞寺碑文), an inscription from the monastery on Mt. She which was to be Sūngnang's last dwelling-place.
- Chan-jan's 湛然 (711-782) *Fa-hua hsüan-i shih-ch'ien* (法華玄義釋籤), T.1717.33.951a20-25.

Even when complemented by fragmentary quotations from Anchō's *Chūron shoki* (中觀論疏記), the information which can be derived from these sources are scanty and to some extent even puzzling, if not overtly contradictory: Thus, even the name Sūngnang, appearing for the first time in the *Kao-seng chuan*, has been subject to debate.³ In fact, Chi-tsang never uses this name, but rather the designations She-shan Ta-shih (攝山大師) ("the great master from Mt. She"), Kau-li Lang Ta-shih (高麗朗大師) ("the great master Lang from Kau-li"), or Ta Lang Fa-shih (大朗法師) ("the great Dharma master Lang"), while his co-disciple Hui-chün (慧均) (n.d.)⁴ in his *Ta-sheng ssu-lun hsüan-i chi* (大

³ For an extensive discussion of this problem, cf. Kim 1994, pp. 23-46, esp. pp. 24-39.

⁴ Alternatively, Chün Cheng (均正) and Hui Cheng (慧正). Both names seem to be abbreviations

乘四論玄義記) (henceforth *Ssu-lun hsüan-i* 四論玄義) employs the name Tao-lang, or Tonang (道朗). Therefore, it should be reasonable to follow the Chŏng Inbo's suggestion that Chi-tsang was anxious to avoid any possible confusion with Ho-hsi Tao-lang (河西道朗), whom he mentioned in other contexts, and therefore consciously avoided to use the first character. The name Sŭngnang thus should be understood as an abbreviation of Sŭng (僧) ("Monk") Tonang (道朗) (Chŏng, 1947:346ff, esp. 352).⁵—For convenience, however, we will abide by the generally received abbreviated name.

Not surprisingly, Sŭngnang's exact dates cannot be determined (fl. 476-512, cf. below). At least, it seems beyond question that Sŭngnang was born in Liao-tung, which had been under Koguryŏ control at least during part of the 5th century. Also, we may assume that Sŭngnang was not Chinese by origin, as he is consistently labeled a Koryŏ (i.e. Koguryŏ) monk.⁶—Most of what is commonly known about Sŭngnang's life may be represented by quoting a passage from Chi-tsang's *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*:

... The great master Lang from Kau-li [staying on] Mt. She originally was from the area of Liao-tung. Setting out from the North, he far away practiced the [scriptural] meanings [established by our] teacher Kūmarajīva. Having come to the South, he stayed

of Hui-chün Seng-cheng (慧均 僧正) (Administrator of the Sangha Hui-chün). Cf. Kim 1994, p.36.

⁵ quoted in Kim 1994, p.26. Kim Yŏng'ae criticises Chŏng Inbo for conflating Sŭngnang and Ho-hsi Tao-lang and considers Hui-chün's use of the character tao (道) instead of seng (僧) a mere writing blunder (p. 38f.). However, Chŏng Inbo's own erroneous identification of these two persons does not invalidate his suggestion that Chi-tsang, assuming separate identities, tried to avoid the name Tonang. This seems also to be Richard Gard's opinion: Citing Chŏng Inbo, he mentions that "... Sŭng-lang (僧朗) might be a shortened form of Sŭng-dong-lang (僧道朗) and often is also written as Dong-lang (道朗)..." and nevertheless cautions the reader not to confuse him with [Ho-hsi] Tao-lang. Cf. Gard 1959, p.65, n. 7. Although apparently unaware of Chŏng Inbo's findings, Itō Takatoshi likewise considers Tonang to be the correct name, cf. Itō 1978, pp. 197ff.

⁶ If Sŭngnang had been a descendant of a Chinese family, one should only expect references to his birthplace in Liao-tung, but not the use of the name Kao-li (高麗). as a prefix to his name (denoting his "otherness", cf. the use of *hu* (胡) for monks of Central Asian descent). The argument that Sŭngnang nevertheless should be regarded part of Chinese Buddhism only because he received his training on Chinese soil and stayed in China the rest of his life should be dismissed already for the reason that we do not know to which extent he had received training in Koguryŏ.

at Ts'ao-tang (艸堂) monastery on Mt. Chung (鍾山),⁷ [there] meeting the retired scholar (yin-shih) Chou Yung (周顥). Chou Yung consequently studied under the master. Then Liang Wu-ti (梁武帝), who respectfully believed in the three jewels, upon hearing that the great master had come, sent Seng-cheng (僧正), Chih-chi (智寂) [etc., altogether] ten masters to the mountain (i.e., Mt. She 攝山),⁸ in order to receive the teaching. The Son of Heaven Liang Wu grasped the master's intention, discarded the *Ch'eng-shih lun* and created *chang* (章) and *shu* (疏) [commentaries] based on Mahāyāna. K'ai-shan (開善) (i.e., Chih-tsang 智藏, 488-522) likewise heard [these] statements and grasped the words, yet failed to grasp the intention. ... (T.1853.19b6-b11).

The account in the *Erh-ti i* is almost identical, but additionally makes explicit mention of the *San-tsung lun* as being a later result of Chou Yung studying under Sūngnang. According to Chi-tsang, when Chih-lin (智琳, 408?-487) asked Chou Yung to give the treatise out of his hands, Chou Yung expressed concern that if he (lit. "the disciple") did so, the general public might be terrified.—Only when Chih-lin stated that he once had heard [statements of] the same meaning in his youth, lamenting that the profound sounds [of the teaching] had been interrupted for more than 40 years, Chou would finally publish the text.

In the corresponding letter (preserved noth in the *Kao seng chuan* and the *Kuang hung-ming chi* 廣弘明記) (Esp. T.2059.50.377a27-b25; T.2102.52.274b23-c18)⁹ Chih-lin assures Chou Yung of the orthodoxy of the latter's statements, claiming that, when he was twenty years old,¹⁰ he had adopted the same position and ever since trusted in it as the instrument eventually leading to spiritual attainment. Also, he remembers that in his youth he had been told by old monks in Ch'ang-an that this idea originally had been well-known in that area, at

7 Mt. Chung is located only five *li* north of the Ch'i capital Chin-ling (金陵) (nowadays Nanking). Cf. Gard 1959, p. 66, n. 10.

8 Sūngnang's final dwelling place on Mt. She, the Ch'i-hsia ssu (棲霞寺) was located some 40 *li* north-east of Chien-k'ang (建康) (mod. Nanking). Cf. Gard 1959, p. 66, n. 11. The effective travel distance appears to have been 70 *li* (cf. below).

9 Esp. cf. T.2059.50.377a27-b25 and T.2102.52.274b23-c18. For a translation based on a synopsis of the available recensions, consult Krause 2001, pp. 146-150.

10 According to Richard H. Robinson, this incident must have occurred around 428. Cf. Robinson 1978, p. 171.

the same time receiving the prognostication that no one east of the river would understand his lectures on this idea. Over a period of forty years he had been proselytizing, literally becoming sick because no one would understand, and finally fearing that the transmission indeed would be cut off. Now, however, he felt great relief, as Chou Yung “secretly manifested what has no connection and solitarily created what is beyond the [ordinary] square”(chi fa wu-hsü tu ch’uang fang-wai (機發無緒 獨創方外), T.2059.50.377b16; T.2102.52.274c9.) ... —Chih-lin’s elaborate praise should not be overweighted, and the subsequent request for a copy of the text for dissemination west of the Yang-tzu might have been motivated by the search for a pretext in order to achieve the emperor’s permit to return home. Nevertheless, the contents of the letter seem to indicate that Chou Yung developed his treatise independently from Chih-lin.

Special attention has been given to the detail that Chih-lin mentions that [at the time of his writing] 67 years (*liu ch’i shih sui* 六七十歲) had passed since the profound voice had ceased, an obvious allusion to Kūmarajīva. Modern research tends to follow an obituary by Seng-chao contained in the *Kuang hung ming chi* (T.2102.52.264c18), and consider Kūmarajīva to have passed away in 413. Thus, it has been assumed that the *San-tsung lun* was written around (413+67 =) 480 or before.¹¹

Although the date 413 is supported by a colophon to the *Ch’eng-shih lun* (成實論) contained in Seng-yu’s (僧瑜, 445-518) *Ch’u san-tsang chi-chi* (出三藏記集), which states that the translation of the text had been finished in 412, Seng-yu himself somewhat reluctantly states that Kūmarajīva died during the I-hsi (義熙, 405-418) period (Robinson, 1978:245). The correct date apparently had not even been known to Hui Chiao (慧皎, 497-554) when compiling the *Kao Seng chuan* (高僧傳) (before 519): In fact, he dates Kūmarajīva’s death to the equivalent of 409, and even a critical note appended to the biography only lists dates corresponding to the years 405 and 406 as possible

11 This theory apparently originated with the Japanese scholar Sakaino Kōyō. Cf. Hirai 1976, p. 264 n.24, or Ko 1989, pp. 16-21, esp. p.19.

alternatives. Thus, it is quite uncertain whether Chih-lin knew the actual date. The letter thus might have been written at least four years earlier, and the *San-tsung lun* theoretically might have been composed in (or even before) 476.

Through Chou Yung's biography in the *Nan Ch'i shu*, we know that at the beginning of the period Chien-yüan (健元, 479-483) he served as adjutant to the Prince of Ch'ang-sha (長沙王), adjutant of the rear troops, and magistrate of Shan-yin (山陰) in K'uai-chi (會稽). Chih-lin proposes in his letter to come to the mountain in order to receive a copy, which he is requesting from Chou Yung. This might suggest that the letter rather was written at a time when Chou Yung usually was staying near the capital on Mt. Chung. Thus, 476 might be considered the more likely date.

Sakaino Kōyō and T'ang Yung-t'ung questioned the facticity of Chou Yung's alleged indebtedness to Sūngnang, basing themselves on a remark in Chan-jan's *Fa-hua hsüan-i shih-ch'ien*, according to which Sūngnang came to the South at the beginning of the Chien-wu (建武) period (494-497) and thus long after the death of Chih-lin, the textual witness of Chou Yung's *San-tsung lun* (Hirai, 1976:253ff).¹² Following their lead, Richard Robinson names several other *San-lun* specialists in the South and points out that Chou Yung was at good terms with the already mentioned Chih-lin, as well as with Hsüan-ch'ang (玄暢) (n.d.), another scholar monk versed in the *San-lun*. In addition, Robinson mentions that Seng Chao's *Pu chen k'ung lun* (不真空論), according to Chi-tsang's *Chung-kuan lun shu* (中觀論疏) the actual source of the *chia-ming k'ung* (假名空) theory forwarded in Chou Yung's treatise (T.1824.42.29b28-c6), is listed in Lu Ch'eng's (陸澄) *Fa-lun-mu-lu* (法輪目錄), which was compiled for Sung Ming-Ti (宋明帝) between 465 and 471 and thus had been known in the South early enough to exert influence on Chou Yung (Robinson, 1978:172f).

And yet, as both Yi Nüng-hwa and Hirai Shun'ei have pointed out, the *Ch'i-hsia ssu pei-wen* states that Sūngnang, while in the south

¹² The corresponding passage can be found in T.1717.33.951a21f. Chih-lin most likely died in 487. As mentioned before, Chou Yung is commonly believed to have passed away in 485.

and "... roaming from the most Northern mountains in the North to the most Southern mountains in the South, kept away from the capital for 3 *ch'i* (紀)..." (i.e., 3 times 12 years, i.e. 36 years), before Liang Wu-ti in 512 sent the above mentioned ten monks to Mt. She. Consequently, Sūngnang may have arrived in the South as early as in 476.—The date given by Chan-jan (i.e., 494) thus may be reinterpreted as the year in which Sūngnang finally went to Ch'i-hsia monastery on Mt. She.¹³

III. Towards a More Detailed Account of Sūngnang's Sojourn in the South

Already Chǒng Inbo quoted extensively from another source, which provides much more detailed information on Sūngnang: the *Sanron soshi den shū* (三論祖師傳集), a text of unknown authorship, which basically is an alignment of textual quotes on important Indian, Chinese, Korean and Japanese predecessors of the Sanron lineage as viewed by the Japanese compiler (Chǒng, 1947:349f).¹⁴ The textus receptus, contained in *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* vol. 111, is based on a text which had been corrected twice.—According to a colophon at the end of the middle *chüan*, the text is a revised edition from the 12th month of the second year Shōka (1259), again revised in the 4th month of the 10th year Kyōhō (1726) (*Bussho kaisetsu daijiten*, vol. 4, 134a).

The passage of interest is labeled as a quotation from the 13th *chüan* (*kwǒn*) of the *Ssu-lun hsüan-i* (四論玄義), written by Chün Cheng (均正) (i.e. Hui Cheng 慧正, or Hui-chün 慧均, n.d.). At the beginning, we find a somewhat alerting excuse by the compilers, stating that the grass script of the manuscript is difficult to read. Unfortunately, the

13 Cf. Kim 1975, pp. 45-67, esp. p.51. Kim Ingsök somewhat idiosyncratically determines 466 to be the year of Sūngnang's arrival in the South. Also cf. Hirai 1976, pp. 253-263, esp. p. 257. For a terse description focussing on the date of Sūngnang's arrival, cf. Ko 1989, pp. 16-21.

While Kim Ingsök and other Korean scholars apparently considered the issue as settled, Hirai Shun'ei expressed doubts whether Sūngnang - being much younger and appearing on the scene only a few years before the composition of the *San-tsung lun* - really could have influenced Chou Yung in writing the treatise. Thus, Hirai reached the more reluctant conclusion that Chi-tsang's narrative concerning Chou Yung and Sūngnang should be considered "not totally without foundation". Cf. Hirai 1976, p.263.

14 A synopsis and rather detailed discussion of this and most other materials at hand can be found in Itō 1978, pp. 197-209.

Ssu-lun hsüan-i has survived only in a 10 *chüan* recension (lacking the first parts of *chüan* 1, 3 and 4, resp.).¹⁵ However, in a note to the table of contents of the extant version, the editor muses whether *chüan* 10 in fact might be *chüan* 12. Furthermore, the *Tōiki dentō mokuroku* (域傳燈目錄) (T.2183.55.1145c-1165b, comp. in the 8th year of the period Kanji (1094) by Eichō (永超) (dates var., 1014-95 or 1003-95) not only records a 12 *chüan* version, but also mentions someone reporting of a 14 *chüan* version (T.2183.55.1159c).—The existence of several versions with such differences in textual alignment might seem odd, and yet becomes explainable if we consider the fact that the *Ssu-lun hsüan-i* (四論玄義)—both in contents and structure comparable to the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun* (大乘玄論)—is a compilation of several self-contained texts.

Following a conspicuous note correcting the year of Kūmarajīva's death to 413, the actual account of Sūngnang's activities begins as follows:

... Right-hand of the [Yellow] River there also was a conditioned arising: At the times of the Ch'i (齊) there was the monk from the state Kau-li (高麗), Dharma master Shih Tao-lang (釋道朗法師). He journeyed to the descendents of the Eight old ones (Pa-su 八宿, i.e. Kūmarajīva's main disciples) (Itō, 1978:195) in the countries of Huang-lung (黃龍) (i.e. in the area of Tun-huang), learned what the disciples had heard and studied, attained the Dharrma gate of the Large Vehicle without abiding and without attainment,¹⁶ crossed the Chiang and reached Yang-chou. At that time a scholar [under] the Prince of Ching-ling (敬陵王),¹⁷ [his] family name being Chou (周), personal name Yung (顛),—this is exactly the grand father of Chou Hung-cheng (周弘正)—kept company with the Dharma master Tao-lang, and thus they compared their [interpretations of textual] meanings and [their respective spiritual] foundation (*i tsung* 義宗, lit.: “meanings and ancestor”). Thus, Lord Chou awoke and understood the general intention (*ta-i* 大意).

15 A manuscript containing the beginning of *chüan* 1 is kept in Japan. While Itō Takatoshi should be credited for having presented parts of this most valuable material in a series of articles, a transcript of the source itself unfortunately is accessible only to a few Japanese scholars.

16 Reading *wu i wu i te* 無依無得 instead of *wu i wu i te* 無依無依得.

17 I.e. Ching-ling Wang 竟陵王, or Hsiao Tzu-liang 蕭子良 (460-494).

Thereupon he prepared the *Ssu-tsung lun* (四宗論) (sic!). At that time [one] did not see his writing.—Master Tao-lang said: [Concerning] the *Ssu-tsung lun* which [you] created: The taste of the words is comprehensible. Afterwards, [Chou] feared this meant that [the master] did not yet appreciate its intention.... (*Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 115, 519b; *Sanron soshi den shū*, 43b).

So far, Hui-chūn's report resembles Chi-tsang's.¹⁸ However, the following remarks allow most interesting insights into Sūngnang's itinerary and his relationship with Chou Yung:

The Prince of Chin-ling invited all Dharma masters to [come to] Wu-shan monastery (五山寺) and establish (*shu* 暨) [their interpretations of textual] meanings (*i* 義). Chou Yung established [his interpretations of textual] meanings and [spiritual] foundation (*i*-tsung 義宗) of the Four treatises (*Ssu-lun* 四論). Thereupon, [the prince]¹⁹ invited the Dharma master Tao-lang to expound the statements of the Large Vehicle at that monastery. - [What used to be] Wu-shan monastery is exactly nowadays Ch'i-hsia monastery (棲霞寺) - ...

... Lord Chou invited the Dharma master to return to Ts'ao-tang monastery (艸堂寺) [on Mt. Chung], to hold lectures and pass on [his] learning. [Concerning] the Large Vehicle of non-attainment, [Chou Yung] was already near to awakening and salvation. He was considered to be a man without pair in the empire. Since Mr. Chou had grown old, he already transformed himself.²⁰

18 The change of the *San-tsung lun* into a *Ssu-tsung lun* mirrors what may be termed a certain obsession with the *Four Treatises*, which is ubiquitous in Hui-chūn's work. Rather intriguing is Hui-chūn's mention of the kinship relationship between Chou Yung and the famous Liang and Ch'ên Dynasty scholar Chou Hung-cheng, which is restated in an interlineary note in the *San-lun hsüan-i* (三論玄義).. The *San-lun* scholars' relations with the Chou clan deserve further attention.

19 As we will see below, the first author to peruse this material suggests that Chou Yung issued the invitation. - The sense of the passage seems to be that the Prince of Chin-ling was so impressed by Chou Yung's lecture that he asked the latter's mentor Sūngnang to lecture in that temple.

20 My understanding of the last passage is very tentative. The double *i* (已) in the text might be due to erroneous transcription.

After the Dharma master had proceeded, Lord [Chou] went to the District Yin (陰) [near] the K'uai-chi (會稽) mountains, and held lectures for a short while ...

Later, all the [other] Dharma masters [from Mt. She] invited the Dharma master again to come to Mt. She (攝山).—Mt. She is 70 li away from Yang-chou (楊州).—[Tao-lang] stopped at Chih-kuan monastery (止觀寺) and practiced the way.

Eventually, when the Son of Heaven Liang Wu[-ti] ascended to his position, he wanted to study the Large Vehicle of non-attainment. He invited [Tao-lang] to come out to Yang-chou. However, the Dharma master personally (wei jen 爲人) always wished to dwell in quietude and did not wish to come out [of the mountain]. The Son of Heaven by imperial decree summoned 10 eminent priests (Ta-te 大惠) and ordered them to enter Mt. She in order to listen to and learn the essential Way of the Large Vehicle... (*Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 115, 519b; *Sanron soshi den shū*, 43b).

Summarizing and arranging the pieces of information pertaining to the stay in the South in a more natural order, we might propose following loose chain of incidents:

1. Sūngnang crosses the Yang-tzu and comes to Yang-chou Province. (ca. 36 years before 512, i.e. around 476)
2. Staying on Mt. Chung,²¹ he associates with Chou Yung, and becomes the lay scholar's mentor. (around 476?)
3. Their interchange of ideas results in the latter's composition of the *San tsung lun*. (around 476?, cf. above)
4. The Prince of Chin-ling organizes a doctrinal disputation at Wu-shan ssu, located at the foot of Mt. She. Chou Yung apparently leaves a lasting impression with his exposition of the Four treatises. Most likely as a result of this incident, Sūngnang is invited to this temple. (presumably, although not necessarily, before his stay in K'uai-chi)²²

21 Chou Yung established this temple on the location of his former eremitage not before the 480s. Thus, Chi-tsang's use of the designation Ts'ao-tang ssu actually is somewhat anachronistic. Chi-tsang might have been unaware of this fact, or he might have purposely chosen the more current place name. In both cases, however, there would be little reason to regard this anachronism a falsification of his account.

5. Chou Yung follows Sūngnang (or, rather, vice-versa) to Shan-yin in K'uai-chi (479, cf. above).
6. Having returned from K'uai-chi, Chou Yung again invites Sūngnang to the Tsao-t'ang ssu on Mt. Chung—only short time before his death. (between 482 and 485?)
7. The Dharma masters from Mt. She ask Sūngnang to return. Sūngnang settles in the Mountain temple [Chih]-kuan ssu. (presumably, in 494)²³
8. Sūngnang becomes abbot of the mountain temple after the death of Fa-tu. (500)
9. Liang Wu-ti tries in vain to lure Sūngnang out of the mountain to the provincial capital and finally sends the famous 10 eminent monks to She-shan. (512)

As Itō Takatoshi has demonstrated, the information found in the text integrate quite well with Chi-tsang's outline of the events (Itō, 1978:201). Furthermore, the quote is accompanied by a quotation apparently drawn from Chikō's (智光, 709-770/780) *Jōmyō gen ron ryaku jutsu* (淨名玄論略述), which, in spite of some other obvious corruption (thus, one character is marked as unreadable) is much smoother to read. Obviously, it summarizes either Hui-chün, or an unknown common source both texts may be based on, at the same time adducing further pieces of information possibly drawn from Chi-tsang's works (*Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho*, vol. 115, 521b; *Sanron soshi den shū*, 45b).

- After some stock phrases on Sūngnang's character and appearance, which seem to summarize contents which appear towards the end of the quotation from Hui-chün's work, we learn that Sūngnang studied under T'an-chi (曇濟) from *Tun-huang*, according to the author a disciple of Tao-sheng (道生).

22 Hsiao Tzu-liang was promoted to the rank of a prince in 482, and became Minister of instruction somewhere before 484. From the same year on, he maintained a famous salon, inviting literati and Buddhist clerics alike. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that this public dispute - if factual at all - took place in 482 earliest. However, Hsiao Tzu-liang's subsequent activities, including the only such dispute mentioned elsewhere, centered around the Western Villa and the adjacent Mt. Chi-lung. Thus, it again might be reasonable to assume that the dispute in question was held in the beginning years of the Ch'i dynasty. - The bottom line is that we just do not know.

23 This assumption is based on the above mentioned interpretation of the date given by Chan-jan. As Itō assumes, the Chih-kuan ssu might be part of or identical with the Ch'i-hsia ssu. Cf. Itō 1978, p. 215 n. 30.

- Again, we learn that Chou Yung received instruction by Sūngnang. However, the San-tsung lun is not mentioned.
- Also, the debate at Wu-shan ssu is mentioned, with the plausible emendment that it was the Prince who suggested Chou Yung to invite Sūngnang.
- There is no word of a stay in K'uai-chi. However, we are informed of Chou Yung's invitation to Tsao-t'ang ssu, this time more logically followed by the reference to Chou Yung's death.
- Though there is no mention of an invitation, we again read about Sūngnang's return to [Chih-]kuan ssu on Mt. She.
- Finally, we again learn of Liang Wu-ti's futile invitations to the capital, after which he sends out the ten masters.

In Anchō's *Chūron shoki* we find a passage echoing the report of Sūngnang's stay at the Chih-kuan ssu. In an attempt to explain the designation "Great master from inside the mountain", Anchō quotes Chikō's *Chūron jutsu ki* (中論述記) as follows:

In the past, the great Dharma master Nang from Koryō went at the end of Sung and the beginning of Ch'i to the place [of sojourn] of Dharma master T'an-ch'ing (曇慶) from Tun-huang prefecture, studied the San-lun and journeyed, proselytizing, to all directions, until he crossed the Chiang and stayed at the old mountain temple, expounding the statements of the Large Vehicle. Then he entered the She mountain range and stopped at Chih-kuan ssu, practicing the way and doing *tsuo-ch'an* (坐禪) (T.2255.65.46b20ff).

Anchō doubts the reliability of the concluding statement and suggests a confusion with Seng-chüan (僧詮), who is widely known as Chih-kuan ssu Seng-chüan (止觀寺僧詮). And yet, discussing the designation She-shan Ta-shih (攝山大師) ("Great master from Mt. She"), Anchō somewhat inconsistently adduces another quotation from the *Chūron jutsu ki* mentioning Sūngnang's stay at Chih-kuan ssu (止觀寺) (T.2255.65.71b13ff).—In this context, he apparently does not feel any necessity to express doubts on account of a possible confusion of statements pertaining to different persons.—The quotation again is backed by another quote from Chün-cheng's *Ssu-lun hsüan-i*:

In the tenth role of Chiün-cheng's *Hsüan-i* it is said: Master Tao-lang, retreating (*yin*) to the district Shan-yin in K'uai-chi, for a little while spoke the Dharma... —End of quote (*ch'u* 處). [...]The Dharma masters asked the Dharma master later to come to Mt. She.—Mt. She is 70 miles away from Yang-chou. —at Chih-kuan monastery he practiced the way [...]—even up to detailed explanation, all as in the first *chiian* of the record.²⁴

Thus, at least parts of the lengthy quote from the *Ssu-lun hsüan-i* found in the *Sanron soshi den shū* can be corroborated with parallel citations in much earlier sources.

For lack of additional sources, any attempt to determine an exact chronology of the events soon will reach its limits.²⁵ However, it should have become evident that Chou Yung and Sūngnang must have shared a close relation over a longer period.—As Anchō quotes from the local gazetteer *T'an-hai chi* (淡海記):

The *dānapati* of Master Lang was called Chou Yung
(T.2255.65.85c5f).

The fundamental question whether Sūngnang influenced Chou Yung also in the composition of the *San-tsung lun* most likely will never be settled beyond doubt. On the other hand, however, the basic arguments brought forward against this assumption are nothing but insubstantial. Furthermore, Chih-lin's claim that he had heard in his youth that corresponding statements had been known in Kuan-chung (i.e., the Ch'ang-an area) indicates that Chou Yung's doctrines had not been current in the South, which in turn might suggest a fresh external stimulus from the North. Thus, it is not improbable that Chou Yung indeed wrote the *San-tsung lun* under Sūngnang's influence, and—unless more substantial counter evidence is brought forward—we should abide by this view.

²⁴ *chi* 記, a self-reference to Anchō's text. The corresponding passage retells the well-known events under Liang Wu-ti, and thus can be left aside.

²⁵ In fact, Chi-tsang's somewhat superficial treatment of Sūngnang's stay in the South seems to indicate that by his and Chiün-cheng's time the transmission of first-hand knowledge on the historical facts had already faded away.

IV. Some Notes on Sūngnang's Thought

There are no extant works known to have been written by Sūngnang. Conclusions concerning his thought can be reached only based on quotations and other references. Therefore, Korean scholars have assembled impressive amounts of text passages from Chi-tsang's works allegedly representing Sūngnang's teachings, the most extensive collection comprising 40 pages (Kim, 1989). However, a careful revision of these materials shows that most attributions should be treated with caution, and some passages definitely have to be discarded.—Already Anchō warns against any automatism concerning such attributions, setting out with following observations concerning Chikō's *Chūron jutsu ki*:

Now, passage over passage says: “Middle of the Mountain (Shan-chung 山中): [This refers to] the great Master Lang from the state of Kau-li; ‘Mountain gate (Shan-men 山門): [This refers to] Dharma master [Seng-]ch'üan ([僧]詮) from Chih-kuan Monastery. If sometimes it is said ‘the one master’, sometimes ‘the great master’, sometimes plainly ‘the master’, [this refers to] Master Fa-lang (法朗, 507-81) from Hsing-huang (興皇) Monastery. ...” (T.2255.65.22a17-20).

What follows, are quotations from various texts illustrating that the usage of “Shan-chung (山中)” and “Shan-men (山門)” in Chi-tsang's and Hui-chün's texts in fact is more complex: In different settings, both terms may alternatively refer to Sūngnang, Seng-ch'üan or Fa-lang. The designations equated with Fa-lang, however, are not subjected to criticism.

This is far from accidental: Although being designed and conceived as literary works, the *hsüan* (玄) and *shu* (疏) commentaries written down by Chi-tsang and Hui-chün or their successors basically fall into the two categories of scripts for and transcripts of public lectures, and almost all texts were written with a physically present local audience in mind.²⁶ As both Sūngnang and Fa-lang are explicitly referred to as *ta-shih*—thus, we find references to She-shan ta-shih (攝山大

師) or She-ling ta-shih (攝嶺大師) (“the great master from Mt. She” and “The great master from the She mountain range”) alongside references to Hsing-huang ta-shih (興皇大師) (“the great master from Hsing-huang [temple]”)²⁷—, it should be evident that underspecified phrases such as *ta-shih* (大師) (“the great master”), *fa-shih* (法師) (“the Dharma master”) or even *shih* (師) (“the master”), as far as they were not preceded by a more specific designation, had to be understood as references to Chi-tsang’s and Hui-chün’s personal mentor, i.e. Fa-lang.

To make things even worse, there are no lengthy quotes and often it is difficult to determine where a given quotation ends. Thus, decisions whether Chi-tsang at a given point rephrases or explains Sūngnang’s thought or whether he already has moved on to present his own ideas are far from trivial. — Nevertheless, a few rather important positions apparently held by Sūngnang may be identified.

1. The Basic Idea Passed on to Chou Yung

In his *San-tsung lun* (三宗論) (“Treatise on the three [spiritual] ancestors”), Chou Yung apparently forwarded a dialectical scheme of three theses reflecting different conceptions of the term “provisional names” (*chia-ming* 假名). Unfortunately, only fragmentary quotes from the text survive. The fundamental theses appear to have been:

... 1. Not emptying provisional names (*pu-k’ung chia-ming* 不空假名), 2. emptying provisional names (*k’ung chia-ming* 空假名). 3. provisional names being empty (*chia-ming k’ung* 假名空).
... (T.1824.42.29b17).

Concerning the culminating final thesis, Chi-tsang explains:

Third: “provisional names being empty”: This is exactly what Chou Yung makes use of. [Its] overall intention says:

²⁶ This should hold true also for those commentaries which are known to have been composed on imperial order. The *San-lun hsüan-i* (三論玄義) might be an exception, in so far as it is an embellished revision of a lecture which had already been held at court.

²⁷ E.g. cf. *Chung-kuan lun-shu.*, T.1824.42.22c27,28c19,168b16 and 85b5,144a14.

provisional names as a matter of fact are exactly emptiness. Searching for the origin of Mr. Chou's "provisional names being empty", [one will find that] it comes out of Seng-chao's (僧肇) (384-414?) *Pu-chen k'ung lun* (不真空論) ("Treatise on [reality] not being truly empty"). The treatise says: "Although having (yu 有) [differentiating characteristics], it still lacks (wu 無) [them], although lacking [differentiating characteristics], it still has [them]."²⁸ "Although having, it still lacks" is what is called "not being something which has" (fei yu 非有). "Although lacking, it still has" is what is called "not being something which lacks" (fei wu 非無). Such does not exactly mean that there are no things.—The things [just] are not real things. If the things are not real things, in relation to what could we make them "things"? Lord Chao [further] says: "For the reason that things are not real things, they are provisional things. For the reason that they are provisional things, they are exactly emptiness." The great master Lang from Kau-li, obtained this meaning in Kuan-nei (i.e. the area around Ch'ang-an) and passed it on to Mr. Chou. Mr. Chou on grounds of this composed the *San-tsung lun* (T.1824.42.b29-c6).

Judging from the above passage, Chi-tsang considered the *San-tsung lun* basically a restatement of Seng-chao's ideas. Concerning the ultimate identity of "that which has" and "that which lacks" [characteristics], or provisional names and emptiness, i.e. the interrelation which Chi-tsang usually labels hsiang-chi (相卽) ("mutual identity").

Thus, it is difficult to decide whether another snippet of information contained in the passage on Sūngnang in the *Erh ti-i* paraphrases the *San-tsung lun*, or merely is a restatement of its quintessential meaning:

...Chou Yung in his late age composed the *San-tsung lun*, clarifying that the two scrutinies take the middle way as their [inner] body (erh-ti i chung-tao wei t'i 二諦以中道爲體) ... (T.1854.45.108b5-6).

²⁸ On reasons to avoid the widespread rendition of yu 有 and wu 無 as "existence" and "inexistence" cf. Plassen 2003, pp. 286-95.

In any case, the passage leads us to what perhaps might be considered Sūngnang's most important, and yet possibly somewhat problematic intellectual contribution.

2. The Two Scrutinies (erh-ti 二諦) and the Middle Way (chung-tao 中道)

In his *Chung-kuan lun shu*, Chi-tsang first claims the eventual identity of the middle and the provisional, and then lets the opponent raise the following question:

... This being such, for what reason is [that which] is neither what has, nor [that which] lacks [characteristics] (fei yu fei wu 非有非無) [in the case of] the Great master of Mt. She termed “middle way” (chung-tao 中道), and [that which] and yet has, and yet lacks (erh yu erh wu 而有而無) is termed “provisional designations” (chia-ming 假名)?—Then, the [inner] body (t'i 體) is termed middle, and the function (yung 用) is exactly the provisional.—For what reason [should] they be without distinction? (T.1824.45.22c27-c29).

Chi-tsang explains that one analyses into [inner] body and function only in a first approach (i-wang kai yü t'i-yung 一往開於體體用), thus designating the [inner] body as the “middle” and the function as the “provisional” (T.1824.42.22c29-a1).—in fact, Sūngnang's statement seems to pose a considerable problem to Chi-tsang, as can be inferred from the second interchange with the opponent:

... Question: Why [then] does the Great master produce this exposition? Answer: The text of the Treatise (i.e., the *Chung-lun*) [has it] such. Therefore, the great master makes use of it.. The Chapter on the fourfold scrutiny says: The multitude of *dharmas* produced by causes and conditions (chung yin-yüan sheng fa 衆因緣生法), I say, these exactly are emptiness (k'ung 空), also I consider them to be provisional designations (chia-ming 假名), and also these are meanings of the middle way (chung-tao i 中道義). The analysis in long lines (i.e., the prose commentary to the verses) says: As it is far apart from the two extremes, it is named “middle way”. For the sake of the living beings, it is spoken of by means of provisional

designations. The middle way being the [inner] body, one cannot speak of its “having” or “lacking”. As the function is [that which] has or lacks, it can get to the point to be spoken of provisionally. Therefore, one takes [that which] neither is what has nor what lacks as the middle and [that which] and yet has, and yet lacks as the provisional.—The above merely means to treat [the matter in just] one way. If one distinguishes the three middle and the three provisional ones, then middle and provisional always penetrate [each other]. Later on, this will be spoken of comprehensively... (Cf. T.1824.42.23a1-a8).

While the reader would expect Chi-tsang to provide some evidence to the effect that also Sūngnang eventually would transcend the static duality of middle and provisional, Chi-tsang apparently has no other choice than to defend Sūngnang by resorting to the limitations imposed by the framework of the textual foundation.

As will be discussed infra, from the perspective of Fa-lang (法朗) and Chi-tsang, Sūngnang’s clear distinction of “middle” and “provisional” ultimately should be discarded.—The benefit of Sūngnang’s conception for the development of San-lun—to be more precise, the branch represented by Fa-lang and Chi-tsang—lies in the uncompromising reduction of yu and wu to mere fang-pien (方便). Thus, these terms are deprived of ultimate validity, and of their initial static. Even though this move by no means anticipated the far more deconstructive developments to follow, it nevertheless was a necessary first step to make these developments possible.

However, Sūngnang’s concept might have implications far beyond the San-lun traditions: The verse from the *Chung-lun*, i.e. MMK 24:18, provides also the textual foundation for the concept of three scrutinies (san-ti 三諦), normally attributed to the T’ien-t’ai scholar Chih-i (智顛) (538-597). Interestingly enough, Chi-tsang considers the use of a third scrutiny (i.e., the scrutiny from the perspective of the middle way) to be a decisive feature lacking in the Ch’eng-shih scholar Chih-tsang’s distorted interpretation of Sūngnang’s theories (*Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, T.1853.45.19b11ff). In the *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, a wealth of textual evidence for the formula of the middle way as [inner] body and the

related idea of a “third scrutiny” is given:

... Question: [According to] which passages in the *sūtras* does the middle way function as the [inner] body of the two scrutinies? Answer: The *Chung-lun* says: The dharmas produced by causes and conditions,—I say, these exactly are emptiness (k’ung 空), also I consider them to be provisional designations (chia-ming 假名), and also these are the attributes of the middle way (chung-tao 中道).—[Comment:] “The dharmas produced by causes and conditions ...”: this is the scrutiny [from the] vulgar [perspective] (su-ti 俗諦). “... these exactly are emptiness”: this is the scrutiny [from the] true [perspective] (chen-ti 真諦). “... and also these are attributes of the middle way”: this is the inner body (t’i 體). The *Hua-yen* (華嚴) says: All dharmas of “that which has” (yu 有) and “that which lacks” (wu 無), [properly] understood, are neither “that which has” nor “that which lacks”. For this reason, that which has and that which lacks function as the two scrutinies, and what is neither “that which has” nor “that which lacks” functions as [their inner] body. The *sūtra* says: “what is neither that which has nor what lacks provisionally is spoken of [as] ‘that which has’ and ‘that which lacks’.” The *Nieh-p’an ching* (涅槃經) says: “Following the [limited capacities of] the living beings, [the Buddha] speaks of the existence of the ‘two scrutinies’.” For this reason, one takes the gate of teaching (chiao-men 教門) to be the scrutinies. The *Jen-wang ching* (仁王經) says: “The scrutiny [from the perspective of] that which has, the scrutiny [from the perspective of] that which lacks, the scrutiny in the highest sense [from the perspective of] the middle way.” Therefore, [you should] know that there is a third scrutiny (T.1853.45.19b17-b25).²⁹

It should not go by unnoticed that the *Jen-wang ching* (仁王經)—together with the *P’u-sa ying-lo pen-yeh ching* (菩薩瓔珞本業經)—provides the scriptural evidence from the *sūtras* Chih-i (智顛, 538-597) / Kuan-ting (灌頂, 561-632), would resort to. Given the circumstance that Hui pu (慧布, 518-587), one of Fa-lang’s three major fellow disciples, is reported to have shared contacts with Chih-i’s predecessor Hui-ssu (慧思, 517-577) (*Hsü Kao seng-chuan*, T.2060.50.480c27ff ; Hirai, 1976:277, 285

²⁹ For the notion of a third scrutiny, also cf. *Erh ti-i*, T.1854.45. 108c24-a8.

n.16), these coincidences give reason to raise the question whether the T'ien-t'ai concept of three truths possibly might have evolved out of Sūngnang's ideas.³⁰

3. The Formulae of the "Provisional Before the Middle" and "The Middle Before the Provisional", etc.

In Chi-tsang's *Ta-sheng hsüan lun*, we find the following passage :

... And the Master from the She range³¹ says: "To explain the middle before the provisional, is the middle as [inner] body (t'i-chung 體中). To explain the middle after the provisional, is the middle as function (yung-chung 用中). To explain the provisional before the middle, means to make use of the middle as provisional (chia-chung 假中). To explain the provisional afterwards, is the provisional of the [inner] body (t'i-chia 體假)."

Therefore, what is neither that which has, nor that which lacks, and yet has and lacks is the middle as [inner] body (t'i-chung 體中). What provisionally "has" is not called "that which has"; what provisionally "lacks" is not termed "that which lacks". Therefore, what neither is that which has nor that which lacks is the middle of the function (t'i-yung 體用).

That what neither has nor lacks yet has and yet lacks is the provisional of the [inner] body (t'i-chia 體假). That what provisionally "has" cannot be termed "that which has", and that what provisionally lacks cannot be termed "that which lacks" is the provisional as function (yung-chia 用假).

Therefore, the use of middle and provisional in both cases depends on the [specific kind of] teaching (chiao 教) exposing [them], and

30 This is not meant to say that Sūngnang's and Chi-tsang's concepts were identical. Thus, the former emphasizes the middle on expense of the provisional, while the latter emphasizes the integration of the middle, the provisional and the empty. And yet, Paul Swanson's roundabout dismissal of Hirai Shun'ei's thesis that Chi-tsang exerted considerable influence on Chih-i (e.g., cf. Swanson 1989, p. 98) clearly is unjustified.

31 My reading of the term She-ling shih 攝嶺師 as referring to Sūngnang, i.e. one particular master, is based on T.1853.45.20a10 and T.1824.42.11b29: *tz'u shih* She-ling Hsing-huang *pen-mo* 此是攝嶺興皇本末 ("This is beginning and end of She-ling and Hsing-huang"). Also cf. T.1824.42.50c25: She-ling *ta-shih yüin*:... ("The great master from the She range says: ...").

the [very] absence of “provisional” and “middle” consequently is the [underlying] structure (li 理) taught (T.1853.45.28c25-29a3).

Even though the final step, the eventual negation of both “middle” and “provisional”, appears to have been taken only by Fa-lang and Chi-tsang, the peculiar use of repeatedly permuted binomials obviously derives from Sūngnang.—This observation is of considerable importance, as the use of dialectical formulae and continuous shifts of the perspective were to become an important feature of Fa-lang’s and Chi-tsang’s exegesis.

V. Practice as a Dividing Issue

Hirai Shun’ei and Aaron Koseki have drawn our attention to a conflict between meditators and lecturers among the followers of Seng-ch’üan (僧詮) (n.d.), Sūngnang’s successor. Seng-ch’üan was, the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* leaves no doubt on this, rather a meditator than a lecturer. Thus, when accepting Fa-lang as a disciple, he would explain that everything depends solely on the middle contemplation (chung-kuan 中觀), and then disappear into the forest in order to meditate (T.2060.50.477c5-7). And when his disciples had broken their commitment to silence, he reportedly said:

[As to] the fine subtleties of this Dharma: Those who recognize [these] can practice [them].—There is nothing [which should] induce to leave the room and then (or: always) disclose [them]. Therefore, the sūtra says: ‘[Among] those who reckon [with the result of] the view of an “ego”, there is no one who would expound this sūtra. Those who deeply enjoy the Dharma do not make much expositions [about it].’ (T.2060.50.477c9-11).

As might be expected, at least two of Seng-ch’üan’s four major disciples became ardent meditators. Chi-tsang’s teacher Fa-lang, however, even though having received training in meditation techniques during his early career, most obviously did not share his predecessor’s inclinations: Quite symbolically, perhaps even somewhat ironically, he was styled Ssu-chü (四句) (“Tetralemma”) (T.2060.50.480c16f).³²

In fact, Fa-lang and his successor Chi-tsang were responsible for a fundamental shift towards an approach in which textual exegesis on the basis of dialectical formulae became the prevalent mode of practice.—The emphasis put on these dialectical formulae can be illustrated by a remark in Chih-k'ai's (智凱) (fl. 6.Jh.) biography in the *Kao-seng chuan*: During Chi-tsang's stay in K'uai-chi (會稽) (591-599), most students were troubled by the difficulty of grasping the process of “driving away the obstructions through double phrases of the First paragraph and the Middle and the provisional”(Ch'u-chang chung-chia fu-tz'u ch'ien chih 初章中假複詞遣滯), while Chih-k'ai reached exceptional mastery (*Hsü kao-seng chuan* 續高僧傳, T.2060.50.705a25ff).³³

In the course of this change, the hsiang-chi (相卽) formula was applied also to the relation of middle and provisional, and Sūngnang's interpretation of the two scrutinies as outward function were developed into the well-known san-ch'ung erh ti (三重二諦) or ssu-ch'ung erh ti (四重二諦) (“two scrutinies in three, or four layers”) formulae.³⁴ The underlying desire to abolish any remaining dichotomy did not only induce Fa-lang and Chi-tsang to criticise Fa-lang's co-disciple Chih-pien (智辯) (n.d.) and others for the hypostatization of a middle beyond the provisional, and to denounce them as Chung-chia shih (中假師) (“Masters of the middle and provisional”). In parallel, it lead to a radical criticism of conventional approaches towards practice. Thus, in Chi-tsang's *Ching-ming hsüan lun* (淨名玄論) the following is reported:

32 A treatment of these and other pertaining passages can be found also in Koseki 1981, pp. 449-66.

33 quoted (in another context) in Hirai 1976, pp. 296f. For details on this shift and its textual background, cf. Plassen 2002.

34 The basic pattern of the formula is the following: The result of an investigation from the vulgar, or conventional, perspective is opposed with its negation, which is labeled as “true” and represents higher insight. On the next stage, the conjunction of both theses is again opposed by its negation. After that, the conjunction of the theses of the previous level again serves as the starting-point. The aim of this process is a stepwise eradication of all dichotomies, including also the separation of “middle” and “provisional”, and ultimately even *nirvāṇa* and *saṃsāra*. The *Erh-ti i* clearly identifies Fa-lang as the inventor of this formula. (Cf. T.1854.45.90c1-2). In spite of Sūngnang's exchange with the Hsüan-hsüeh specialist Chou Yung and his sojourn in K'uai-chi, a region where Ch'ung-hsüan 重玄 scholars Chih Tun 支盾 (fl. 314-366) and Sun Ch'ō 孫綽 (301-380) had been active, there is no evidence that Sūngnang were influenced by this strand of thought, or even might be considered the progenitor of these later developments.

... Furthermore, our master, the monk Hsing-huang (i.e., Fa-lang), whenever he ascended the high seat, always made these words: [If] the people who practice the Way want to abandon what is not the Way and strive for the right Way, then they are tied up by the “Way”. Those [practicing] seated dhyāna, bringing confusion to a rest and striving for stillness, are tied up by dhyāna. The crowd at the dharma-gate (i.e., the beginners in the own coterie), meaning that there is wisdom (chih-hui 智慧, i.e. *prajñā*), is tied up by wisdom (hui 慧). Again, he says: [If] one practices the contemplation without arising (wu-sheng kuan 無生), desiring to shatter and wash [away] de mind of having something to obtain (yu so te hsin 有所得心), then one is tied up by [the goal of being] without arising (wu-sheng 無生) ... (T.1780.38.874b15-19).

Answering the question what liberation (chieh 解) would mean in the light of the above out-look on being tied-up, Chi-tsang quotes a passage from a *sūtra*: If the foolish consider clarity and unclarity (i.e., ming 明 and wu-ming 無明) to be two, then this is called being tied up.—What kind of salvation should there be? The opponent insisting on an answer, Chi-tsang finally states:

... [If] one brings to an end [the state that] there is something to strive for, then one brings to an end [the state that] there is something to be tied up with.—What kind of salvation [then should the]?—This single instruction suffices to make known the dark (i.e., profound) awakening. ... (T.1780.38.847b27-28).³⁵

In the light of Chi-tsang’s apparent unease concerning Sūngnang’s statements on the middle and the provisional, one might raise the somewhat provocative question whether, if Sūngnang—after all, the teacher of Fa-lang’s teacher Seng-ch’üan, and at the same time a convenient link to the Kuan-chung tradition—had not been indispensable for the construction of a San-lun lineage, he would not also have been subject to criticism as the first Chung-chia shih (中假師).

³⁵ However, as we already have seen, in most students’ cases this is only the theory: Thus, the passage continues: “In case someone does not yet understand, I now in outline explain the gate towards the teaching.”

Furthermore, aking another phrase ascribed to Sūngnang, yüan chin yü kuan kuan chin yü yüan (緣盡觀 觀盡緣) (“the conditions are exhausted in contemplation, and contemplation is exhausted in the conditions”), as evidence, already Kim Ingsök assumed that Sūngnang was not only inclined towards logics, but that to a certain degree his practice was one of “practicing the way and [performing] seated meditation” (haeng to, chwasön 行道坐禪) (Kim, 1975:66f).—This wording seems to allude to some of the sources quoted above. Thus, Chün-cheng’s mention of Sūngnang’s sojourn at Chih-kuan ssu (止觀寺), where he reportedly practiced the Way (hsing tao 行道), or, as Chikō later would state, practiced “seated meditation” (tsuo-ch’an 坐禪), suggests that meditation practice on Mt. She did not begin with Seng-ch’üan, but already with Sūngnang. Thus, Sūngnang actually would fall into yet another, albeit related and partially overlapping, group of *San-lun* adherents severely criticised by Fa-lang and Chi-tsang.

VI. Conclusions

To our best knowledge, Sūngnang’s encounter with Chou Yung should be considered factual. Probably it thus indeed was Sūngnang, who triggered the revival of Kuan-chung thought in the South.

Although only few concepts can be convincingly traced back to Sūngnang himself, by the explicit interpretation of the two scrutinies as *fang-pien* merely pointing at the Middle Way and the introduction of certain dialectical formulae, he obviously laid important groundwork for later developments. On the other hand, the actual “revolution” in Chinese *San-lun*, resulting in a radical change in the concept of practice, apparently was still to occur.

While Fa-lang and Chi-tsang had little freedom in choosing the predecessors for the time-honoured lineage of teachers and disciples they needed to construct³⁶ and thus could not possibly bypass

36 An attempt at developing such a lineage, based both on doctrinal similarities and their transmission through personal relationships, can be seen in Chi-tsang’s account of various theories concerning the two scrutinies (*erh-ti* 二諦). Cf. *Chung-kuan lun shu* 中觀論疏,

Sūngnang, the scarce information we have on his doctrines and attitude towards practice in fact seems to indicate that Sūngnang's positions rather would have resembled those of San-lun fractions heavily criticised by them. Thus, it might even be justified to view the above mentioned Chih-pien and other practicers of meditation, notably the outstanding Ta-ming fa-shih (大明法師),³⁷ as the true heirs or main branches of the Mt. She tradition.

Eventually, Sūngnang might have exerted more influence on T'ien-t'ai and Ch'an circles than on the so-called "doctrinal" San-lun.— Hopefully, future research will shed more light on these still rather neglected relations.

Glossary of Chinese Terms

Anchō 安澄

Ch'an 禪

Ch'ang-an 長安

Ch'ang-sha Wang 長沙王

Ch'en 陳

Ch'i 齊

ch'i 紀

Ch'i-hsia ssu pei-wen 棲霞寺碑文

Ch'i-hsia ssu 棲霞寺

ch'u 處

Ch'u-chang chung-chia fu-tz'u ch'ien chih 初章中假複詞遣滯

T.1824.42.29a4-c10., discussed in Hurvitz 1975. The underlying quest for acknowledgement as a time-honoured movement cannot be better illustrated than by a passage in Chi-tsang's *Lun-chi* 論述, where he states that Fa-lang occasionally began his lectures on the *Chung-lun* 中論 by reading the old prefaces written in Kuan-ho 關河 (i.e., the Ch'ang-an area), in order to demonstrate that *San-lun* studies indeed preceeded those on the *Ch'eng-shih lun* 成實論. Cf. T.1853.45.68a21-24.

37 Although depicted by Tao-hsüan 道宣 (596-667) as the most perceptive among Fa-lang's disciples during the latter's stay on Mt. She and thus the legitimate intellectual heir of the Shan-men 山門 tradition (n.b., not the Hsing-huang 皇興 tradition as a whole, as Hirai's quote would suggest, cf. Hirai 1976, p. 276), Ta-ming left Fa-lang at an early stage and retreated with his followers to Mt. Mao 茅山. There, he established a thriving community, which came to bear lasting influence on the Niu-t'ou 牛頭 fraction of Ch'an. Cf. Hirai 1976, pp.324ff. and Koseki 1981, p. 452.

- Ch'ung-hsüan 重玄
Chan-jan 湛然
chen-ti 真諦
chi fa wu-hsü tu ch'uang fang-wai 機發無緒 獨創方外
chi 記
Chi-long-shan 雞籠山
Chi-tsang 吉藏
chia-chung 假中
chia-ming k'ung 假名空
chia-ming 假名
Chiang 江
chiao 教
chiao-men 教門
chieh 解
Chien-k'ang 建康
Chien-wu 建武
Chien-yüan 健元
Chih Tun 支盾
chih 智
Chih-chi 智寂
chih-hui 智慧
Chih-i 智顛
Chih-k'ai 智凱
Chih-kuan ssu 止觀寺
Chih-lin 智琳
Chih-pien 智辯
Chih-tsang 智藏
Chikō 智光
Chin-ling 金陵
Ching-ling Wang 竟陵王
Ching-ling Wang 敬陵王
Ching-ming hsüan lun 淨名玄論
Chosŏn Pulgyo T'ongsa 朝鮮佛教通史
Chou Hung-cheng 周弘正

- Chou Yung 周顥
 Ch'u san-tsang chi-chi 出三藏記集
 chung yin-yüan sheng fa 衆因緣生法
 Chung-chia shih 中假師
 Chung-kuan lun shu 中觀論疏
 chung-kuan 中觀
 Chung-lun 中論
 Chung-shan 鍾山
 chung-tao I 中道義
 chung-tao 中道
 Ch'eng-shih lun 成實論
 Ch'i-hsia ssu pei-wen 棲霞寺碑文
 Ch'oe Namsön 崔南善
 chüan/kwön 卷
 Chün Cheng 均正
 Chöng Inbo 鄭寅普
 Chūron jutsu ki 中論述記
 Chūron shoki 中論疏記
 Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho 大日本佛教全書
 Eichō 永超
 erh yu erh wu 而有而無
 erh-ti i chung-tao wei t'i 二諦以中道爲體
 Erh-ti I 二諦義
 erh-ti 二諦
 Fa-hua hsüan-i shih-ch'ien 法華玄義釋籤
 Fa-lang 法朗
 Fa-lun mu-lu 法輪目錄
 fa-shih 法師
 Fa-tu 法度
 fang-pien 方便
 fei wu 非無
 fei yu 非有
 hsiang-chi 相卽
 Hsiao Tzu-liang 蕭子良

hsing tao 行道
 Hsing-huang ssu 皇興寺
 Hsing-huang ta-shih 興皇大師
 Hsü kao-seng chuan 續高僧傳
 hsüan 玄
 Hsüan-ch'ang 玄暢
 Hua-yen 華嚴
 Huang-lung 黃龍
 Hui Cheng 慧正
 Hui pu 慧布
 hui 慧
 Hui-chün 慧均
 Hui-ssu 慧思
 hu 胡
 I 義
 I 已
 i-tsung 義宗
 i-wang kai yü t'i-yung 一往開於體體用
 Jen-wang ching 仁王經
 Jōmyō gen ron ryaku jutsu 淨名玄論略述
 K'ai-shan 開善
 K'uai-chi 會稽
 k'ung chia-ming 空假名
 k'ung 空
 Kanji 寬治
 Kao-li/Koryō 高麗
 Kao-seng chuan 高僧傳
 Kau-li Lang Ta-shih 高麗朗大師
 Kuan-chung 關中
 Kuan-ho 關河
 Kuan-ting 灌頂
 Kuang hung-ming chi 廣弘明記
 Kyōhō 享保
 li 理

Liang Wu-ti 梁武帝
 Liao-tung 遼東
 liu ch'i shih sui 六七十歲
 Lu Ch'eng 陸澄
 Lun-chi 論迹
 Mao-shan 茅山
 ming 明
 Nan Ch'i shu 南齊書
 Nieh-p'an ching 涅槃經
 Niu-t'ou 牛頭
 P'u-sa ying-lo pen-yeh ching 菩薩嬰珞本經
 Pa-su 八宿
 Pai-lun 百論
 Pu chen k'ung lun 不真空論
 pu-k'ung chia-ming 不空假名
 Sakaino Kōyō 境野黃洋
 san-ch'ung erh ti 三重二諦
 San-lun hsüan-i 三論玄義
 San-lun 三論
 san-ti 三諦
 San-tsung lun 三宗論
 Sanron soshi den shū 三論祖師傳集
 seng 僧
 Seng-ch'üan 僧詮
 Seng-chao 僧肇
 Seng-cheng 僧正
 Seng-cheng 慧均僧正
 Seng-yu 僧瑜
 Shan-chung 山中
 Shan-men 山門
 Shan-yin 山陰
 She-ling shih 攝嶺師
 She-shan Ta-shih 攝山大師
 She-shan 攝山

Shih Tao-lang fa-shih 釋道朗法師
shih 師
Shih-erh men lun 十二門論
shu 疏
shu 豎
ssu-ch'ung erh ti 四重二諦
Ssu-chü 四句
Ssu-lun hsüan-i 四論玄義
Ssu-lun 四論
Ssu-tsung lun 四宗論
su-ti 俗諦
Sun Ch'o 孫綽
Sung Ming-ti 宋明帝
Süng Tonang 僧道朗
Süngnang 僧朗
T'an-ch'ing 曇慶
T'an-chi 曇濟
T'an-hai chi 淡海記
T'ang Yung-t'ung 湯用彤
ti 體
t'i-chia 體假
t'i-chung 體中
t'i-yung 體用
T'ien-t'ai 天台
t'zu-shih She-ling Hsing-huang pen-mo 攝嶺興皇本末
Ta Lang fa-shih 大朗法師
ta-i 大意
Ta-ming fa-shih 大明法師
Ta-sheng hsüan lun 大乘玄論
Ta-sheng ssu-lun hsüan-i chi 大乘四論玄義記
ta-shih 大師
Ta-te 大德
tao 道
Tao-hsüan 道宣

Tao-lang/Tonang 道朗

Tao-sheng 道生

ti 諦

Tongbang Pulgyo 東方佛教

Ts'ao-tang ssu 艸堂寺

tsuo ch'an 坐禪

Tun-huang 敦煌

Tōiki dentō mokuroku 域傳燈目錄

wei jen 爲人

wu i wu i te 無依無得

wu i wu i te 無依無依得

wu 無

wu-ming 無明

Wu-shan ssu 五山寺

wu-sheng kuan 無生觀

wu-sheng 無生

Yang-chou 楊洲

Yi Nŭnghwa 李能和

yin 陰

yu so te hsin 有所得心

yu 有

yung 用

yung-chia 用假

yung-chung 用中

yüan chin yü kuan kuan chin yü yüan 緣盡觀 觀盡緣

References

- Ch'oe, Namsŏn
崔南善
1974
“Chosŏn Pulgyo. Tongbang munhwasa innŭn kŭ
chiwi 朝鮮佛教. 東方文化史 있는 그 地位” .
In: Yuktang Ch'oe Namsŏn chŏnjip
p'yŏnch'an wiwŏnhoe 六堂崔南善全集編輯委員
會 (eds.): Yuktang Ch'oe Namsŏn chŏnjip 六堂
崔南善全集, vol. 2, Seoul: Hyonam, pp.
546-572. [orig. in Pulgyo 불교, Vol. 74
(1930.8), pp. 1-51].
- Chŏng, Inbo
鄭寅普
1947
Chosŏn sa yŏn'gu 朝鮮史 研究. Seoul: Sŏul
Sinmunsa.
- Gard, Richard A.
1959
“The Mādhyamika in Korea”. Indogakku
Bukkyōgaku kenkyū 印度學佛教學研究, vol.
7.2, no.14, pp. 60-78.
- Hirai Shun'ei
平井僑榮
1976
Chūgoku Hannya shisōshi kenkyū
中國般若思想史研究 . Tōkyō: Shunjusha.
- Hurvitz, Leon
1975
“The First Systematizations Of Buddhist Thought
in China”. Journal of Chinese Philosophy, vol.
2, pp. 361-388.
- Itō Takatoshi
伊藤隆壽
1978
“Sanronshō gakueishi ni kansuru dentō-setsu no
seiritsu. Toku ni Chūgoku Sanron gakuha ni
tsuite Sanronshō gakuishi ni kansuru
dentō-setsu no seiritsu 三論宗學系史に關する傳
統說の成立”. Komazawa Daigaku
Bukkyōgaku-bu Kenkyū Kiyō 駒澤大學佛教學
部研究紀要, vol. 36, pp.192-217.
- Kim, Ingsŏk
金仍石
1975
“Koguryŏ Sŭngnang-gwa Samnonhak 高句麗 僧
朗斗 三論學”. In: Sungsan Pak Kilchin paksa
hwagap kinyŏm saŏphoe 崇山朴吉眞博士華甲
紀念事業會 (eds.): Han'guk Pulgyo sasangsa.
Sungsan Pak Kilchin paksa hwagap kinyŏm
韓國佛教思想史. 崇山朴吉眞博士華甲紀念, Iri:
Wŏn Pulgyo sasang yŏn'guwŏn, pp. 43-67.
- Kim, Indŏk
金仁德
1989
“Sŭngnang Taesa sasang, haksŏl-ŭi kwangye
charyo 僧朗大師의 思想・學說의 關係資料”. In:
Pulgyo Sahakhoe 佛敎史學會 (eds.): Kodae
Han'guk Pulgyo kyohak yŏngu 古代韓國佛敎
敎學研究, Seoul: Minjoksa, pp. 183-227.

- Kim, Yŏngt'ae
金煥泰
1994
"Koguryŏ Sŭngnang-e taehan chaegoch'al 高句麗僧朗에 대한 재고찰". Han'guk Pulgyohak 韓國佛敎學, vol. 20., pp. 23-46.
- Ko, Ikch'in
高翊晉
1989
Samguk sidae Taesŭng kyohag-e taehan yŏn'gu 三國時代大乘敎學에 대한 研究". In: Pulgyo Sahakhoe 佛敎史學會 (eds.): *Kodae Han'guk Pulgyo kyohak yŏn'gu* 古代韓國佛敎敎學研究, Seoul: Minjoksa, pp.15-98.
- Koseki, Aaron
1981
"The concept of practice in San-lun thought: Chi-tsang and the concurrent insight of the two truths". *Philosophy East and West*, vol. 31, pp. 449-66.
- Krause, Carsten
2001
Das Ch'eng-shih lun - Aufnahme und Wirkung eines buddhistischen Textes im mittelalterlichen China von Kumārajīva (344-414) bis Chi-tsang (549-623). Unpubl. PhD thesis, University of Hamburg, 146-150.
- Ono Genmyo
小野玄妙 (ed.)
Bussho kaisetsu daijiten 佛書解説大辭典. 14 vols. Tōkyō: Daitō Shuppansha, 1933-36, 1974, 1988.
- Swanson, Paul
1989
Foundations of T'ien-t'ai philosophy: The two truths theory in Chinese Buddhism. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press.
- Plassen, Joerg
2002
Die Spuren der Abhandlung (Lun-chi): Exegese und Übung im San-lun des 6. Jahrhunderts. Hamburg.- [Hamburg Univ., Diss., 2000].
2003
"Rudolf G. Wagner: Language, Ontology, and Political Philosophy in China: Wang Bi's Scholarly Exploration of the Dark (Xuanxue). Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003". *BJOAF*, vol. 27 (2003), pp. 286-95.
- Robinson, Richard H.
1978
Early Mādhyamika in India and China. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, p. 171. [Reprint of First Edition: Wisconsin, 1967].
- Shim, Jae-ryong
1989
"On the General Characteristics of Korean Buddhism - Is Korean Buddhism Syncretic?". *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies*, vol. 2. pp. 147-157.