

泗州大聖僧伽傳奇新論——宋代佛教居士與僧伽崇拜

Revisiting the Legend of Sengqie, the Great Sage of Sizhou——Lay Buddhists and the Cult of Sengqie during the Song Dynasty

黃啓江

Chi-chiang Huang

美國 Hobart and William Smith Colleges

亞洲語言文化系教授

提要

2003年11月在江蘇江陰出土的所謂僧伽「真身舍利」，再度引起了學界對僧伽研究之興趣。雖然有關僧伽崇拜，海峽兩岸學者鮮少注意，但日本著名佛教史學者牧田諦亮曾有相當仔細之研究，而其研究對西方學界之認識僧伽甚有裨益。最近于君方教授之著作《觀音》，其中討論僧伽與觀音之關係一節，即多依賴牧田之著作。牧田之重要論點之一，是僧伽為中國史上之「庶民信仰」。本文未盡同意牧田之論點，一方面是因牧田似從未明確地界定「庶民」之意義，而以約定俗成之說法來決定其意涵。由於此種說法隱含「庶民」(commoners)與「菁英份子」(elites)為兩種分離而不相涉的信仰團體，則僧伽為「庶民信仰」之說，自然將菁英份子排除於庶民信仰之外。此種觀點或非牧田本意，然牧田並未澄清。本文擬釐清牧田之說法，指出宋代佛教居士不乏信仰及崇奉僧伽之事實。此輩居士多為地方或中央官吏，並參與僧伽故事之傳述與僧伽傳奇之撰寫。在崇重僧伽信仰的皇帝治理下，他們也形成士大夫中為數不小的僧伽崇拜者。僧伽信仰變成了庶民與士人的共同信仰，並未在二者之間造成任何緊張與衝突。而且在僧伽接二連三地受皇帝賜號而如同一般地方信仰「標準化」、「標名化」而變成全國性信仰之後，仍繼續擴散傳播。本文細論蔣之奇、李綱和李祥等佛教居士及其對僧伽之記載，指出僧伽信仰雖以地方信仰之姿態崛起，但其流傳之迅速，足以使其立即變成長久的全國性信仰。有別於某些學者之看法，它並未在宋末因禪宗之興盛而告式微，也未因理學家之批判而寢衰。有關僧伽之死及唐宋以來泗州僧伽塔建造之相關記錄，都證明僧伽之遺體從未焚化，故其真身是完整的，不至分散各處。雖然宋太宗曾詔命建造十三級僧伽浮圖，並下旨奉安「釋迦舍利」於其下，但自金人焚毀泗州寺，並囊括寺內寶物及僧伽真身北渡之後，並無任何記載確指僧伽塔之下落，也無有關僧伽「真身舍利」外流之記錄。如此說來，考古學家判

定出土舍利爲僧伽「真身舍利」之說似乎站不住腳。

Abstract

Archaeological excavation of the so-called “true body relic” (zhenshen sheli), i.e., sarira of the mummified Sengqie, in Jianyin, Jiangsu, in November of 2003, has rekindled scholars’ interest in the study of the cult of Sengqie in Chinese history. While the topic drew little attention to Chinese historians previously, it was studied in much detail by the renowned Japanese Buddhist scholar, Makita Tairyū. Western understanding of Sengqie, as demonstrated by Professor Chun-fang Yu’s recent book on Guanyin, has benefited greatly from Makita’s books, which argue that the Sengqie cult was a “popular cult” or the commoners’ cult (shomin). This paper argues against the notion of the Sengqie cult being solely a “popular cult,” which is a term Makita seems to have adopted by following convention without making any qualification. Since the definition suggests separate and mutually exclusive cult patterns in two different camps, that of commoners and that of elites, the use of the term naturally excludes elites from being active participants of the Sengqie cult, even though Makita might not have that intent. In an attempt to clarify Makita’s points, this paper shows that lay Buddhists, often ranking officials in both regional and central governments, participated in the retelling and rewriting of the Sengqie legend and dedicated themselves to the worship of Sengqie. They constituted a substantial portion of the elite population under Song emperors who promoted the Sengqie cult as devout or pragmatic patrons. The Sengqie cult began as a cult to both commoners and elites, causing little tension and conflict between them yet continuing its spread after the name of Sengqie had undergone a process similar to the so-called “standardization” or “superscription” that is said to have transformed many local cults into national cults. The paper’s delineation of Jiang Zhiqi, Li Gang, and Li Xiang, as well as of their accounts of Sengqie, indicates that the cult of Sengqie gained its currency rapidly enough to turn itself from a local cult into a longstanding national cult. Contrary to what has been suggested, the cult never declined in the latter Song because of the rise of Chan Buddhism. Nor did it suffer a setback because of Neo-Confucians’ attack. Last but not least, the accounts of the death of Sengqie and the constructions of the Sengqie Pagoda in Sizhou from the Tang to the Song prove to us that Sengqie was never cremated and thus never left any *śarīra* to be distributed in different locales. Although some legendary Buddha’s relics were enshrined under the Pagoda after its construction under the auspices of Emperor Taizong of the Song, no any account has detailed their whereabouts and the distribution of Sengqie’s sarira since the Jurchen burnt the Sizhou Temple and rounded up the treasures of the temple, including the mummified body of Sengqie. These facts render archaeologists’ designation of the

unearthed sarira as the “true body relic” of Sengqie invalid.