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Summary

Truth is one of the central subjects not only in philosophy but also in religions. In this paper, I would like to examine the theory of twofold truth, one of the representative theories in the Mahāyāna Buddhism, especially focusing on the interpretation of Zenju 善珠 (732-797), an eminent scholar monk of the Japanese Yogācāra (Hossō) school in the Nara period.

Based on Ji 基 (632-682) and Woncheuk 圓測 (613-696), Zenju explains four levels of the twofold truth which classifies the twofold truth (the conventional truth and the ultimate truth) under four levels respectively. He states that both verbal conventions and realities are the foundation of the truths (satya), and those eightfold truth forms a mutually linked system.

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the workshop “Truth and Meaning in Buddhism,” Center for Advanced Studies, Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, Munich, September 12-13, 2016. I would like to thank Dr. Paulus Kaufmann for organizing this fruitful workshop and all the participants for their invaluable feedback. This paper was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. JP15H03155.
The theory of four levels of the twofold truth also plays an important role in hetuvidyā or Buddhist logic. Zenju states that the restriction of the proof of vijñaptimātratā, zhengu 眞故 or “in the ultimate truth,” corresponds to the first three of four levels of the ultimate truth: the conventional ultimate truth, the ultimate truth based on real principles, and the ultimate truth based on realization. In verbal communication or debate with logical expressions, Zenju allows plural truths corresponding to opponents, including those of religions or thoughts other than Buddhism.

I. Introduction

From a relativistic standpoint, there are various truths, although each people or cultural/religious/philosophical tradition claims its own truth according to the situation. Like other philosophical and/or religious traditions, Buddhism has various theories of truth(s). The theory of the twofold truth (Skt. satya-dvaya; Ch. erdi 二諦) is one of the Buddhist approaches to truths,¹ which divides many truths into two categories: the ultimate truth 勝義諦 (paramārtha-satya) and conventional truth 世俗諦 (saṃvṛti-satya).

There have been many discussions on the twofold truth in Buddhist scriptures. Although Nāgārjuna’s Māla-madhayamaka-kārikā (MMK) has been regarded as the representative treatise on the twofold truth, the theory of two truths was not unique to Nāgārjuna but shared by his contemporaries, according to Hayashima (2014).² In

¹) Lushtaus (2010) states that “there are potentially innumerable ‘truths,’ with the set saṃvṛti-paramārtha only being one of them” in the Yogācāra.

²) Hayashima (2014) states that the interpretations of the twofold truth in MMK have been strongly influenced by later commentaries, and he proposes a comparative analysis between Nāgārjuna and his
Mahāyāna Buddhism, it is often said that the ultimate truth cannot be explained verbally. Some Buddhist scholars, however, have claimed that the verbal explanation on the ultimate truth could be regarded as the secondary ultimate truth. For example, Sthiramati, one of the famous Indian Yogācāra scholar monks, regarded both the words explaining the ultimate truth and the objects (meanings) as the ultimate truth in his commentary of MMK entitled Dasheng zhongguan shilun 大乘中觀釋論:

Since the wisdom of the most excellent (*pradhāna parama?) Tathāgatha is the same as the object (*artha) of the teachings, they are called the ultimate (*paramārtha). All others are conventional (*saṃvṛti), since they are not the nature of the truth. This teaching is the most excellent, since [it consists of] the good words and the good objects taught by the Buddha. Therefore [Nāgārjuna] wrote the verse [like this]:

I bow my head to the Buddha, whose [teaching is] the greatest among all teachings. 3)

There seems to be room for consideration on the relationship between language, meaning, and truth in the theories of the twofold truth. In this paper, focusing on this relationship, I would like to investigate some scholastic classifications of the twofold truth, based especially on Ji 基 (632-682), one of the disciples of Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664) who has been regarded as the founder of the Faxiang/Hossō 法相 school (an East Asian transmission of Yogācāra school), and Zenju 善珠 (732-797), one of the eminent scholar monks of the Nara 奈良 and early Heian 平安 period in Japan.

3) 若彼勝上如來之智、如所説義、故名勝義。餘皆世俗、不實性故。此説最上、謂佛所説善文善義。是故頌言「我稽首禮佛、諸説中第一」。 (T1567, 30, 136b29-c3)
II. Four Interpretations of the Twofold Truth in the Faxiang/Hossō school

1. Erdi yi of Dasheng fayuan yilinzhāng

Ji devoted one chapter entitled Erdi yi 二諦義 (the meanings of the twofold truth)⁴ to the scholastic interpretation on the twofold truth in his seven volumes of Dasheng fayuan yilinzhāng 大乘法苑義林章 (DFY). The outline of Erdi yi is as follows:

1 Clarification of the Names and the Explanation of the Nature 顯名辨體
   1-1 Clarification of the Names 顯名
      1-1-1 Enumeration 列名
      1-1-2 Interpretation of the names 釋名
   1-2 Explanation of the nature 辨體

2 Depth and shallowness of the three vehicles 三乘淺深
   2-1 Distinction of the three vehicles 辨三乘
   2-2 Clarification of the depth and shallowness 顯淺深
      2-2-1 Person 人淺深
      2-2-2 Dharma 法淺深

3 Relationships and dialogues 相攝問答
   3-1 Relationships between descriptions of sutras 諸教相攝
   3-2 Dialogues 問答分別

Erdi yi, especially in §3-1, quotes many sutras and treatises⁵ as well as the anonymous references of the works of Huiyuan 慧遠 (523-592), such as his

⁴ Jizang 吉藏 (549–623), a master of the Chinese Sanlun 三論 school, wrote the treatise on the twofold truth with the same name (T1854). Jizang’s philosophical influence on Ji has been pointed out (Suemitsu 1987).

commentary of the *Nirvāṇa sutra* and *Dasheng yizhang* 大乘義章, a massive encyclopedic work of Buddhist terminology, which precedes DFY.

2. Structure of the four-level twofold truths

The basic structure of the twofold truth in the Faxiang/Hossō doctrine is defined in §1-1-1. Ji classifies the twofold truth into four levels respectively, mainly based on *Yogācārabhūmi, Xianyang shengjiao lun* 顯揚聖教論 and the *Nirvāṇa sutra* of the Mahāyāna:

For the enumeration of the synonyms (§1-1-1), now I clarify the difference of the natures in the twofold truth between substantial and insubstantial, the distinction of the meanings [of the twofold truth] between phenomena and principle, the shallowness and depth [of the twofold truth] and the various explanations of the meanings [of the twofold truth]. Therefore, there are the four levels of the twofold truth, which are called the twofold truth of name and phenomena, the twofold truth of phenomena and principle, the shallow and deep twofold truth, and the twofold truth for explanation of the meanings.

The four names of the conventional truth are: C₁) the mundane conventional truth, which is also called the nominal truth, C₂) the conventional truth based on real principles, which is also known as the truth based on the classification of phenomena, C₃) the conventional truth based on realization, which is also called the described truth for convenience sake, and C₄) the ultimate conventional truth, which is also known as the conventionally designated indescribable truth.

(...)

The four names of the ultimate truth are: U₁) the conventional ultimate truth, which is also called the truth of the representation of essence and function, U₂) the ultimate truth based on real principles, which is also known as the truth based on the classification of cause and effect, U₃) the ultimate truth based on realization, which is also called the truth of representing reality based on the
teaching [of emptiness], and $U_4$) the ultimate-ultimate truth, which is also known as the truth of discussing the principle through abolishing language.

The former three are known as the described ultimate [truth] and the fourth one is the indescribable [truth].

These eight truths ($C_1$-$C_4$, $U_1$-$U_4$) are structured as in Table 1 and Table 2, according to Woncheuk 圓測 quoted by Zenju’s Hō’on gikyō 法苑義鏡, a Japanese commentary of DFY.

[Woncheuk of] Ximing 西明 [temple] explained that the mutual distinctions of the twofold truth had four levels.

The first is the twofold truth of the nominal and the real, which regards [words like] “army” or “forest” as the conventional truth [because they are nominal,] and regards [terms like] the [five] aggregates, the [twelve] bases and the

6) 列別名者、今明二諦、有無體異、事理義殊、淺深不同、詮旨各別。故於二諦各有四重，亦名名事二諦・事理二諦・淺深二諦・詮旨二諦。世俗諦四名者、一世間世俗諦、亦名有名無實諦。二道理世俗諦、亦名隨事差別諦。三證得世俗諦、亦名方便安立諦。四勝義世俗諦、亦名假名非安立諦。（…）勝義諦四名者、一世間勝義諦、亦名體用顯現諦。二道理勝義諦、亦名因果差別諦。三證得勝義諦、亦名依門顯實諦。四勝義勝義諦、亦名廢詮談旨諦。前之三種名安立勝義、第四一種非安立勝義。（Erdi yi, T1861, 45, 287b26-c11）

7) Fukaura (1954) interprets the structure of the four-level twofold truth as a hierarchical diagram like the one below (see p. 575):
[eighteen] realms as the ultimate truth [because they are real].

The second is the twofold truth of phenomena and principle, which regards the [five] aggregates etc. as the conventional [truth because they are phenomena,] and regards [the truth of] suffering (duḥkha) [of the four noble truths] as the ultimate truth [because they are principles].

The third is the twofold truth of the four noble truths and the ultimate truth, which regards the four noble truths as the conventional [truth] and regards the verbally established thusness 安立真如 as the ultimate truth.

The fourth is the twofold truth of the verbally established and the unestablished, which regards the verbally established thusness as the conventional [truth,] and regards the unestablished thusness as the ultimate truth.

[Ji’s] meaning is the same as this [Woncheuk’s explanation].

In this context, the term “ultimate,” which is often used for the translation of paramārtha, does not mean ultimateness but superiority, except the ultimate-ultimate truth (U₄). Almost truths are Buddhist doctrinal concepts, such as the four noble truths, while the first one, the mundane conventional truth (C₁), refers to non-Buddhist concepts of truths including ordinary language usage.

---

8) 西明解云、二諦相對有其四重。一假實二諦、謂軍林等為世俗諦、蘊處界等為勝義諦。二事理二諦、謂蘊等名世俗、苦等為勝義。三四諦勝義二諦、謂苦等四諦以爲俗諦、安立眞如爲勝義諦。四安立非安立二諦、謂安立眞如以爲俗諦、非安立眞如爲勝義諦。義亦同此。(T2317, 71, 178c20-26)
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Truth</th>
<th>Ultimate Truth</th>
<th>Twofold truth of substantial and insubstantial/Twofold truth of nominal and real</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₁) Mundane conventional truth e.g. armies, vases etc. (= ordinary language usage).</td>
<td>U₁) Conventional ultimate truth e.g. the five aggregates (skandha), the twelve bases (āyatana), and the eighteen realms (dhātu).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂) Conventional truth based on real principles e.g. the five aggregates, the twelve bases, and the eighteen realms.</td>
<td>U₂) Ultimate truth based on real principles e.g. the four noble truths.</td>
<td>Twofold truth of phenomena and principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₃) Conventional truth based on realization e.g. the four noble truths.</td>
<td>U₃) Ultimate truth based on realization e.g. the verbally established thusness.</td>
<td>Shallowness and depth of the twofold truth/Twofold truth of the four noble truths and the ultimate truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₄) Ultimate conventional truth e.g. the verbally established thusness.</td>
<td>U₄) Ultimate-ultimate truth e.g. the verbally unestablished thusness.</td>
<td>Various explanations of the meanings of the twofold truth/Twofold truth of the verbally established and the unestablished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Truth</th>
<th>Ultimate Truth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₁) Mundane conventional truth</td>
<td>= U₁) Conventional ultimate truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂) Conventional truth based on real principles</td>
<td>= U₃) Ultimate truth based on real principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₃) Conventional truth based on realization</td>
<td>= U₃) Ultimate truth based on realization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₄) Ultimate conventional truth</td>
<td>= U₄) Ultimate-ultimate truth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Tables 1 and 2 are based on a traditional view of the twofold truth: words and the substances establishing the words,⁹ the structures are different. Table 1

---

⁹) Master Vasumitra says “Showing words are conventional. Shown entities (*dharma) are ultimate.” 長者 Master Vasumitra says “Showing words are conventional. Shown entities (*dharma) are ultimate.”
shows the inconsistency or gap between words and the substances, while Table 2 demonstrates the words corresponding to the substances. As seen in Table 2, all truths, except the ultimate-ultimate truth (U₄), can be expressed by language. The middle three (C₂ = U₁, C₃ = U₂ and C₄ = U₃) show that Buddhist doctrines explained in words have both conventional and ultimate sides. From the point of view of the relationship between language and meaning, the mundane conventional truth or the nominal truth (C₁) is considered as the truth established only by language or verbal convention, while U₄ is the truth based only on reality beyond language. The others (C₂ = U₁, C₃ = U₂ and C₄ = U₃) also depend on realities, but they correspond to words. In other words, the truth in C₂ is established by both U₁ and U₂ (C₃ and C₄ are also similar). All truths are mutually related, and those except for U₄ are based on verbal convention and eventually established by U₄. It seems possible to generalize the structure as follows: Verbally established truth system Cₙ has the entity Uₙ that cannot be explained by the language for Cₙ but can be expressed by that for Cₙ₊₁. U₀ for C₁ does not exist. U₄ (or, more generally speaking, U₉) does not have C₅ (or C₉₊₁) which can express itself verbally.

Moreover, the four-level twofold truths are classified under the three vehicles. Tables 3 and 4, based on the description of Erdi yi (T1861, 45, 287b26-c11), show the content of each truth. Although most of the contents are different between vehicles, the truths in each vehicle have the same structure as Table 2 (For example C₂ of Śrāvaka corresponds to U₁ of Śrāvaka). Many truths can coexist relating to each other in the structure of the twofold truth.

世友作如是説「能顯名是世俗、所顯法是勝義」。(*Apidamo dapiposha lun*, T1545, 27, 400a26-27)
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conventional Truth</th>
<th>Śrāvaka</th>
<th>Pratyekabuddha</th>
<th>Bodhisattva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₁</strong> Mundane conventional truth</td>
<td>所安立瓶・軍・林等，我・有情等</td>
<td>Verbalized established vases, armies, forests, ātman, and sattva.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₂</strong> Conventional truth based on real principles</td>
<td>所安立蘊・處・界</td>
<td>The five aggregates (skandha), the twelve bases (āyatana) and the eighteen realms (dhātu) that are verbally established.</td>
<td>所安立十二有支</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₃</strong> Conventional truth based on realization</td>
<td>所安立四聖諦理</td>
<td>Verbally established four noble truths.</td>
<td>所安立十二有支順逆觀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₄</strong> Ultimate conventional truth</td>
<td>所安立生空眞如</td>
<td>Verbally established thusness as emptiness of self.</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ultimate Truth</th>
<th>Śrāvaka</th>
<th>Pratyekabuddha</th>
<th>Bodhisattva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U₁</strong> Conventional ultimate truth</td>
<td>所安立蘊・處・界</td>
<td>The five aggregates, the twelve bases, and the eighteen realms that are verbally established.</td>
<td>所安立十二有支</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U₂</strong> Ultimate truth based on real principles</td>
<td>所安立四聖諦理</td>
<td>Verbally established four noble truths.</td>
<td>所安立十二有支順逆觀</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. The four-level twofold truth and *Madhyāntavibhāga*

The relationship between truth and language in the four-level twofold truth seems to be derived from Indian Yogācāra tradition. Vasubandhu’s *Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya* (MAVBh; Ch. *Bian zhongbian lun* 辯中邊論) also classifies the twofold truth into three types:

Coarse truth and subtle truth are the conventional truth and the ultimate truth.
How do these [truths] depend on [the three natures as] the fundamental truth?
The verse says:

You should understand that the conventional truth is classified into three types:
Nominal explanation (*prajñāpīti*), practice (*pratipatti*), and revelation (*udbhāvanā*) depend on the fundamental three [natures] respectively.

The ultimate truth has three [types]:
object (*artha*), realization (*prāpti*), and correct practice (*pratipatti*). (…)  
Comment: The conventional truth has three types: C_i) The conventional truth as nominal explanation, C_ii) the conventional truth as practice, and C_iii) the conventional truth as revelation. These three conventional truths are established depending on the fundamental three truths respectively.  
The ultimate truth also has three types: U_i) The ultimate truth as object
(arthaparamārtha) is the thusness (tathatā) in the sense that it is the object (artha) of the ultimate (parama) wisdom. U_i The ultimate truth as realization (prāptiparamārtha) is the nirvāṇa in the sense that it is the ultimate (parama) goal (artha). U_ii The ultimate truth as practice (pratipattiparamārtha) is the path (mārga) in the sense that it has the ultimate (parama) target (artha). You should understand that these three ultimate [truths] are established depending only on the perfectly accomplished nature (parinispapana-svabhāva) of the fundamental three [natures].

Quoting this passage, Erdi yi discusses the relationship between the four-level ultimate truths and the three interpretations of MAVBh as follows:

This conventional truth as nominal explanation (C_i) corresponds to the first conventional [truth] (C_1), since there is only nominal explanation and no essence in it. The conventional truth as practice (C_ii) corresponds to the second and third conventional [truths] (C_2, C_3), since they are conditioned phenomena and the appearance as alterations of consciousness like the principle of the four noble truths. Since the principle is not different from the phenomena, they correspond to the nature of arising depending on others (*paratantra-svabhāva) and the second and third conventional [truth]. The conventional truth as revelation (C_iii) corresponds to the fourth conventional [truth] (C_4), since the teaching of the two kinds of emptiness is revealed in it. (⋯)

The ultimate truth as object (U_i) corresponds to the fourth ultimate [truth] (U_4).

The ultimate truth as realization (U_ii) corresponds to the third ultimate [truth] (U_3), since it appears by realization and is named according to realization. The ultimate truth as practice (U_iii) corresponds to the second ultimate [truth] (U_2),
since the principle of the true untainted wisdom is relatively superior. When following the phenomena [of the second ultimate truth, the ultimate truth as practice] corresponds to the first ultimate [truth] \((U_1)\).\(^{11}\)

According to \textit{Madhyāntavibhāga-ṭīkā}, Sthiramati’s commentary on MAVBh, the term “revelation” [of the conventional truth as revelation corresponding to \((C_{iii})\)] means the explanation of the dharma-realm that cannot be explained by words, using words such as \textit{tathatā} (thusness). Therefore, the perfectly accomplished nature \((\textit{parinispanna-svabhāva})\) also corresponds to the conventional truth as revelation \((C_{iii})\), which is not a conventional truth essentially.\(^{12}\)

It is reasonable to think that these discussions are similar to the structure of \(C_4\), \(U_3\), and \(U_4\) of Table 2, since \(C_4\) and \(U_3\) mean the verbally established thusness, while \(U_4\) is said to be the verbally unestablished thusness.

III. Logical expression of the ultimate truth

As seen above, in the context of the four different levels of the twofold truth, the ultimate truth includes the whole concepts of Buddhist doctrines. The Faxiang/Hossō school had studied \textit{yinming/inmyō} 因明 \textit{(hetu-vidyā)}, an East Asian transmission of the Dignāga’s (陳那, c. 400-480) logic and discussed how to handle these ultimate truths in logical expressions.

It is well known that Bhāviveka (清弁, c. 490-570) modified the Dignāgan logical system to demonstrate emptiness \(\textit{(śūnyatā)}\) by means of language. He used the

---

11) 此假世俗第一俗攝，唯有假名都無體故。此行世俗第二第三世俗所攝，有為事故、心上變似四諦相理。理不離事故、依他攝、第二第三世俗攝也。顯了世俗第四俗攝、依二空門所顯了故。\((\cdots)\) 其義勝義第四真攝。此得勝義第三真攝，因證顯故約得辨故。此行勝義第二真攝、無漏真智理稍勝故。若隨其事第一真攝。\((T1861, 45, 292b20-28)\)

12) See also Hayashima (2011).
restriction “in the ultimate reality (*paramārthas)” to distinguish a logical expression from conventional usage of language and common sense. The restriction is not his specialty but can be found in the treatises of the Sarvāstivāda and the Yogācāra. According to the tradition of the Faxiang/Hossō school, Xuanzang also used the restriction to prove the view that nothing exists independently from the consciousness (*vijñapti-mātratā).

After traveling around India and completing his study, our master [Xuanzang] wanted to return to China. At that time, Śilāditya, who was the king of all India, held a large and uninterrupted Buddhist service that lasted for eighteen days and asked our master to demonstrate [the Yogācāra doctrine] all over India. The king chose those who had wisdom and goodness and called them to the service. He sent non-Buddhists and Hīnayāna Buddhists to dispute with Xuanzang. Our master had made the following inference, and no one could make an argument against it: In the ultimate reality (*paramārthas), generally accepted forms are not apart from visual consciousness (proposition). Because, based on the theory which we accept, they are categorized in the first three [of the eighteen realms] and not included in the general eyes (reason). Like as the visual consciousness (example).^{13}

In his *Inmyō ronsho myōtōshō* 因明論疏明燈鈔, Zenju interprets the meaning of “the ultimate reality” in the restriction of the proof of *vijñapti-mātratā*, comparing it with the doctrine of the four-level twofold truths.

In this restriction, there are two purposes: The first is, [based on] the mutual

---

^{13} 且如大師，周遊西域，學滿將還。時戒日王、王五印度，為設十八日無遮大會、令大師立義遍諸天竺。簡選賢良、皆集會所、遣外道小乘、競申論詰。大師立量、時人無敢對揚者。大師立唯識比量云「真故極成色不離於眼識宗、自許初三攝眼所不攝故因、猶如眼識喻。」(*Yinming ruzhenglilun shu* 因明入正理論疏, T1840, 44, 115b21-27). Moro (2015) discussed some historical problems of the tradition of Xuanzang’s proof.
distinctions of the twofold truth, for avoiding the fallacy of [contradiction to] common sense (*loka-viruddha) of non-Buddhists. ‘Based on the ultimate reality’ means that the first three of the [four-level] ultimate realities are called ‘the ultimate reality.’ Since these three ultimate truths cannot be understood by the common sense of non-Buddhists, it is excluded [from the domain of discourse by the restriction].

The second is, [based on] the mutual distinctions of the three vehicles, for avoiding the fallacy of [contradiction to] common sense of Buddhists. Each of the three vehicles has the twofold truth; Regarding the four-level ultimate [truths] of the Bodhisattva vehicle, the second ‘ultimate truth based on real principles’ is called the special doctrine of the Mahāyāna and is not the territory of the two vehicles.\(^{14}\)

The first purpose mentioned above is to show that a logical expression with the restriction “in the ultimate reality” is not based on the mundane conventional truth (C\(_1\)) but on the first three ultimate realities (U\(_1\), U\(_2\), and U\(_3\)). The second purpose is, however, to demonstrate a logical expression with the restriction based on U\(_1\), U\(_2\), and U\(_3\) of Bodhisattva as shown in Table 4. Since Zenju believed that Xuanzang tried to demonstrate the logical correctness of \(\text{vijñapti-mātratā}\) to “non-Buddhists and Hīnayāna Buddhists,” he showed these two purposes in the quotation above. The truths of non-Buddhists correspond to C\(_1\) and those of Hīnayāna Buddhists to U\(_1\), U\(_2\), and U\(_3\) of Śrāvaka and Pratyekabuddha.

In general, all truths of the four-level twofold truths, except the ultimate-ultimate truth, can be described with logical expressions using the restriction, which limits the context or semantic domain of a discourse. In East Asian Buddhist logic, there are many restriction words\(^{15}\). Ono [2010] states that Indian logic or Buddhist logic has a

\(^{14}\) 此簡別中、總有二義。一者二諦相對、簡別非學世間之過。依勝義者、即真前三、合名勝義。（…）此三勝義、非是非學世間所知。故以簡之。（…）第二三乘相對、簡別學者世間之過。三乘各有二諦之中、指菩薩乘二諦、真四重中、第二道理勝義諦、名為大乘殊勝義、非是二乘之境界。（T2270, 68, 315b7-c1）
thought that one’s own proposition is limited by the claim and standpoint of the dialogue counterpart, and the thought seems to be a part of the religious tolerance in India. The thought of limitation is not irrelevant to the coexistence of various truths mentioned in the previous chapter.

IV. Conclusion

So far, we have outlined the four levels of the twofold truth in the East Asian Yogācāra school and its practical application in the context of Buddhist logic. It is reasonable to suppose that the system of the twofold truth shows the thought of coexistence of truths especially in the context of a dialogue between people who have different cultural/religious/philosophical traditions, and the thought seems to be based on the religious tolerance in India. The future direction of this study would be the influence of the tolerance on East Asian Yogācāra Buddhism, which faced little opposition by non-Buddhists and Hīnayāna Buddhists unlike in India.

Abbreviations

DFY Dasheng fayuan yilinzhang 大乘法苑義林章 (T1861).
MAVBh Xuanzang’s Chinese translation of Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya of Vasubandhu (T1600).
MMK Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā of Nāgārjuna.
T Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

15) For details of the restriction terms found in the proof of vijñapti-mātratā, see Moro (2015), chapter 2.
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사중이제(四重二諦)에 대한 동아시아 법상종(法相宗, Yogācāra School)의 해석

모로 시게키(師茂樹)
하나조노 대학(花園大学)

진리(諦, truth)는 철학뿐만이 아니라 종교에서도 중요한 주제이다. 본 논문에서는 대승불교의 대표적인 이론 중 하나인 이제설(二諦說)을 다루는데, 특히 나라(奈良) 시대의 일본 법상종(法相, Hossō)에서 뛰어난 학자이자 승려인 젠주(善珠, 732-797)의 해석에 초점을 맞추었다.

젠주는 기(基, 632-682)와 원측(圓測, 613-696)의 해석에 기반하여, 사중(四重) 각각을 세속제(世俗諦)와 승의제(勝義諦)의 이제(二諦)로 분류한 사중이제(四重二諦)에 대해 설명한다. 그는 연설상(言説相)과 진(眞)은 제(諦, satya)의 토대이고, 이러한 여덟 개의 제는 상호적으로 연결된 체계를 형성한다고 서술한다.

사중이제설은 인명(因明, hetuvidyā)이나 불교논리학에서도 중요한 역할을 한다. 젠주는 유식비량(唯識比量)의 분별인 진고(真故) 또는 취승의(就勝義)는 진제의 사중에서 앞의 세 가지인 세간승의제(世間勝義諦), 도리승의제(道理勝義諦, 중득승의제(證得勝義諦)에 해당한다고 말한다. 그는 논리식을 포함한 언어적 소통이나 논쟁에서, 불교 이외의 다른 종교나 사상을 포함한 상대(對論者)에 상응하는 다수의 제(諦)를 허용한다.
주제어
기(基), 사중이제설(四重二諦說), 원측(圓測), 유식비량(唯識比量), 인명(因明)
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