

# 正觉学报

*Journal of True Enlightenment*

第 四 期

2013

正觉教育基金会 主办

True Enlightenment Education Foundation

# 正觉学报

*Journal of True Enlightenment*

---

第 四 期

2013

编 审 委 员 群

佛教正觉同修会亲教师团

曲立全                      周子全

周焕铭                      张火庆

陈介源                      贾坤芳

(按笔划顺序排列)

财团法人正觉教育基金会

True Enlightenment Education Foundation

ISBN 978-986-87362-2-1

國家圖書館出版品預行編目(CIP)資料

正覺學報. 第四期 / 白志偉總編輯. -- 初版.

-- 臺北市：正覺教育基金會，2013.06

面；公分

年刊

部分內容為英文

簡體字版

ISBN 978-986-87362-2-1(平裝)

1. 佛教 2. 禪宗 3. 期刊

220.5

102011276

# 正觉学报 — 第四期

*Journal of True Enlightenment*

创 办 人：萧平实

总 编 辑：白志伟

作 者：蔡礼政、张志成、袁经文

出 版 者：财团法人正觉教育基金会

地 址：103 台北市承德路三段 267 号 10 楼

电 话：886-2-2595 6092

传 真：886-2-2595 4493

学 报 网 址：<http://scholar.enlighten.org.tw>

版 次、日 期：初版首刷 2013/6/30 二千册

国 内 定 价：每期新台币 300 元

国 外 定 价：每期 15 美元

## 宗 旨

正觉学报的宗旨,在于弘扬释迦牟尼佛实证第八识如来藏而成就佛道的佛法义学,秉持学术界客观求真的科学精神,以合乎三量—至教量、现量、比量—的辩证方法,公平客观的引证态度,以及真修实证的立场,引导佛学界回归以实证为目标的佛法义学。

## Mission Statement

The mission of the *Journal of True Enlightenment* is to spread **Buddha Sakyamuni's** doctrine of attaining Buddhahood through the personal realization of the eighth consciousness, Tathagatagarbha, and to guide the Buddhist academia back to the correct understanding of Buddhist sutras based on the scientific spirit of objectively pursuing the truth, the methodology of the three-ways-of-knowing—knowing by ultimate teachings, personal experience and logical inference, the fair attitude of citation, and the standpoint of both real practice and personal realization.

# 正觉学报 — Issue 4

*Journal of True Enlightenment*

## Editorial Board

The Teaching Group of True Enlightenment Practitioners Association

Chu Lichuan	Chou Tzuchuan
Chou Huannming	Chang Hwoching
Chen Chienyuan	Jea Kuenfang

Founder	:	Pings Xiao
Chief Editor	:	Pai Chihwei
Authors	:	Tsai Lichen, Chang Chihcheng, Yuan Jingwen
Publisher	:	True Enlightenment Education Foundation
Address	:	10th Fl., No. 267, Sec. 3, Chengde Rd., Datong District, Taipei 103, Taiwan, R.O.C.
Telephone	:	886-2-2595 6092
Fax	:	886-2-2595 4493
Website	:	<a href="http://scholar.enlighten.org.tw">http://scholar.enlighten.org.tw</a>
Edition and Date	:	1 <sup>st</sup> edition, first print, 2013/6/30, 2000 copies
Domestic Price	:	NT\$300/copy
Overseas Price	:	US\$ 15/copy



## 编辑序言

佛教是一个富有科学实证精神与批判精神的理性宗教，因为佛教正法所宣说的解脱智慧与实相智慧，完全符合有情生命与器世间所涉及现象界与实相界的事实真相，因此佛教实证与批判的内涵是涵盖一切世间法与出世间法。所以佛教经典中经常可见释迦牟尼佛劝说众生「宜舍此恶邪见」<sup>1</sup>、「不邪见」<sup>2</sup>，乃至为救护众生而劝告佛弟子「勤破邪见」<sup>3</sup>、「胜智摧邪智」<sup>4</sup>；也就是以实证第八识如来藏心的解脱智慧与实相智慧，批判摧灭偏邪而不符法界实相的错误见解，以期利他与自利。这是大乘佛教独有的殊胜智慧，不但不共于二乘圣者<sup>5</sup>，也不共于一切外道、宗教或纯粹的学术研究。

在大乘佛教的不同宗派中，都可以看到以同样的实证精神与批判精神作为核心价值。例如唯识宗<sup>6</sup>的玄奘大师在《成唯识论》中主张「若不摧邪难以显正」<sup>7</sup>，或如中国禅宗许多证悟祖师「拈提古今」<sup>8</sup>，都是具体的案例。玄奘大师与禅宗祖师们之

<sup>1</sup> 《长阿含经》卷 7：【又语婆罗门：「汝今宜舍此恶邪见，勿为长夜自增苦恼。」】《大正藏》册 1，页 45，上 27-28。

<sup>2</sup> 《长阿含经》卷 6：【(佛告婆悉咤：)「婆悉咤！若刹利种中有不杀者，有不盗、不淫、不妄语、不两舌、不恶口、不绮语、不悭贪、不嫉妬、不邪见；婆罗门种、居士、首陀罗种，亦皆如是同修十善。夫行善法必有善报，行清白行必有白报。」】《大正藏》册 1，页 37，上 17-21。

<sup>3</sup> 《长阿含经》卷 9：「云何七知法？谓七勤：勤于戒行、勤灭贪欲、勤破邪见、勤于多闻、勤于精进、勤于正念、勤于禅定。」《大正藏》册 1，页 54，下 6-9。

<sup>4</sup> 《诸法集要经》卷 1：「住四无所畏，能降诸恐怖；正念祛妄念，胜智摧邪智。」《大正藏》册 17，页 458，下 10-11。

<sup>5</sup> 因为二乘圣者只实证蕴处界虚妄不实，不证第八识如来藏心，因此大乘菩萨实证第八识的实相智慧并不共于二乘圣者。

<sup>6</sup> 唯识宗，一般称之为法相唯识宗。请参考：平实导师著，《宗通与说通》，正智出版社（台北），2001，页 315。

<sup>7</sup> 《成唯识论》卷 3：「若不摧邪难以显正。」《大正藏》册 31，页 12，下 18-19。

<sup>8</sup> 《大慧普觉禅师宗门武库》卷 1：【严阳尊者见赵州。有僧问：「如何是佛？」云：「土块。」「如何是法？」云：「地动也。」「如何是僧？」「吃粥吃饭。」又问：「如何是新兴水？」云：「前面江里。」师云：「似这般法门，恰似儿戏相似；入得这般法门，方安乐得人。如真净和尚拈提古今，不在雪窦之下，而末流传习，却成恶口小家。只管问古人作么生，真又如何下语，杨岐又如何下语。尔管得许多闲事，瘥病不假驴驼药。若是对病与药，篱根下拾得一

所以能够摧邪显正、拈提古今，就是因为实证第八识如来藏心，甚至因此发起唯识种智智慧。特别是禅宗所强调明心与见性的实证，正是佛教之贤圣能够以「胜智摧邪智」的智慧根源。<sup>9</sup>

然而，也有假冒佛教的外道宗派，错以为辨正佛教义理的能力，系来自于学术式的、思辩式的、固定问答式的「辩经训练」<sup>10</sup>，并以此自豪。例如，西藏流亡到印度的达赖伪政府所弘传本质只是双身法与鬼神信仰的「藏传佛教」，却将佛教的批判精神与批判能力，错误地归属于「辩经训练」。其实，佛法中以「胜智摧邪智」的智慧与能力，并不是透过类似达赖喇嘛所设立达兰萨拉辩经学院的「辩经训练」而来；而是以科学实证的精神与方法验证蕴处界的虚妄不实，以及蕴处界之上别有第八识如来藏心真实存在；因此实证解脱智慧与实相智慧而发起择法眼，与学术训练、思辩训练或问答训练毫无关系。

继承自应成派中观的六识论思想而作的辩经训练，无论如何训练思辩、研究与问答，终不离六识虚妄的言语境界<sup>11</sup>，终不离夜夜自我断灭的虚妄境界，如何可能解脱生死流转？不能解脱生死，又有何殊胜之处而能胜他呢？因此依于辩经训练之「藏传佛教」，于双身法之邪淫或六识之断灭等本质，终不能自辩而无法使之转变为清净、常住。如此依于虚妄六识所建立的辩经训练，何有批判及自省之能力可言？如此依于人类有情皆能实证的六识论，与外道凡夫并无不同，而没有任何殊胜的智慧可言。如此同于外道凡夫的辩经训练，显然没有不共于外道凡夫的解脱智慧与实相智慧，因此

---

茎草，便可疗病，说什么朱砂附子人参白术。」】《大正藏》册47，页951，下6-15。

「拈提」的意义有多重，就如同批判的意义也有多重；拈提与批判，除了指出他人错误的意义外，同时也有指示出正确道理而利益他人的积极性意义。

<sup>9</sup> 玄奘大师创立法相唯识宗，虽非禅宗一系，但是玄奘大师能依于八识建立三种能变识，分疏百法，抉择正讹，皆因实证禅宗所证的第八识如来藏心，甚且证量超越于诸多禅宗祖师之故。

<sup>10</sup> 根据西藏流亡政府的官方网站所刊载，刘毓珠著，〈印度辩经学院：学僧喇嘛的摇篮〉介绍的文章：「所谓的辩经，它是一种抉择，透过『应成』的理论能够逐一排遣矛盾、去除疑惑，且能越趣深入，得到最严密和正确的抉择，此抉择慧即是思所成慧。」（2011/5/27 撷取自西藏流亡政府官方网站：<http://www.xizang-zhiye.org/b5/comp/ddi/tdddi01.html>）

由于辩经学院的辩经训练，是承继自应成中观师的训练，而且西藏流亡政府官方网站认同其辩经训练是「思所成慧」，所以只是学术式、思辩式与固定问答式的训练，并无修所成慧，故非真正的智慧。

<sup>11</sup> 应成派中观师皆是六识论者，主张法界只有眼耳鼻舌身意等六识，主张第七、八识仅是意识的细分，否定第七识与第八识的存在，与佛陀以八识论破诸外道迥然不同。



可知达赖喇嘛建立达兰萨拉辩经学院所弘扬的「藏传佛教」，根本不属于佛教的任何宗派，其实只是贪着世间淫欲而迷信鬼神的喇嘛教。

由于大乘佛教从天竺流传至东土，并在震旦从唐宋二代以降，以生动活泼的禅宗面貌，开展出兴盛的大乘文化。而禅宗不但标举明心见性的实证目标，并且展现「拈提古今」的批判精神，因此禅宗文化颇能代表大乘佛教实证与批判的核心精神。然而批判精神却不能离开佛教实证的前提而存在，若离佛教实证的前提，则是落入纯学术想象之中。如同日本「批判佛教」松本史朗之类，就是犯下这个过失，使他们对正统佛教的批判沦落到荒谬绝伦的地步。由此之故，本期学报以「中国禅宗、批判佛教」作为主题，并且采用三篇相关的论文如下：

- 1、中国禅宗探源——并略论三乘圣者同闻大乘经典（蔡礼政）
- 2、以实证佛学探究中国禅宗的禅法传承本质——以萧平实老师的义学主张为范式（张志成）
- 3、「批判佛教」思潮之「基体」论谬误剖析（袁经文）

蔡礼政著作的〈中国禅宗探源——并略论三乘圣者同闻大乘经典〉，系以《阿含经》为文献证据，证明中国大乘禅宗源流自《阿含经》结集<sup>12</sup>前由佛陀亲口所宣说。作者首先引用《中阿含经》的《蜜丸喻经》提出**实证性批判**（positivist criticism），作为解读佛教经典的方法论。作者认为只有亲自实证法界实相，再运用实证所得的解脱智慧与实相智慧，才能够对于佛教经典中种种「略说」有正确的理解，才能够具备批判的能力；相对的，目前学术界常用**文本批判**（text criticism）的方法，而没有任何实证的智慧，则不但不能正确解读经典中的「略说」，也常常导致错误的判读与结论。其中一个严重而显着的例子，就是大乘佛法如果可以溯源于《阿含经》的「略说」，则逻辑上应该就证明此大乘佛法在《阿含经》结集前，已经由佛陀亲口宣说；可是许多学者将部派佛教后大乘佛法的复兴溯源于《阿含经》的「略说」，错误地判读《阿含经》中的声闻教为「初期佛教」，否定大乘佛法是佛陀亲口所说，误指大乘佛法是释迦佛入灭后的佛弟子所创造，不符四阿含诸经中的教证。因此，作者认为部派佛教后大乘佛教的再次兴盛，应该称为「大乘复兴」而不应该称为「初期大乘兴起」，唯

<sup>12</sup> 四大部《阿含经》约 1500 部经典，是第一次五百结集时由四十位声闻阿罗汉与其他果位的声闻人共同结集一次完成。其后之七百结集，是百余年后声闻人结集律典（十事非法）等，并非结集阿含部经典，详见平实导师《阿含正义》举证之四阿含诸经原文教证。由七百结集之律典内容，亦可证实之。

有「大乘复兴」的说法才是符合史实的历史定位。

对于中国禅宗的源流，该文继续运用实证性批判的方法，举出南北传《阿含经》所共同记载的鸯掘魔罗追佛事件，其实是一则生动活泼的禅宗公案；对于采用**文本批判**方法的学者而言，一则生动活泼而富含深妙佛法妙义的禅宗公案，却仅仅被视为一则佛典故事而已。对于禅宗公案，一向予人有摸不着头绪之感；作者引用《增壹阿含经》中关于鸯掘魔罗公案略说的经文，阐释禅宗公案所指示参究法界实相的理路，以及实证禅宗公案所修断的内涵，揭开禅宗公案千百年来的神秘面纱，可以作为未来禅学研究的指导方针。

该文不仅诠释禅宗公案的参究理路与修断内容，而且同时以《阿含经》经文举出大乘「真实禅」与小乘「方便禅思」的不同。显示在佛世时，佛陀不但说小乘禅，也同时宣说大乘禅，二乘法声闻圣者也同时与闻，证明三乘佛法确实皆是佛陀所亲口宣说。除此之外，作者极具巧思，从《阿含经》中举出三则生动活泼的禅宗公案，以及一则野狐公案；并且从禅宗祖师语录中选取相对应的禅宗公案与野狐公案，彼此相互辉映对照，不但显示中国禅宗确实源流于佛世，亦显得妙趣横生，意味无穷。

该文又另举一则《阿含经》中所载，婆四咤婆罗门尼遥见世尊无量大众围绕说法而开悟明心的公案，显示结集《阿含经》的声闻圣者与大乘菩萨共同参与佛陀演说般若经法会的文献证据。《阿含经》中禅宗公案的文献证据，不但证明三乘贤圣同闻大乘经典的历史事实，同时也证明只有在大庭广众之下，佛陀示现禅宗公案令当机的大乘菩萨开悟明心，而其余与会大众如痴如盲的大乘禅宗，才是佛教中真正的密教，至于达赖喇嘛所弘传的「藏传佛教」，根本不是佛教，更不是密教。

作者以**实证性批判**的方法论贯串全文，举出《阿含经》富含禅宗公案文献证据的史实，使得中国大乘禅宗直接溯源承继自佛陀直接地示现说法，并且对于《阿含经》富含禅宗公案的历史意义提出极深刻的诠释，建立了中国禅宗不可质疑的佛法地位。整篇文章的研究方法新颖，处处可见别具只眼的见解，研究成果极为丰硕。该文以新视角重新解读古文献《阿含经》，为近代禅学研究经常围绕于敦煌文献的解读之外，开创禅学文献资料的新视角与新领域，亦树立近代中国禅学研究新的里程碑。

张志成著作的〈以实证佛学探究中国禅宗的禅法传承本质——以萧平实老师的义学主张为范式〉，提出「以实证诠释为本」的方法论贯串全文，以期能够拨开**祖统说**依人传递的表相法脉传承事相的迷雾，直探禅法传承的义学本质与实证内涵。作者举出永嘉玄觉禅师自己悟后由六祖慧能印证，因此被《景德传灯录》列为「第三十三祖

慧能大师法嗣」之一。由此可见中国禅宗传承的本质，自古以来皆是以不变的实证内容——实证第八识如来藏心——作为传承的具体内涵，并且皆以上位菩萨作为禅法的依止师，而非只依表面上师徒关系而论禅法的传承，指出依法不依人的真正法脉传承，方属中国佛教的真正传承。

该文同时指出，佛法义学其实是「以实证诠释为本」的实证佛学作为核心；而实证佛学不是一种思想观念或玄想理论的哲学，而是奠基于真实的证悟第八识如来藏心。作者举示大乘经论证明实证第八识如来藏心，因此才能发起的般若智慧确实是全部大乘佛法的核心；而萧平实老师的义学主张也是以实证第八识如来藏为核心，与大乘经论完全相契相合。因此作者认为萧平实老师主张以实证第八识如来藏作为全部佛法实证的核心，确实是符于三乘经论所宣说的佛法本质，并且足以作为所有修学佛法者学习与效法的范式。

该文同时以实证佛学为核心，直指现代佛学学术界探讨佛法与禅宗时，经常以文献学、考据学、思想史、哲学、语意诠释学等等侧重思想哲理、思想发展史的世间层面方法来分析研究，但是却忽略实证方法在佛学研究的方法论中所具有关键性的角色。作者同时举出日本的「批判佛教」与台湾的释印顺都是以「六识论的缘起性空」作纯思想的研究，缺乏对《阿含经》中所说第八识如来藏的实证体验，才会对佛教教义的核心——八识论的如来藏思想——持反对的意见。同样的，中国大陆的吕澄虽是八识论者，但是因为不能实证第八识如来藏，所以对于如来藏「性寂」与「性觉」并俱而不冲突一事不能信解，因此错误地认为《起信论》、《楞严经》等等大乘经论是中土创造的伪经伪论，错误地否定大乘经典的真实性。该文作者由此种种证据出发，最后归结于禅宗祖师对于般若和如来藏系经论等同看待的态度，是教导弟子以实证为目的而自由运用，并非思想上有演变或融合的现象，推翻了六识论者及尚未实证者对于中国禅宗严重误会所作的结论。

该文同时举出禅宗语录的文献证据，证明中国禅宗以实证第八识如来藏为标的，这不仅仅是萧平实老师的主张，而且也是中国禅宗一切真悟祖师的共同见解，并与印度大乘佛法的核心教义相契相符。该文并对禅宗开悟是渐是顿、如来禅与祖师禅的差异等等重要议题，同时进行深刻的探讨。该文以**实证佛教**之主张，总括近代学术界争议分歧的要点；并且旁征博引纵横古今，令禅宗从印度至现代中国之传法本质清晰可辨，是篇甚具创见的佳作。

袁经文著作的〈「批判佛教」思潮之「基体」论谬误剖析〉，将日本「批判佛教」

抨击中国传统佛教天台宗、华严宗和禅宗的唯识与如来藏学说的观点，归纳出四个特征：一个靶的，两个渊源，视角异化泛化，佛教学养不实；而以第四特征贯串于前三个特征中。其中，「批判佛教」以「界」论的「基体论」来体现出印度唯识学的阿赖耶识和如来藏思想，并作为批判的「一个靶的」。

该文指出松本史朗将老子哲学、神我论、梵我思想和世界东西方古老民族，对于生命根源于共同的一个「基体」的「一元论」思想，附和为佛教的如来藏思想，根本就是对佛教教义的错误认知。因为佛教的基本思想是每一个众生都有自己独一无二的如来藏（亦名阿赖耶识），而一切众生各各独尊的如来藏体性皆完全相同，与同一个「基体」的「一元论」刚好相反，也与老子哲学、神我论、梵我思想完全不同。作者指出松本史朗将如来藏含藏一切种子、出生一切法的深义，以简单化的老子思想、梵我思想比附，显然只是拙劣性的皮毛相似而已，并没有真正了解佛教的核心义理。

该文涉及第八识如来藏的空性与虚空、虚空界，如来藏与「基体」所指涉的场所哲学（locus philosophy），如来藏与实体，阿赖耶识体是常或无常的种种辨正与分析，直指日本「批判佛教」对于中国佛教教义错误理解的根本缺失。由于日本「批判佛教」对于佛教基本思想的认识，有根本上的错误，正好显示出日本「批判佛教」的「佛教学养不实」。作者全篇对日本「批判佛教」所提出的六识论作综合性辨析，以显示「批判佛教」的「佛教学养不实」乃是根本特征；而「批判佛教」之所以会有「佛教学养不实」的问题，就是缺乏解读佛教经典的基本要求——实证第八识如来藏。该文对于「批判佛教」有深刻的分析与辨正，是一篇回应日本「批判佛教」的佳作。

以上三篇论文，从直探中国禅宗之源流，或者综论古今佛教禅法的传承本质，乃至旁及现代日本新兴的「批判佛教」佛学议题，全都围绕在佛教教义是否指向「实证第八识如来藏」的关键议题。换言之，只有从实证而获得解脱智慧与实相智慧，才能够综论古今所涉及宇宙与生命实相的一切议题；甚至及于「辩经训练」是否能正确获得佛法智慧的方法论，乃至回到什么是众生「宜舍此恶邪见」的基本内涵。而且从上述三篇论文精彩的论述与辨正，不但发古人之所未发，乃至见今人之所未见，正是显示实证才是获得解脱智慧与实相智慧的源泉。

总编辑

白志伟 谨识

公元 二〇一一年六月六日

## Editorial Note

Buddhism is a rational religion full of scientific, positivist, and critical spirits. The liberation wisdom and the wisdom of ultimate reality expounded in the true Buddhism are in complete accord with the true facts of the phenomenal world and the ultimate reality, both of which are involved with the life of sentient beings and the material worlds. Hence, the positivist and critical contents of Buddhism include all mundane and transmundane dharmas. In Buddhist sutras, it is often found that Buddha Sakyamuni advised sentient beings **“to renounce these evil erroneous views”**<sup>1</sup> and **“to have no erroneous views”**<sup>2</sup>; to save sentient beings, the Buddha even advised the Buddhist disciples **“to diligently refute the evil views”**<sup>3</sup> and **“to use the supreme wisdom to destroy the evil wisdom.”**<sup>4</sup> Namely, with the liberation wisdom and the wisdom of ultimate reality attained from the actual realization of the eighth *vijnana* Tathagatagarbha, one criticizes and destroys the erroneous views that are incompatible with the ultimate reality of dharma-realm to benefit oneself and others. This is the exceptional wisdom unique to Mahayana Buddhism, but not commonly shared by the saints of Two Vehicles<sup>5</sup>, non-Buddhists, and religious or pure academic researchers.

In different schools of Mahayana Buddhism, we can see the core value based on the same positivist and critical spirits. For example, in the *Treatise on the Establishment of Vijnana-Only*, Master Xuanzang of the Vijnana-Only School<sup>6</sup> claimed, **“It will be difficult to manifest the right dharma if one does not destroy the evil one,”**<sup>7</sup> or in the Chinese Chan School, many enlightened patriarchs **“comment on ancient and modern masters”**<sup>8</sup>; both are typical examples. The reason

<sup>1</sup> The *Dirgha-Agama*, Vol. 7: “The Buddha told the Brahman again, ‘You should renounce these evil erroneous views and do not increase your vexations by yourself for a long time.’” (CBETA, T01, no. 1, p. 45, a27-28)

<sup>2</sup> The *Dirgha-Agama*, Vol. 6: (The Buddha told Vasistha,) “Vasistha! For example, there are Kshatriyas who do no killing, no stealing, no sexual misconduct, no deception, no divisive speech, no harsh speech, no idle talks, no stinginess or greed, no jealousy, and no erroneous views; there are also Brahmins, Vaishyas, and Shudras who similarly practice the ten good deeds. Those who do the good deeds will certainly receive good retributions, and those who do the pure practices will certainly receive pure retributions.” (CBETA, T01, no. 1, p. 37, a17-21)

<sup>3</sup> The *Dirgha-Agama*, Vol. 9: “What are the seven knowing dharmas? They refer to the seven diligences: diligence in precepts, diligence in eliminating the greed, diligence in destroying the erroneous views, diligence in hearing much, diligence in effort, diligence in correct thought, and diligence in *samadhi*.” (CBETA, T01, no. 1, p. 54, c6-9)

<sup>4</sup> *The Sutra of Essential Collections of All Dharmas*, Vol. 1: “Dwelling in the four kinds of fearlessness, one can calm all fears. One uses the correct thought to remove the delusional thought, and uses the supreme wisdom to destroy the evil wisdom.” (CBETA, T17, no. 728, p. 458, c10-11)

<sup>5</sup> The saints of Two Vehicles have actually realized only the illusory unreality of aggregates, sense-fields and sense-realms, but not the eighth *vijnana* Tathagatagarbha. Therefore, the wisdom of ultimate reality attained from the actual realization of the eighth *vijnana* by the Mahayana bodhisattvas is not commonly shared by the saints of Two Vehicles.

<sup>6</sup> The Vijnana-Only School is generally called the Dharma-Character School of Vijnana-Only [Vijnanavada]. Please refer to *Mastery of School Tenets and Eloquence*, Venerable Pings Xiao, True Wisdom Publishing Co. (Taipei), 2001, p. 315.

<sup>7</sup> *Treatise on the Establishment of Vijnana-Only*, Vol. 3: “It will be difficult to manifest the right dharma if one does not destroy the evil one.” (CBETA, T31, no. 1585, p. 12, c18-19)

<sup>8</sup> *Chan Master Dahui Pujue's Arsenal for the Chan School*, Vol. 1: “Venerable Yanyang visited Chan Master Zhaozhou. A monk asked, ‘What is a Buddha?’ The master answered, ‘A clod.’ ‘What is the dharma?’ ‘An earthquake.’ ‘What is a monastic?’ ‘Eating gruel and eating rice.’ ‘What is the Xinxing water?’ ‘In the river before us.’ The master said, ‘Such a

why Master Xuanzang could destroy the evil dharma and manifest the right one, or the Chan patriarchs could comment on the ancient and the modern, is that they had personally realized the eighth *viññana* Tathagatagarbha and even had attained the way-seed-prajna of Vijnana-Only. In particular, the actual realization of the true mind and seeing the Buddha-nature emphasized in the Chan School is exactly the origin of wisdom, by which the Buddhist sages and saints can “**use the supreme wisdom to destroy the evil wisdom.**”<sup>9</sup>

However, there are also non-Buddhist schools under the guise of Buddhism falsely believing that the capability of Buddhist doctrine debate comes from “the training in scripture debate,”<sup>10</sup> which is academic, dialectical, and catechetic; they are also proud of it. For instance, exiled from Tibet to India, the Dalai’s bogus government propagates “Tibetan Buddhism,” whose essence is merely the couple practice of copulation, with a belief in ghosts and deities. They mistakenly believe that the critical spirit and capability of Buddhism come from the “training in scripture debate.” In fact, the capability to “**use the supreme wisdom to destroy the evil wisdom**” does not come from the “training in scripture debate” similar to that in the Institute of Buddhist Dialectics founded by the Dalai Lama in Dharamsala. With the scientific, positivist spirits and methods, the Buddhist wisdom actually comes from the verification that the aggregates, sense-fields, and sense-realms are illusory unreality, and that there is the eighth *viññana* Tathagatagarbha really existing beyond the aggregates, sense-fields, and sense-realms. Therefore, to actually realize the liberation wisdom and the wisdom of ultimate reality to bring about the eye for discriminating the right doctrines has nothing to do with the academic, dialectical, or catechetic trainings.

---

dharma-door is just like a trifling matter. However, after entering this dharma-door, one can attain peace and happiness. For example, Monk Zhenjing **commented on ancient and modern masters**. What he did is not less than that of Chan Master Xuedou. However, after propagation to the later Buddhist learners, Zhenjing’s comments have become harsh words or statements of less importance. Just ask how the ancient masters did it, how you say about the True Suchness, and how Chan Master Yongqi said about it. You are involved in many unimportant things, and the disease is not cured by a lot of medicines. Given the correct medicine, the disease can be cured by picking up a blade of grass under a fence; it is unnecessary to take medicines such as cinnabar, monkshood, ginseng, or Atractylodes (Bai Zhu).” (CBETA, T47, no. 1998B, p. 951, c6-15)

The meanings of “commenting” are manifold, just like those of criticizing; in addition to the meaning of pointing out others’ mistakes, commenting and criticizing have the positive meaning of pointing out the correct principle to benefit others.

<sup>9</sup> Master Xuanzang founded the Dharma-Character School of Vijnana-Only. Although it is not a lineage of the Chan School, Master Xuanzang could establish the three able-changing *viññanas* based on the eight *viññanas*, interpret the hundred dharmas, and choose between right and wrong. It is all because he had actually realized the eighth *viññana* Tathagatagarbha, which is also realized in the Chan School, and his attainment surpasses those of many Chan patriarchs.

<sup>10</sup> According to the official website of the exiled Tibetan government, Liu Yuzhu, “The Institute of Buddhist Dialectics in India: The Cradle of Lama Students”: “The so-called scripture debate is a choice; through the Prasangika theory, one can dispel contradictions step by step and eliminate doubts; going deeper and deeper, one finally makes the strictest and most correct choice. This choosing wisdom is exactly the wisdom attained from thinking.” (Retrieved from the official website of the exiled Tibetan government: <http://www.xizang-zhiye.org/b5/comp/ddi/tdddi01.html>. 2011/5/27.)

Because the training in scripture debate in the Institute of Buddhist Dialectics is the training inherited from the gurus of Prasangika Madhyamika, and the official website of the exiled Tibetan government agrees that its training in scripture debate is “the wisdom attained from thinking,” it is an academic, dialectical, and catechetic training, devoid of the wisdom attained from practice, and therefore it is not the true wisdom.



The training in scripture debate, which inherits the theory of six *vijnanas* from Prasāṅgika Mādhyamika, is connected with the illusory language state of six *vijnanas*,<sup>11</sup> which cease to exist every night; how could it be possible to be liberated from the cycle of births and deaths? Unable to be liberated from births and deaths, how could one be exceptional and superior to others? Hence, based on the training in scripture debate, the practitioners of “Tibetan Buddhism” cannot defend their viewpoints about the sexual misconduct of the copulation *tantra* or the nihilistic essence of six *vijnanas*, which cannot be transformed into a state of purity or permanent existence. How could the training in scripture debate based on the illusory six *vijnanas* enable one to be critical and introspective? In this way, based on the theory of six *vijnanas*, which can be actually realized by all human beings, the practitioners of “Tibetan Buddhism” are the same as non-Buddhists and ordinary mortals, devoid of any exceptional wisdom. Obviously, such training in scripture debate, similar to non-Buddhists and ordinary mortals, cannot bring about the liberation wisdom or the wisdom of ultimate reality, which are not commonly shared by non-Buddhists or ordinary mortals. Therefore, the “Tibetan Buddhism” propagated by the Dalai Lama in the Institute of Buddhist Dialectics in Dharamsala does not belong to any Buddhist school, but in fact the Lamaism, which craves the mundane lust with a blind belief in ghosts and deities.

Mahayana Buddhism spread eastwards from India. In China, manifested as the lively Chan School, the Mahayana culture had been flourishing after the Tang and Song dynasties. The Chan School not only sets goals to actually realize the true mind and see the Buddha-nature but also shows the critical spirit of “**commenting on ancient and modern masters.**” Therefore, the Chan culture represents the core spirits of actual enlightenment and criticism in Mahayana Buddhism. However, the critical spirit cannot exist without the premise of Buddhist actual enlightenment; otherwise, it would fall into the trap of purely academic imagination. Just like Shiro Matsumoto of “Critical Buddhism” in Japan, people made this error, and their critique of the orthodox Buddhism is completely absurd. For this reason, the topics of this issue are about “the Chinese Chan School and Critical Buddhism,” and three related articles are presented as follows:

1. Exploring the Origin of the Chinese Chan School—Also a Brief Comment on the Saints of Three Vehicles Hearing Mahayana Teachings Together (Tsai Lichen)
2. To Explore the Essence of Chan Transmission in the Chinese Chan School with Positivist Buddhism—Using the Practical Theory of Venerable Pings Xiao as a Model (Chang Chihcheng)

<sup>11</sup> The gurus of Prasāṅgika Mādhyamika all support the theory of six *vijnanas*; they hold that there are only six *vijnanas*, namely the eye-*vijnana*, the ear-*vijnana*, the nose-*vijnana*, the tongue-*vijnana*, the body-*vijnana*, and the Manovijñāna [the consciousness], in the dharma-realm, and the seventh and eighth *vijnanas* are merely the subtle levels of the Manovijñāna. They negate the existence of the seventh *vijnana* and the eighth *vijnana*. Their view is entirely different from that of the Buddha, who refuted the non-Buddhists with the theory of eight *vijnanas*.

### 3. Analyzing the Errors in the “Dhātu-vāda” of the “Critical Buddhism” (Yuan Jingwen)

Using the *Agama Sutras* as the documental evidence, Tsai Lichen’s article “Exploring the Origin of the Chinese Chan School—Also a Brief Comment on the Saints of Three Vehicles Hearing Mahayana Teachings Together” proves that the Chinese Mahayana Chan School originates from what the Buddha had personally expounded before the collection of the *Agama Sutras*.<sup>12</sup> According to *The Sutra of Honey Pill Simile* in the *Madhyama-Agama*, Tsai first proposes **positivist criticism** as the methodology of interpreting the Buddhist sutras. The author believes that only through the personal realization of the ultimate reality of dharma-realm, with the further application of the liberation wisdom and the wisdom of ultimate reality obtained from actual enlightenment, can one have a correct understanding of the various “brief teachings” in the Buddhist sutras. In contrast, without any wisdom of actual enlightenment, the method of text criticism currently used by the academic world not only makes one misunderstand the “brief teachings” in the sutras, but also leads to misinterpretations and wrong conclusions frequently. Among them, a serious, obvious example is that, if Mahayana Buddhism can be traced back to the “brief teachings” of the *Agama Sutras*, it logically proves that Mahayana Buddhism had been personally expounded by the Buddha before the collection of the *Agama Sutras*. However, the fact that the revival of Mahayana Buddhism after the Sectarian Buddhism can be traced back to the “brief teachings” of the *Agama Sutras* is misinterpreted by many scholars as that the sound-hearing teachings in the *Agama Sutras* are “Early Buddhism”; they deny that Mahayana Buddhism was personally expounded by the Buddha, and wrongly claim that Mahayana Buddhism was created by the Buddhist disciples after Buddha Sakyamuni passed away. What they say is not in accord with the sutra teachings of four Agama divisions. Hence, the author believes that “the revival of Mahayana Buddhism” after the Sectarian Buddhism should be called as such, but not the “initial arising of Mahayana”; only “the revival of Mahayana Buddhism” is the correct term used for its historical positioning in conformity with the historical fact.

Concerning the origin of the Chinese Chan School, the author still applies the method of positivist criticism and cites the event of Angulimala chasing the Buddha, which is recorded in the *Agama Sutras* of both Southern and Northern traditions and in fact a lively Chan Koan. For those scholars who use the method of text criticism, a lively Chan Koan with profound Buddhist meaning is merely

---

<sup>12</sup> The *Agama Sutras* of the four divisions include roughly 1,500 sutras, which were collected by forty sound-hearer *arhats* and sound-hearers of other fruition-stages in the First Buddhist Council of the five hundred. Later, the Second Buddhist Council of the seven hundred was about the collection of the *vinaya* sutras (ten practices not in accord with the dharma) by the sound-hearers more than a hundred years after the Buddha’s passing away. It was not about the collection of the Agama sutras. Please refer to the original text proof cited from the four Agama sutras in *The Correct Meanings of The Agama Sutras* by Venerable Pings Xiao. One can also prove that fact with reference to the contents of the *vinaya* sutras of the Second Buddhist council.



regarded as a Buddhist story. People always feel confused about the Chan Koans. The author cites the sutra passage about the brief teachings of the Angulimala's Koan in the *Ekottara-Agama* to explain the reasoning process for meditatively contemplating the ultimate reality of dharma-realm and the contents to be eliminated for actually realizing the Chan Koan. Lifting the mystical veil of Chan Koans, this study can be the guiding principle for the future research in Chan.

Tsai's article not only interprets the reasoning process and the contents to be eliminated for meditatively contemplating the Chan Koans, but also points out the difference between the Mahayana "real Chan" and the Hinayana "expedient Chan thought" with the citations from the *Agama Suttas*. It shows that, during His lifetime, the Buddha expounded the Hinayana Chan and the Mahayana Chan at the same time, and the sound-hearer saints of Two Vehicles also heard the teachings together; this proves that the Buddha did personally expound the Buddha dharma of Three Vehicles. In addition, the ingenious author presents three lively Chan Koans from the *Agama Suttas* and a Wild-Fox Chan, and selects the corresponding Chan Koans and the Wild-Fox Chan from the written records of Chan patriarchs to compare with each other; it shows that the Chinese Chan School indeed originated from the Buddha's teachings and is full of wit and humor, with infinite meanings.

Tsai's article also cites another Koan from the *Agama Suttas*, which says that Vasistha, a female Brahmin, became enlightened after seeing from a distance that The World-Honored One, surrounded by countless people, spoke the dharma. This Koan is the documental evidence showing that the sound-hearer saints, who collected the *Agama Suttas* later, and the Mahayana bodhisattvas together participated in the dharma assembly in which the Buddha expounded the *prajna* sutras. The documental evidence of the Chan Koans in the *Agama Suttas* proves not only the historical fact that the saints of Three Vehicles heard the Mahayana teachings together, but also the fact that, before a big crowd, the Buddha could show a Chan Koan to make the qualified Mahayana bodhisattvas become enlightened, while the rest participating people were ignorant and blind to the Buddha's teaching. This shows that only the Mahayana Chan School is the true secret school of Buddhism. As for the "Tibetan Buddhism" propagated by the Dalai Lama, it is not Buddhism at all, nor is it a secret school.

With the methodology of positivist criticism running through his whole article, the author presents the documental evidence of historical facts that the *Agama Suttas* are full of Chan Koans, and this proves that the Chinese Mahayana Chan School originated directly from the Buddha's direct teachings. The author also gives a very profound interpretation of the historical significance that the *Agama Suttas* are full of Chan Koans, which establishes the unquestionable position of the Chinese Chan School in Buddhism. The research method of this article is new; the author's unique