

## 春花或金屑？ ——紫柏真可的禪教觀及其背後的 反智識主義難題\*

林悟石\*\*

### 摘 要

在禪宗史中時不時地浮現的禪、教爭議，其中一個關鍵即是「教外別傳，不立文字」的不同立場，亦即「經教」在禪宗的解脫論中具有何種功能——或不具功能。與此同時，經教作為「智識」的理解對象，也代表了禪、教爭議的背後正是禪門對於「智識」的不同觀點。禪宗社群中強調經教的重要性者，往往肯認「智識」在修證過程中具有積極意義，進而需要以智識的方式來解釋智識之於契及禪悟的重要性，甚至是必要性。明代被視為禪門「尊宿」的紫柏真可（1543-1604），就曾嘗試理論性地解釋「非智識的禪悟與智識之間的關係為何」與「為何非智識的禪悟可由智識去契及」，並譬喻「禪如春也，文字則花也。春在於花，全花是春；花在於春，全春是花」的禪教不二立場。然而，當取法唯識學及其量論時，紫柏所立足的《楞嚴經》與《大乘起

---

2021.03.30 收稿，2021.12.10 通過刊登。

\* 本文之撰成主要承蒙林佩瑩老師、林鎮國老師、廖肇亨老師、蔡伯郎老師、鄧偉仁老師、果幸法師、果鏡法師的建議與課堂上的啟發。也感謝諸位審查老師的建議，但因篇幅與修改時間有限，許多內容未必能在本文中予以處理。亦致謝 Ronan Farrell（弘倫）、Kamil R. Nowak、林含潔、孫馨平、徐維里、張雅雯、楊鎮鴻、鍾寧與編輯部諸君的協助，以及本文所有徵引文獻及其知識生產與傳續過程的參與者（以上人名均按姓氏筆劃排序）。另，本文可能的爭議性觀點、立場與疏漏皆為筆者之個人責任。

\*\* 作者係法鼓文理學院佛教學系博士生。

信論》的心意識理論，卻讓他重新回到了「不立文字」的反智識主義立場——紫柏認為第六意識已落比量，只能變帶地緣取真如假境，僅有第六識未起前的清淨真心才能挾帶地、現量地親緣真如。但是，這就重新陷入了一個難題：如若第六識與經教在理論上無關於修行者對真如的契悟，到底要如何說明經教之於禪悟是重要的？——經教到底是翳眼的金屑，抑或與春意體一不二的繁花？

**關鍵詞：**紫柏真可、禪教觀、開悟經驗、密契主義、反智識主義

**Flowers as Spring or Gold Dust as Film  
in the Eyes?  
Zibo Zhenke's View on the Relationship  
between Chan and Doctrine and  
Its Problems on Anti-intellectualism**

Lin, Wushi \*

**Abstract**

The debate on the relationship between Chan and doctrine appears from time to time in the history of the Chan community. One of critical points is their different positions on “a separate transmission apart from the doctrine”(教外別傳) and “not setting up language and letter,”(不立文字) that is, the core of the problem is to determine what role “doctrine”(經教) plays in meditation and the experience of Chan enlightenment, or if “doctrine” does not play any role. However, if we examine this issue deeper, then we will find that the Chan patriarchs' positions on this debate showed their rationale. The Chan patriarchs who emphasized the importance of doctrine also preferred to agree that rationale can or must have a positive position in Chan practice. But because of their emphasis on to logic and atypical position from the mainstream, they need to explain intellectually how doctrine is necessary and why it will influence Chan meditation.

---

\* Ph.D. Student, Department of Buddhist Studies, Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts.

Zibo Zhenke( 紫柏真可 , 1543-1604) who is regarded as a Noble Master( 尊宿 ) in the Ming Chan community, highly stressed the importance of literary Chan( 文字禪 ) and doctrine by claiming that the relation between Chan and doctrine is non-dualistic with a metaphor: Chan is the spring, literature (including doctrine) is the flowers. However, when Zibo tried to interpret the theories of consciousness, direct perception (pratyakṣa, 現量 ) and logical inference (anumāna, 比量 ) from Yogācāra Chinese texts, his preunderstanding which is based on \**Śūraṅgama Sūtra*( 楞嚴經 ) and *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna*( 大乘起信論 ) made him return to the anti-intellectualist position of “not setting up language and letter” and debasing rationale. Zibo argued that the sixth consciousness already fell into logical inference, and only the pure mind, which is something before the arising of sixth consciousness, is able to perceive *tathatā*( 真如 ) in direct perception way. However, this contradiction makes the problem emerge again: theoretically, if doctrine plays no role in perceiving *tathatā*, why and how is doctrine important for getting enlightenment? Is doctrine gold dust as film in the eyes or the flowers as spring?

**Keywords:** Zibo Zhenke, the relationship between Chan and doctrine, the experience of enlightenment, mysticism, anti-intellectualism

