高麗－朝鮮における佛教－儒教間の対立の眼目

(鄭道傳(ジョンドウジョン 1342-1398)による『佛氏雜辨』と、己和(キファ)（涵虚得通(ハムホドゥックトン; 1376-1433)『顯正論』の立場に關する比較)

English Title: The Goryeo-Joseon Confucian-Buddhist Confrontation: Focusing on the Works of Jeong Dojeon (Sambong) and Hamheo Deuktong (Gihwa)

A. プロジェクトの背景と見方の特徴 (哲学的、文化比較、宗教と宗教の間の討論) (朴性焙)

1. 歴史的背景: 東アジアでの仏教の拡大の期間の儒教と老莊思想

a. 優位な哲学的/宗教的の流れとしての仏教の発展 （カルマ、因果関係、輪廻、悟り、解脱など）

b. 中国での仏教に対して儒教者の批判の起源: 韓愈 (768–824), 張載 (1020–1077), 周敦頤 (1017–1073), 程顥 テイコウ (1032–1085), 程頤 テイイ (1033–1107), 朱熹 (1130–1200)

c. 宋学教義の基礎: 論語、孟子、中庸、大學、易經、陰陽、五行等;

対華嚴、禪

2. 韓国の「宋学」と鄭道傳：宋の影響と高麗の特殊状況; 李成桂 (イ・ソンゲ 1335–1408), 成均館 (ソンギュングァン)

3. 仏教者の少反応 (宗密 780-842は例外)

4. 己和

5. 主な論文: 「佛氏雜辨」と「顯正論」

a. 佛氏雜辨

1. 佛氏輪迴之辨 (立証不可能な印度的概念)

2. 佛氏因果之辨 (東アジアの人々は五行, 陰陽等に頼る、例えば、漢方など)

3. 佛氏心性之辨 (仏教経典の中では「心」と「性」の定義は様々、不統一)

4. 佛氏作用是性之辨 （理氣[体用]を理解していない）

5. 佛氏心跡之辨（心跡[体用]を理解していない）

6. 佛氏昧於道器之辨（道器[体用]が一貫していない）

7. 佛氏毀棄人倫之辨

8. 佛氏慈悲之辨

9. 佛氏眞假之辨（体用が一貫していない）

10. 佛氏地獄之辨

11. 佛氏禍福之辨

12. 佛氏乞食之辨

13. 佛氏禪教之辨

14. 儒釋同異之辨 (Main philosophical summary)

15. 佛法入中國

16. 事佛得禍

17. 舍天道而談佛果

18. 佛甚謹年代尤促

19. 闢異端之辨

b. 顯正論（己和）

1. 序言

2. 教えのレベル的区別(従って、一見矛盾している樣に見えるが、本質はそうではない)

3. 常と権 （儒教者は体用を理解していない）

4. 釋迦牟尼の愛着からの解脱

5. 社会の義務（儒教者は体用を理解していない）

6. 生物に害を及ぼす

7. 「仁」の意味（仏教では体用が一貫している：儒教では教えと実践の矛盾がある）

8. アルコールを飲むこと (他の犯罪の原因となる)

9. 仏教の布施の批判への論破

10. カルマと輪廻の論理的擁護 (「証明」がある)

11. 仏教的の火葬の習慣の擁護

12. 外国宗教としての仏教に対する批判への論破（嘲笑的）

13. 災難の前触れとしての仏教の批判への論破（逆の例を示す）

14. 寄生体としての僧の批判への論破（仏教では体用が一貫している）

15. 仏教教団の退廃の批判への論破（体用が一貫していない）

16. 虚無主義(nihilism)と無律法主義(antinomianism)の批判への論破 （仏教では体用が一貫している）

17. 三教一致（三教合一）(体用の立場から統一している)

6. その後。。。

参考資料

「体用」の類同語: [儒教(+宋学)] 本末、仁禮、性情、終始、厚薄、理氣、 等 [道教] 道德、白黑、樸器、等 [仏教] 性相、性情、理事 等

① 佛氏佛氏雜辨(鄭道傳) 第3章

彼佛氏以心爲性、求其說而不得。乃曰迷之則心、悟之則性。又曰心性之異名、猶眼目之殊稱。。。。[省略] 然皆得於想象髣髴之中、而無豁然眞實之見。其說多爲遊辭而無一定之論、其情可得矣。吾儒之說曰、盡心知性。 此本心以竆理也。。。。[省略] 佛氏之說曰、觀心見性、心卽性也。是別以一心見此一心。心安有二乎哉。彼亦自知其說之竆。從而遁之曰、以心觀心如以口齕口。當以不觀觀之、此何等語歟。

The Buddhists take the mind to be the nature. But if you examine their theory thoroughly, it doesn't add up. They furthermore say that delusion is none other than the mind, and that awakening is none other than the nature. They also say that "mind" and "nature" are synonymous, just like the words *yan* 眼 and *mu* 目….Yet this is all done based on nebulous supposition, rather than on explicit facts. The teachings of the Buddhists have lots of word play and lack a set argument, and so their actual intentions can be understood. Our Confucian teachers say, "exhaust your mind to understand the nature." Here the original mind is used to fathom a profound principle.

The Buddha's teaching says, "observe the mind and see the nature," and "mind is none other than the nature." This means that you use a separate one mind to observe this one mind. But how can a person have two minds? From this we can also readily know the impoverishment of their theories. We can sum it up by saying that using one's mind to observe the mind is like using the mouth to eat the mouth. What kind of nonsense is this to say that we will use the unobserving to observe?!

② 且吾儒曰、方寸之間 虛靈不昧、具衆理應萬事。其曰虛靈不昧者、心也。具衆理者、性也。應萬事者、情也。惟其此心、具衆理。故於事物之來、應之無不各得其當。所以處事物之當否、而事物皆聽命於我也。此吾儒之學。內自身心、外而至事物、自源徂流、一以通貫、如源頭之水流於萬派、無非水也。如持有星之衡、稱量天下之物。其物之輕重與權衡之銖兩相稱。此所謂元不曾間斷者也。

Moreover, when our Confucian teachers say, "within the space of a square inch, [every single thing has its definite principle]" and "the rarefied spirit is undarkened, [including within it a multitude of principles, responding to myriad circumstances.]" The rarefied spirit that is undarkened is the mind. That which contains a multitude of principles, is the nature. Those things which respond to a myriad circumstances are the sentiments. Now, since this mind is endowed with a multitude of principles, when all affairs and things impinge upon the mind, there is none that is not responded to appropriately. Therefore affairs and things are treated according to their correctness and incorrectness, and affairs and things follow the lead of the self. This is the learning of our Confucian masters. From inside the body and mind, extending out to [all] affairs and things—from the source, flowing out to the branch streams—all are penetrated by one, like the water that comes down from the fountainhead to flow out to a myriad branch streams—there is no place where it is not water. It is like holding the handle of the Big Dipper, which assesses the worth of all things under heaven. The relative worth of those things is just like the weighing of *zhu* and *liang* on a scale. This is what is meant by saying that there has never been a moment of interruption.

③ 佛氏佛氏雜辨(鄭道傳) 第6章

亦如此所謂體用一源、顯微無間者也。彼之學取其心、不取其跡。乃曰、文殊大聖遊諸酒肆、跡雖非而心則是也。侘如此類者、甚多。非心跡之判歟。程子曰、佛氏之學於敬以直内則有之矣。義以方外則未之有也。故滯固者、入於枯槁。

It is like the saying "essence and function spring from the same source; the manifest and the subtle have no gap between them." The Buddhist method of study addresses the mind, but does not address its manifestations. This can be seen in the Buddhist’s saying things like "The bodhisattva Mañjuśrī wanders through the taverns, but these activities are not his mind." Excuses like this for sloppy behavior abound [in the Buddhist teachings]. Is this not a separation of the mind from its activities? Chengzi said: "The study of the Buddhists includes reverence to correct the internal, but does not include justice to straighten the external." Therefore those who are stuck in these [incorrect views] wither away. (SBJ 1.79c–d)

④顯正論(己和) 第 6章

詩云、一發五豝。論語云、釣而不綱、弋不射宿。孟子云、君子遠庖廚也。聞其聲、不忍食其肉。又云數罟不入汚池、魚鼈不可勝食。此皆爲仁而未盡其道也。何不契於一己之言乎。中庸云、言顧行行顧言、君子胡不慥慥爾。今何至此乎。此儒者之所以善論爲仁之道而未盡善也。旣要殺少、何必發矢。旣憐其宿、何射不宿。旣遠庖廚、何必食肉。小旣傷殘、何須害大。

佛於大戒以不殺居先。又慈心因緣不食肉經云、如佛所說、食肉者、此人行慈不滿足。常受短命多病身、迷没生死不成佛。又、教中所以教持漉囊者、恐傷微命也。昔有二比丘、同欲見佛、行於曠野。渴遇蟲水。一人云但得見佛、飮之何罪。卽飮。一人云、佛戒殺生。若破佛戒、見佛何益。忍渴不飮。死生天上、先見於佛得佛讚嘆。此乃仁人之眞語實行、而冥相契於一己之言、慥慥之訓也。

The *Book of Odes* says: "One arrow for five boars." The *Analects* say: "When fishing, the Master would not use a net; when hunting, he would not shoot at a perched bird." (*Analects* 7:27) The *Mencius* says: "The Superior Man keeps his distance from the kitchen, for if he hears the screams of slaughtered beasts, he cannot stand to eat their meat." (*Mencius* 1A:7) It also says: "If fine-mesh nets are not used for fishing, there will always be fish and turtles for eating in abundance." (*Mencius* 1A:3) These are all examples of an incomplete practice of humaneness. Why don’t they live up to the assertion of forming a single body with the myriad things? The *Doctrine of the Mean* says: "His words reflecting his actions, his actions reflecting his words—how can this Superior Man not be sincere through and through?" Now where have we seen this actualized? This is a clear example of the Confucians’ skillfully expounding the Way of humaneness, but not being exhaustively good. If you think that it is necessary to minimize killing, then why is it necessary to even shoot the arrow at all? If you take pity on birds that are perched, why shoot at them when they are not perched? If you are already going to keep your distance from the kitchen, why is it necessary to eat meat at all? If the small are already being subjected to injury, why is it necessary to inflict harm upon the large?

In his Mahāyāna vinaya, the Buddha placed the precept of not taking life first. Also, the *Yiqiezhi guangming xianren cixin yinyuan bushirou jing* (Sutra on the Omniscient Luminous Sages Who Possess the Causes and Conditions of Compassion in Not Eating Meat) says: "As the Buddha has taught, the eating of meat reflects a deficiency in one’s practice of compassion. One will inevitably shorten one’s life and experience numerous sicknesses, becoming lost and submerged in birth-and-death and unable to become a Buddha" Furthermore, Buddhism’s recommendation of the usage of water filters is based on a concern for taking the life of minute creatures. Once upon a time there were two monks who, intent on seeing the Buddha, traveled through a desert. Being thirsty, they happened upon some water that had bugs in it. One monk said, "We are just going to see the Buddha. What harm can there be in drinking?" and so saying, went ahead and drank. The other monk said, "The Buddha has prohibited the taking of life. If we break the Buddha’s prohibitions, even if we see him, what benefit can there be?" He restrained himself and did not drink. After dying he was reborn in the heavenly realm, where he was able to directly see the Buddha and receive his praise. We can call this the genuine words and true actions of the humane man, which accords precisely with the claim of "forming a single body" and "being sincere through and through."

⑤顯正論(己和) 第 17 章

所言之理旣同、而所教之迹、何以異乎。專己略人、是此非彼、人之常情也。通人達士唯義是從。豈以人我彼此而是非者乎。使人不待爵賞之勸而靡然從化者、三教之中、佛教能然也。蓋以吾佛大聖大慈之所感也。舜好問而好察邇言、隱惡而揚善。禹拜昌言。若使舜禹遇佛之化、則豈不歸美乎。而以爲不可爲修己治人之方者、亦未之思也。曰老與儒釋、同異優劣如何。

曰、老之言曰、無爲而無不爲。當有爲而無爲。釋之言曰、寂而常照、照而常寂。孔之言曰、夫易無思也無爲也。寂然不動、感而遂通。夫寂然者、未嘗無感、卽寂而常照也。感通者、未嘗不寂、卽照而常寂也。無爲而無不爲、卽寂而常感也。有爲而無所爲。卽感而常寂也。據此則三家所言、冥相符契、而如出一口也。若履踐之高低、發用之同異、則洗盡心垢、廓淸慧目、然後看盡大藏儒道諸書。參於日用之間、生死禍福之際、則不待言而自點頭矣。吾何強辨以駭君聽。

If the underlying principle of the words is the same, then why should the outward appearances of the teachings differ? Holding stubbornly to one’s own opinion while ignoring the positions of others, arbitrarily affirming this and rejecting that—this is the attitude ordinarily seen in people. The man of broad learning and the penetrating scholar only follow what is right. How could they make determinations of right and wrong based the positions of self and other or this and that? When it comes to the task of motivating people to surrender themselves [to the right Way] without reliance on reward and praise, then among the three teachings, it is Buddhism that works best. It does so because people are affected by the great holiness and great compassion of our teacher, the Buddha. "[The Emperor] Shun liked to question people and delighted in listening to everyday speech. He would cover people’s bad points and disclose their goodness." "Yu paid homage to the excellent words." If we could have Shun and Yu encounter the Buddha’s transformative teaching, would they not praise it? To say that the Buddhist teaching does not work for the cultivation of oneself and the transformation of others is truly ridiculous!

　　　You ask: What are the points of sameness and difference and the relative strengths and weaknesses of Daoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism? The answer is this. Laozi said: "No doing and no not-doing; with something to do yet not-doing." The Buddha said: "Quiescent yet eternally luminous; luminous yet eternally quiescent." Confucius said: "The Changes have neither thought nor activity, still and unmoving they respond and penetrate the world." Now this "stillness," which has never failed to "respond," is the same thing as the "quiescence" which is "eternally luminous." The "responding and penetrating," which has never not been "still," is exactly the same as the "luminosity that is eternally quiescent." "No doing and no not-doing" is none other than "still, yet eternally responding." "Eternally doing yet with nothing to be done" is none other than "responding, yet eternally still." If you can grasp this, then the words of the three teachers fit together like the pieces of the same tally—as if they had all come out of the same mouth! If you would like actually to demonstrate the high and low among these teachings, exposing their sameness and difference in function, then you must first completely wash the pollution from your mind and completely clarify your eye of wisdom. Then you can study all of the texts contained in the Buddhist, Confucian, and Daoist canons. Compare them in your daily activities, at the times of birth and death, fortune and misfortune. Without needing words, you will spontaneously nod in assent. How strong do I need to make my argument to get you to listen?