

A Comparative Exploration on Wonhyo's Theory of One Mind in East Asian Buddhism with the idea of Mind (Manas) in the Astika school of Indian philosophy; highlighting Unity and Divergence

Author

Navya K N,
Graduate in Sanskrit Language and Literature,
University of Kerala (CSS), Kariavattom, Thiruvanthapuram, Kerala, 695581
Mob: +91 6282293635
email:navyakomu2000@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research looks at the various interpretations of "Mind" found in the Astika Darshanas, which cover the six main schools of Indian philosophy. At the same time, it looks into the profound East Asian Buddhist doctrine of One Mind as presented by Wonhyo, a great Korean Buddhist monk. This study seeks to identify the interesting similarities and differences that lie at the nexus of various philosophical domains by travelling through the complex landscape of different intellectual traditions. By using a comparative approach, it aims to clarify the connections and distinguishing characteristics that form the conception of 'Mind' in both Korean Buddhist philosophy and the six schools of Indian philosophy, thereby advancing our understanding of the various philosophical currents that have influenced the intellectual fabric of these traditions. Focusing on the transmission and assimilation of Indian philosophical ideas into Buddhist philosophies, the research explores how these concepts were adapted and evolved as Buddhism spread across East Asian cultures. Through a rigorous examination of textual sources, historical records, and philosophical treatises, this research aims to elucidate the intricate process by which Indian philosophical ideas shaped the distinctive features of Korean Buddhism, contributing to the formation of a unique cultural and intellectual synthesis in the region. This research seeks to bridge these dissimilar contexts in order to reveal the interconnections of Indian and Korean philosophical traditions, contributing to a better understanding of the universal threads that connect these landscapes and highlighting the enduring resonance of fundamental concepts in the pursuit of enlightenment.

KEYWORDS

Indian philosophy; Six schools of Indian philosophy; The Astika school of Indian philosophy; Korean Buddhist philosophy; East Asian philosophy; Wonhyo's One mind; Mind in Astika philosophy; Nyaya philosophy; Sankhya philosophy; yoga philosophy; Visheshika philosophy; Mimamsa philosophy; Wonhyo's theory of one mind

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Studying the comparative exploration of Wonhyo's Theory of One Mind in East Asian Buddhism with the idea of Mind (Manas) in the Astika school of Indian philosophy offers intellectual and personal benefits by providing a deep understanding of East Asian Buddhism, insights into the Astika school of Indian philosophy, especially the concept of Mind (Manas), and exploration of the cultural and historical contexts shaping these philosophical ideas. By delving into this study, individuals can develop critical thinking skills, honing their ability to analyse and compare complex philosophical concepts. This process, in turn, enhances their capacity to evaluate and synthesis information from diverse cultural and philosophical traditions. Moreover, the exploration of East Asian Buddhism and Indian philosophy fosters the improvement of cross-cultural competence, providing valuable insights into how different cultures approach and express philosophical concepts.

This analytical journey contributes to the development of skills for comparing and contrasting philosophical frameworks. Beyond the academic realm, this study becomes a catalyst for personal growth by exposing individuals to diverse worldviews and philosophical perspectives, encouraging a more detailed and open-minded approach to understanding complex ideas. Furthermore, the acquired skills and insights open up opportunities for further academic study or research in fields such as Indian philosophy, religious studies, or East Asian studies. This not only enhances one's intellectual profile but also positions individuals for careers that highly value critical thinking, research skills, and cross-cultural understanding. This study aids people from different nationalities in grasping philosophy more easily by drawing comparisons. Additionally, it paves the way for more diverse studies, strengthening the relationships between various philosophical traditions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To compare Wonhyo's Theory of One Mind in East Asian Buddhism with the concept of mind (manas) in the Astika school of Indian philosophy.
- To highlight the shared principles (unity) and differences (divergence) between the two philosophical perspectives.
- To examine how cultural and historical contexts shape the development of these philosophical ideas.

- To develop analytical skills by critically evaluating and contrasting complex philosophical frameworks.

SOURCE OF DATA AND METHOD

The source of the study mainly obtained from two resources. One is the library resource and others online resource. I referred historical context and analyzed with my idea to write the content and also seek help of online sources to get the information that discovered recently

CONTENT

Philosophy is like a quest for wisdom and understanding by digging into basic questions about existence, awareness, values, reason, thoughts, and language. The thoughts that come out of philosophy give us a broad way to grasp life and values, touching many societies and influencing how people act worldwide. The moral ideas we get from philosophy, like justice and human rights, are the building blocks for a lot of legal and ethical systems in different cultures. It's not just about one region; philosophical traditions have left their mark on art, literature, and religious practices, making this diverse worldwide culture.

Going through the philosophical voyage of ancient India, unwinding the varied threads of thought created by the six schools of Indian philosophy, each presenting a distinct lens through which to study the nature of existence and the paths to insight. Six systems of thought have gained particular prominence among the diverse systems of thought, namely 'Gautama's Nyaya Darsana' (Philosophy), 'Kanada's Vaieṣika Darsana', 'Kapila's Sankhya Darsana', 'Patanjali's Yoga Darsana', 'Jaimini's Purva Mimamsa Darsana', and 'Bādarayana's Uttara Mimamsa Darsana', collectively recognised as the Brahmanical systems due to their shared recognition of the authority of the Vedas. The schools of thought that accept the validity of the Vedas are known as Astika, while those that reject it are known as Nastika. The Astika or Nastika character of a system is determined not by its positive or negative findings about the nature of the supreme spirit, but by acceptance or rejection of the authority of the Vedas. Even Buddhist schools trace their roots back to the Upanishads, although they are not considered orthodox because they reject the authority of the Vedas. The main schools of Indian philosophy were formalised and recognised chiefly between 500 BCE and the late centuries of the Common Era.

Wōnhyo, a Silla dynasty scholar-monk in 7th-century Korea, is regarded as a fundamental figure in Korean Buddhism, respected for his profound insights and passionate prose. Wōnhyo 's writings delve into the vast realms of Buddhist theories, drawing inspiration not only from major Mahayana scriptures but also from diverse philosophical traditions, including Chinese Sanlun thinkers, Daoist luminaries like Laozi and Zhuangzi, and Tang Dynasty intellectual discourse. During the seventh century, his scholastic method reveals a broad embrace of Asian thinking,

contributing to a golden age of East Asian culture and scholasticism. The concept of "One Mind" is central to Wŏnhyo's philosophy, reflecting the inherent purity and unchanging character of the mind shared by all sentient beings. Despite the appearance of impurity and impermanence, Wŏnhyo believes that every erroneous idea emerges from the same mind, which paradoxically possesses the ability for enlightenment. With over 200 references in his works, his detailed examination of the One Mind idea is notably visible in his Commentary on the 'Kūmgang sammae kyŏng' (Vajrasamādhī-sūtra or Sutra of Diamond-like Concentration) and his two commentaries on the Awakening of Mahayana Faith .

This research seeks to bridge these dissimilar contexts in order to reveal the interconnections of Indian and Korean philosophical traditions, contributing to a better understanding of the universal threads that connect these landscapes and highlighting the enduring resonance of fundamental concepts in the pursuit of enlightenment.

● The Nyaya Darsana with Wŏnhyo's One mind theory

The Nyaya school of philosophy, shaped by the sage Gautama in the "Nyaya Sutra," stands out for its systematic exploration of fundamental ideas through concise aphorisms. Nyaya, translating to a method guiding the mind to conclusions, becomes a science of right reasoning, prioritizing evidence-based understanding. This approach breaks down knowledge into four key components: the cognizer, the object of cognition, the resulting state of cognition, and the means of knowledge. Nyaya recognizes 'Pratyakṣa' or intuition as the most significant source of knowledge, encapsulating both understanding the truth and the steps taken in the process. This emphasis underscores the intricate nature of perceptual knowledge, which Nyaya believes depends on the reliable tool called "Pramana."

The philosophy of Nyaya delves into the concept of 'mind' (manas), acknowledging its role as a mediator between the inner self and the external world. The mind, according to Nyaya, plays a pivotal role in perception. In situations where attention is deeply focused, the mind's absorption in the surroundings can lead to the selective perception of sensory stimuli. Even when multiple senses are engaged, the mind's selective focus results in non-simultaneous perception. Nyaya's exploration of the mind positions it as a crucial element in every act of perception, underscoring its role in understanding the world sensibly. Thus, Nyaya provides not only a structured approach to knowledge acquisition but also recognizes the significance of the mind in shaping our perception of the external environment, making it a comprehensive and insightful contribution to Indian philosophical thought.

Wŏnhyo delves into the nature of the mind, emphasizing the concept of the "One Mind." This idea comprises two key aspects: the "aspect of true thusness" and the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing." In the "aspect of true thusness," Wŏnhyo describes the mind from a pure, changeless standpoint, where all phenomena exist in a calm state from the beginning. This represents the true nature of the mind, termed "thusness." On the other hand, the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing" acknowledges the mind's constant interaction with the external world, influenced by ignorance, leading to fluctuations. Yet, understanding the One Mind's true nature enables individuals to transcend these fluctuations and attain eternal tranquility. These perspectives reveal a dynamic system where the mind remains unchanging in essence while experiencing arising and ceasing in response to the world. Wŏnhyo further argues that the mind's various

manifestations are indeed the mind itself. Despite diverse experiences, the essence of the mind remains unaltered. Ignorance plays a role in causing the mind to manifest differently, resulting in various experiences. However, returning to the source of the One Mind allows individuals to realize its undivided and unchanging nature, bringing about understanding and lasting tranquility.

Wŏnhyo's exploration of the nature of the mind in the 7th-century Korean Buddhist context shares interesting parallels with the philosophical concepts of the Nyaya school in ancient Indian thought, particularly as outlined by the sage Gautama in the "Nyaya Sutras." In Wŏnhyo's philosophy, the focus on the "One Mind" lines up with Nyaya's attention to the ways we understand things, called "Pramana." Wŏnhyo talks about the mind staying the same even though it shows up in different ways, which is similar to Nyaya's idea that what we know depends on how we know it. Nyaya breaks down knowledge into four parts: the person who knows, the thing known, the knowing that happens, and how you come to know it—similar to how Wŏnhyo looks into the One Mind. Both of these ways of thinking see the mind as crucial in how we see and understand things. Wŏnhyo says the One Mind links our inner self with the outside world, while Nyaya says the mind acts like a go-between for our inner self and our senses. The big deal here is how the mind plays a huge role in shaping how we see things and how it's tied to all sorts of knowledge in both Wŏnhyo's and Nyaya's ideas. Despite cultural and contextual differences, the comparative study reveals shared themes in the conceptualization of the mind in these distinct philosophical traditions. Both Wŏnhyo and Nyaya contribute to the exploration of the mind's nature, emphasizing its pivotal role in the acquisition of knowledge and the understanding of the world.

● [The Visheshika Darsana with Wŏnhyo's One mind theory](#)

Visheshika, one of ancient India's six schools of philosophy, began as an autonomous philosophy embracing metaphysics, epistemology, logic, ethics, and soteriology. It gradually harmonised with the Nyaya school in philosophical methods, ethical conclusions, and soteriology, while retaining differences in epistemology and metaphysics. The Visheshika school of thought, similar to Buddhism, recognised only direct observation and inference as reliable forms of knowledge. The "Visheshika Sutra" of Kanada (or Kanabhuj or Kanabhaksa) is the earliest comprehensive presentation of the Visheshika philosophy.

The Visheshika philosophy recognizes four types of valid knowledge: perception, inference, remembrance, and intuitive knowledge. Perception helps grasp substances, qualities, and actions, but it is limited to gross substances. Visheshika introduces yogic perception for the soul. Inference includes comparison, tradition, and verbal knowledge, with scriptural statements considered valid through the unimpeachable veracity of inspired seers. Visheshika distinguishes substances from qualities, asserting that substances exist beyond qualities at their production. Eternal and non-eternal substances are recognized, with compound substances being dependent and transitory. The philosophy identifies nine substances, including earth, water, light, air, ākāśa (**space**), time, space, soul, and Manas/Mind . It acknowledges both corporeal and elemental substances.

In the Visheshika philosophy, the concept of "Manas" holds a pivotal role as the mind, intricately woven into the fabric of understanding knowledge and consciousness. First and foremost, manas is recognized for its significant involvement in the perceptual cognition of the soul (ātmapratyakṣa), indicating its active role in the soul's awareness of its surroundings. Moreover, manas engages in the process of inference, contributing to the understanding and derivation of conclusions. Its role extends to verbal knowledge, encompassing the comprehension of meanings within words and sentences. As a crucial component in consciousness, Mind serves as the means by which the soul not only perceives external phenomena but also comprehends its own qualities, fostering a holistic awareness of the external world and internal experiences. It also underscores the connection between manas and the body, elucidating that despite the soul's all-pervading nature, the life of cognition, emotion, and activity primarily resides where the body is located. The distinctness of souls and their unity throughout diverse experiences are also attributed to manas, as scriptural injunctions assume this uniqueness. Finally, the multifunctional nature of 'Manas' is highlighted, playing a role in various bodily functions and phenomena, such as breathing, eyelid movement, injury healing, and the movement of the mind. In essence, within the Visheshika philosophy, manas emerges as a versatile and integral aspect of the self, contributing significantly to perception, inference, consciousness, and the overall functioning of the soul in conjunction with the body.

The idea of "Manas" in Visheshika and the concept of the "One Mind" in Wōnhyo's teachings share some commonalities but also exhibit significant differences in their perspectives on the nature of the mind. Both concepts acknowledge the multifaceted nature of the mind. In Visheshika, manas is described as playing a pivotal role in perception, inference, and consciousness. Similarly, Wōnhyo's "One Mind" encompasses two aspects: the "aspect of true thusness" and the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing," indicating a dynamic and multifaceted understanding. Both philosophies recognize the mind's interaction with the external world. In Visheshika, Mind is involved in cognitive processes that relate to the external environment. Wōnhyo's "aspect of arising-and-ceasing" acknowledges the mind's constant interaction with the world, leading to fluctuations. Visheshika suggests that individual selves retain their self hood in the face of cosmic and social interactions. In contrast, Wōnhyo's teachings emphasise the mind's changing character, with the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing" emphasising variations caused by ignorance. While Visheshika emphasises the significance of recognising the individuality of individual selves in order to achieve permanent tranquility (Peace fullness), Wōnhyo's teachings emphasise comprehending the unchanging nature of the One Mind in order to achieve lasting tranquility. Both this concepts recognize the intricate nature of the mind and its interaction with the external world. However, they differ in their perspectives on the nature of change, the approach to tranquility, and the understanding of the mind's manifestations.

● [The Sankhya Darsana with Wōnhyo's One mind theory](#)

Sankhya, one of the six classical schools of Indian philosophy, is a comprehensive system that seeks to explain the nature of reality and the means to attain liberation (moksha). The foundational text of Sankhya is the "Sankhya Karika," attributed to the sage Kapila, who is considered the founder of this philosophical tradition. Certainly, The Sankhya philosophy

introduces a different way of thinking compared to more rigid perspectives. The Sankhya philosophy establishes its dualistic view of 'Prakriti' (material nature) and 'Purusha' (conscious self) through the use of the principle of causality.

According to Sankhya philosophy, the concept of "manas" serves as a pivotal element akin to the manager of the cognitive process. It functions to synthesize information obtained from the senses into coherent perception, proposes alternative courses of action, and executes volitional commands through the organs of action. An essential feature of this conceptualization is the absence of a categorical distinction between the organ itself and its functions, mirroring the philosophical treatment of intellect and self-awareness within the Sankhya framework. Described metaphorically as a "door keeper," Manas/Mind oversees the influx of sensory input, considering it indispensable for both the processes of perception and subsequent action. Operating in conjunction with different senses, manas assumes diverse forms corresponding to its sensory engagements. Unlike an omnipresent entity, manas is characterized as an instrument possessing movement and action, comprised of distinct components due to its close association with the senses. Furthermore, within the Sankhya philosophy, the elements of intellect (buddhi), ego (ahamkara), and manas (mind) are not construed as stages of chronological evolution but rather as outcomes of meticulous logical analyses applied to evolved selves. This analytical approach elucidates the sequence wherein external senses are initially engaged, followed by mental considerations (manas), object referrals to the ego (ahamkara), and ultimate decisions employing intellect (buddhi). While this explicates the recognition of various factors at the individual level, the extension of these principles to a cosmic plane remains somewhat elusive within the philosophical discourse. The Sankhya framework, while shedding light on the understanding of mental components, does not provide a precise account of their functions when extrapolated to a cosmic context.

While both Wōnhyo's exploration of the "One Mind" and the Sankhya philosophy delve into the nature of the mind, they diverge in their fundamental principles and ideas. The former describes the mind's pure, changeless nature, where all phenomena exist in a calm state from the beginning. This resonates with the Sankhya idea of a conscious self (purusha) that remains unchanging in the middle of the transformations of the material world. However, Wōnhyo's emphasis on the mind's interaction with the external world and its fluctuations introduces a dynamic element not explicitly present in Sankhya. On the other hand, the Sankhya philosophy portrays the mind (manas) as a coordinating agent that synthesizes sense data, suggests courses of action, and executes the will. Unlike Wōnhyo's dynamic perspective, Sankhya highlights the mind's role in perception and action, with a distinct separation between the conscious self (purusha) and the material nature (prakriti). Sankhya does not explicitly explore the mind's dual aspects of true thusness and arising-and-ceasing, as presented by Wōnhyo. Moreover, Wōnhyo's emphasis on ignorance influencing the mind's fluctuations aligns with the Buddhist notion of ignorance as a root cause of suffering, which is distinct from the Sankhya framework that attributes fluctuations to the interplay of the three gunas (qualities) within prakriti.

● [The Yoga Darsana with Wōnhyo's One mind theory](#)

Yoga philosophy, which was defined by the sage Patanjali and is based in ancient Indian traditions, is a methodical pursuit of perfection by mastering mastery over the multiple parts of human nature—both physical and psychical. Patanjali emphasises the harmonious mastery of the physical body, the active will, and the keen intelligence as essential components of the transformation path of yoga.

According to Yoga philosophy, focus is a basic attribute present across all mental states, reaching its peak in the profound state of 'Samadhi'. Each mental change, or "vetti," creates a latent impression known as "samskara," which might reappear as conscious ideas when provoked. The mind, defined as an arena of opposing forces, requires unity, especially in the face of continuous demands for self-preservation and self-reproduction. The path to focus is filled with obstacles like as ignorance, egoism, attachment, aversion, and clinging to life, among others. Obstacles such as illness, uncertainty, idleness, and worldly distractions further complicate the task. The difficulty is twofold: broad attitudes that are detrimental to focus and specific instances that obstruct the concentration process.

The true self, according to Yoga philosophy, is not discovered through an objective use of the mind but through the suppression of its activities. Penetrating beneath the mental layers that conceal our divine nature requires discipline and a redirection of consciousness. The Yoga philosophy emphasizes the need for rigorous practice and the conquest of desires to inhibit mental states and pave the way for self-realization.

Both Wōnhyo's concept of the "One Mind" and the Yoga philosophy share a profound understanding of the mind but approach it differently. Wōnhyo examines the mind's essence through the "aspect of true-thusness" and the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing," describing its unchanging nature and constant interaction with the external world. Transcending these fluctuations leads to eternal tranquility. In contrast, Yoga philosophy, articulated by Patanjali, focuses on concentration as a universal trait in all mental states, addressing the mind as an arena of conflicting forces requiring unification. Both traditions acknowledge the role of ignorance, advocate disciplined practices, and aim for self-realization, but they differ in conceptualizing the mind's nature, the approach to concentration, and the path to lasting peace.

● [The Mimamsa Darsana \(Purva Mimamsa and Uttara Mimamsa\) with Wōnhyo's One mind theory](#)

Mimamsa, comprising Purva Mimamsa and Uttara Mimamsa, stands as one of the six orthodox (Astika) schools of Indian philosophy, focusing on the essence of dharma. Purva Mimamsa, attributed to 'Jaimini', primarily concerns itself with the performance of Vedic rituals and the interpretation of sacrificial duties outlined in the Vedic texts. It is more concerned with the practical aspects of dharma than with speculative philosophy. In contrast, Uttara Mimamsa, also known as Vedanta and attributed to sage 'Vyasa', shifts its focus to the pursuit of knowledge

regarding the ultimate truth of existence. While both branches share a commitment to Vedic authority, they differ in their emphasis, with Purva Mimamsa concentrating on ritualistic practices and Uttara Mimamsa delving into metaphysical inquiries. Together, these Mimamsa traditions contribute richly to the diverse tapestry of classical Indian philosophy, offering comprehensive perspectives on the nature of duty, ritual, and the ultimate reality.

In Mimamsa philosophy, the concept of "manas" or 'Mind' holds a central role in the intricate processes of cognition and perception. Acting as a bridge between the soul and the external world, Mind facilitates the contact that leads to cognition. Whether influenced by the soul's effort or guided by the unseen destiny set in motion by previous karma, Mind is depicted as the intermediary that enables the soul to be the experiencer or enjoyer of worldly phenomena. In this experiential journey, the body serves as the vessel for these experiences, and the senses act as instruments, with Mind orchestrating the connection between the self and the external environment.

The involvement of Mind extends into the complex realm of perception. In the perception process, Mind plays a crucial role in determinate and indeterminate perceptions. It is instrumental in discerning the generic and specific qualities of objects, particularly in determinate perception where it compares and contrasts the perceived object with others of the same class. Additionally, Mind is active in mental perception, allowing individuals to know subjective experiences such as pleasure and pain. In the realm of dreams, Mind is implicated in the remembrance of past impressions, giving rise to dream experiences that are closely tied to previously perceived objects.

However, the role of Mind in deep sleep diverges in interpretation within Mimamsa philosophy. While Prabhakara, a famous Mimamsa philosopher, suggests that in deep sleep, the self loses contact with Mind, Kumarila proposes that the self regains a form of pure consciousness where dreams are not possible. Overall, the multifaceted engagement of Mind in the processes of cognition, perception, and dream experiences underscores its significance in shaping the Mimamsa understanding of the relationship between the self and the external world.

In both Mimamsa philosophy and Wŏnhyo's "One Mind" concept, the centrality of the mind in shaping human experiences emerges as a common theme. Mimamsa underscores the mind's active role as a mediator, facilitating contact between the soul and the external world, while Wŏnhyo introduces the dual nature of the mind — the "aspect of true thusness" and the "aspect of arising-and-ceasing." Despite differences in terminology, both philosophies acknowledge the impact of ignorance on the mind's manifestations, leading to diverse experiences. However, they diverge in their emphasis on the mind's nature, with Mimamsa focusing on its practical role in daily life, particularly in rituals and understanding dharma. In contrast, Wŏnhyo's philosophy seeks transcendent goals, encouraging individuals to go beyond fluctuations by understanding the unchanging core of the One Mind for lasting peace and enlightenment.

● CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

The exploration of Wŏnhyo's 7th-century Korean Buddhist philosophy, particularly his concept of the "One Mind," reveals intriguing parallels and differences with various Indian philosophical traditions such as Nyaya, Visheshika, Sankhya, Yoga and Mimamsas. The commonality lies in recognising the profound role of the mind in shaping human experiences, understanding its interaction with the external world, and acknowledging the impact of ignorance. Despite these shared themes, each philosophical tradition offers unique perspectives on the nature of the mind, approaches to achieving tranquility, and ultimate goals.

Wŏnhyo's exploration of the "One Mind" resonates intriguingly with Nyaya's emphasis on the means of knowledge, or "Pramana." Both traditions recognise the mind's pivotal role in perception and understanding. Wŏnhyo's dual aspects of the mind align with Nyaya's systematic approach, involving the cognizer, the object, the resulting cognition, and the means of knowledge. The multifaceted engagement of the mind in cognition and perception serves as a common thread between these seemingly disparate traditions.

Comparing Wŏnhyo's concept with Visheshika reveals shared themes but also distinct perspectives. Both philosophies acknowledge the multifaceted nature of the mind and its interaction with the external world. In Visheshika, the mind (manas) is pivotal in cognitive processes, akin to Wŏnhyo's focus on the mind as a bridge between the self and the external environment. However, differences emerge in their views on change, with Visheshika emphasising individual self hood and Wŏnhyo highlighting the dynamic nature of the mind's manifestations influenced by ignorance.

The comparison with Sankhya highlights differences in fundamental principles. Wŏnhyo introduces a dynamic element with fluctuations in the mind, absent in Sankhya's delineation of purusha and prakriti. Sankhya portrays the mind (manas) as a coordinating agent in perception and action, emphasising its role within a dualistic framework distinct from Wŏnhyo's dynamic perspective.

Yoga philosophy, with its emphasis on concentration, shares a common goal of achieving tranquility with Wŏnhyo, yet the paths diverge in their conceptualizations of the mind's nature. The encounter with Mimamsa reveals a shared acknowledgment of the mind's mediating role, but the emphasis on practicality and rituals in Mimamsa stands in contrast to Wŏnhyo's transcendent goals. Both advocate disciplined practices and self-realisation but diverge in conceptualising the mind's nature, with Yoga focusing on concentration as a universal trait and Wŏnhyo emphasising the dynamic aspects of the mind.

With Mimamsa philosophy and Wŏnhyo's exploration of the mind, a shared recognition emerges regarding the mind's role as a mediator, facilitating the connection between the self and the external world. However, nuanced differences reveal distinct emphases in each tradition. Mimamsa, grounded in practical and ritualistic concerns, sees the mind as a dynamic force instrumental in the execution of religious duties and the interpretation of Vedic texts within the context of daily life. Conversely, Wŏnhyo's philosophy transcends the practical, introducing a dual perspective on the mind and emphasising contemplation on its profound nature for spiritual realisation and lasting tranquility. While both traditions acknowledge the

mind's mediating function, Mimamsa emphasises its practical utility, while Wŏnhyo invites a deeper contemplation towards spiritual enlightenment.

This comparative study delves into the conceptualization of the mind's nature, exploring ideas of change, self hood, and the impact of ignorance. While shared themes such as the multifaceted nature of the mind and its interaction with the external world emerge, differences manifest in the understanding of these aspects. The comparison brings to light the dynamic perspectives of Wŏnhyo's teachings, introducing fluctuations influenced by ignorance in contrast to the more static portrayals in some Indian philosophies. The research underscores the significance of the mind across diverse philosophical traditions, transcending cultural and temporal boundaries. The study provides valuable insights into how different philosophical systems grapple with understanding the mind, its functions, and the pursuit of tranquility. By comparing Wŏnhyo's teachings with Indian philosophies, the research contributes to a broader understanding of the human psyche, cognition, and the quest for inner peace, enriching the global discourse on philosophy.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The exploration of Wŏnhyo's 7th-century Korean Buddhist philosophy alongside various Indian philosophical traditions provides useful insights but has some limitations. Using translations of original texts makes it challenging to capture nuances related to language and cultural context. Interpretation of philosophical texts is subjective, and this study reflects certain views, potentially missing alternative insights. Diversity within each tradition, later influences, and limitations in Wŏnhyo's works pose challenges. The study's direct relevance to today's contexts may be limited as philosophical interpretations evolve. Despite these limitations, the study lays a foundation for further research, urging scholars to explore specific aspects of each tradition and fostering a more nuanced understanding of Korean and Indian philosophical thought intersections and differences.

REFERENCES

- Dr S Ramakrishnan's Indian philosophy Vol.I and Vol.II, published in 1923 by Oxford University Press, New Delhi
- A short history of Sanskrit Literature, by T.K Ramachandra Aiyar, Published by R.S Vadhyar & sons, Kalpathi, Kerala, 2018

- The Pure Land of the One Mind in Wŏnhyo's Thought (Journal article, Vol. 6, No. 1, April 2015, Pure Land Buddhism in Korea) by Kim Jong Wook, Published by Institute for the Study of Religion, Sogang University, Korea
- Wŏnhyo's Theory of "One Mind": A Korean Way of Interpreting Mind (Journal article), by Eun-su Cho, 2017, Faculty Member, Seoul National University
- http://www.koreanbuddhism.net/bbs/board.php?bo_table=1010&wr_id=142
(Wonhyo's Philosophy)
- [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_philosophy#:~:text=11%20External%20links-,Common%20themes,practices%20\(moksha%2C%20nirvana\).](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_philosophy#:~:text=11%20External%20links-,Common%20themes,practices%20(moksha%2C%20nirvana).) (Indian Philosophy)
- <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Indian-philosophy>