

# The Contradiction of Cultivation

## 修行中的悖論

Taken from a Talk by Dr. Martin Verhoeven Given at the Berkeley Buddhist Monastery on March 11, 2022

Chinese Translated by Cliff Wang

摘自馬汀維和文教授 2022年3月11日柏克萊寺講座

王立夫 中譯



Stan Shoptaugh 攝影

Photo by Stan Shoptaugh

There is a contradictory—or at least seemingly contradictory—dimension to the teachings on cultivation. On the one hand, one is exhorted to see through the false to find the true, one is enjoined to hold precepts and cultivate various contemplative practices calming the mind, stilling the mental fluctuations and the emotional ups and downs. And yet, on the other hand, elsewhere we are pointedly told not to seek, not to go after, not to let the mind grasp and attach. Sometimes teachings are presented that point out the absurdity, the silliness of grasping, seeking, attaching, and yet, on the other hand, sometimes teachings are presented that provide, even encourage, temporary things to go after and to take hold of.

The following verses from the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* exemplify the former type of instruction:

修行的教法中有這麼個悖論——或至少看起來有點矛盾，就是一方面，我們被教導要破妄顯真，持戒並修行各種觀照法門以安其心，平息思緒之波動和情緒之起伏；而另一方面，我們又被刻意教導不應尋求，不應追隨，不應抓取，不應執著。有時，教法會明確指出抓住、追求、執著是荒謬和愚蠢的，而有時教法甚至又會給我們一些暫時的對境讓心去觀察和專注。

以下《華嚴經》的這個偈頌（出自光明覺品第九），就是說明第一種教導的一個例子：

*If one looks for the taming and regulating master of peoples  
In the appearances of virtue and clan,  
This is like a disease of the eyes, which distorts one's vision.  
Someone like this can never appreciate the most supreme Dharma.  
The Thus Come One's form, appearance, and so on,  
Cannot be fathomed by anyone in the world.  
And if throughout ten million nayutas of kalpas one tried to  
comprehend them,  
Still the dimensions of these forms, marks, and awesome virtue  
turn without bounds.*

This passage from the *Avatamsaka Sūtra* speaks to the ineffable—how the Buddha's appearances are unfathomable. The concept here is the same as what we see in the *Vajra Sutra*. There, the Buddha is speaking to his disciple Subhūti. One of the questions Subhūti was trying to figure out is something really fundamental, not only to cultivation but to life in general: how do we find a stable place to abide in when indeed everything else is impermanent, fleeting, and fluctuating.

Basically, the Buddha responds to Subhūti by trying to quell his troubled mind, indicating to him that the troubled mind is brought on by his misunderstanding, his ways of looking at things that are not clear. And because of this lack of clarity, he comes up with all these doubts and questions.

So what the Buddha is trying to do is simply to bring Subhūti back to the ground of his own naturally awakened state and in doing so, calm his mind. Then it is by the calming of his mind, the letting go of the grasping and attaching and frantic seeking that's motivating him, that he gets freed, or liberated.

In the *Vajra Sutra*, the Buddha says,

*If one sees me in forms,  
If one seeks me in sounds,  
He practices a deviant way,  
And cannot see the Tathagata.*

This also includes smells, tastes, tangibles—even mental imaginings. Someone who looks for the Tathagata in any of those will never find him.

In fact, many metaphors are used to explain this paradoxical

若以威德色種族，而見人中調御師；  
是為病眼顛倒見，彼不能知最勝法。  
如來色形諸相等，一切世間莫能測；  
億那由劫共思量，色相威德轉無邊。

《華嚴經》的這段偈頌，講述了為什麼佛陀的形色是無法測度的，不可言喻的；同樣的概念，在《金剛經》中也有體現。在《金剛經》中，佛為弟子須菩提講法，須菩提問了一個不僅對修行，乃至對生活都非常重要的根本性問題：當一切都是無常（Impermanent）、遷流（fleeting）、變動（fluctuating）的時候，我們究竟依何而住。

基本上，佛通過問答來平息須菩提心中的煩惱，向他指示內心煩惱其實根源於錯誤的知見，是因為對事物的看法不透徹所致。正因這種不透徹，導致產生了各種的疑問和困惑。

所以佛的教導簡而言之就是，指引須菩提回歸到自性覺悟的心地，並在過程中來安其心。然後通過安心，放下之前驅動他的那些執取、執著和馳求，使須菩提重獲自由，或者說是解脫。

在《金剛經》中，佛說：

若以色見我，以音聲求我，  
是人行邪道，不能見如來。

不僅是「色」，這裡同樣也包括了氣味、味道、有形之物——乃至心中的念想；任何人想要在這些裡面尋找如來的踪跡是無有是處的。

實際上，有許多譬喻被用來探討上述所提到的自我修行中的這個悖論，筏喻就是其中之一。比如你發現自己站在河的一邊，此岸危機四伏，而且險象環生，毒獸蛇蟲，還有火災、乾

dimension of self-cultivation. One is the parable of the raft. You find yourself on one side of a river, on a shore full of danger and peril. The situation is very unsettled, turbulent, and fraught with obstacles; there are poisonous animals, snakes, fire, drought, and famine. None of these problems exist on the other side of the river. But how do you get there? There is no bridge, no ferry. There doesn't seem to be a way to get across. In desperation, almost pushed up against the wall, you go along the shore and you grab whatever will float—bamboo, sticks, and whatnot. You bind it all together quickly with whatever will hold it—you don't even have nails. Then you get on the raft and you enter into the stream to cross over. Since you are going against the stream to get to the other shore, you have to paddle frantically—or as the text says, “making an effort with your hands and feet.” Once you have crossed over to the other shore, as the Buddha points out, there is no need for the raft anymore, no need for the wild paddling: you can just let it go. Similarly, the Dharma is presented as a temporary expedient, taken up only because one has gotten caught up on one shore and needs to get across to the safety of the other shore.

The other metaphor that's often used is 'medicine.' Medicine is only required when imbalance occurs in the body, in the four elements. If there is no imbalance, then there is no need for medicine. If there is no greed, anger, and delusion, there is no need for śīla, samādhi, and prajñā—the medicine of Dharma. But even if there is a need for it, it should only be taken until health is restored, when the natural state is restored. At that point, the medicine is no longer useful and could potentially even be harmful or fatal.

Now, what this passage of the *Avataṃsaka Sūtra* is talking about is that not only is the nature of the Dharma-teachings expedient, but even the teacher, the Buddha, is only a phenomenal manifestation of the wisdom and compassion of a being who takes on different forms and appearances and shapes. The sole purpose of these manifestations is restoring the grounding, centering, and wholeness in other living beings that he or she encounters. But to mistake the appearance, even the virtues, manifested by the awakened being as an end-goal on which one then relies, really just becomes a spiritual sickness. That won't restore and bring one back to one's own state of self-reliant wholeness, but instead brings a kind of unhealthy dependency, either on the teachings or the teacher.

旱和饑荒。但是在河的彼岸並沒有這些危險。在沒有橋、沒有渡船的情況下，你如何從此岸到達彼岸呢？似乎無計可施，在絕望之際，你沿著河岸奔跑，找來竹子、樹枝等任何可能讓自己漂浮起來的東西。在甚至沒有釘子的情況下，你用任何能固定它的東西，想辦法迅速地將它們綁在一起做成竹筏。然後你跳上竹筏，衝入河中，穿過河流。由於要逆流而上，所以你必須奮力划槳，渡過河流——或者如經上所說的，還要「手腳並用」。一旦你到達彼岸了，正如佛陀所指出的，你就不需要這個竹筏了，也不再需要拼命地划槳：你可以放手了。同樣的，佛法也可以被呈現為一種暫時性的權宜方便，只是為了把人從被困的此岸，需要渡到安全的彼岸。

另一個常用的譬喻是「藥喻」。當人出現四大失調時，才需要藥物進行治療；若四大調和了，那麼就不需要用藥。人如果沒有貪、瞋、癡的病，就不需要戒、定、慧的法藥。即使有病吃藥，也只能服用到身體康復為止。身體恢復了，這時候就不應該再服藥了，否則就有潛在不利之危害。

現在《華嚴經》這個偈頌意思是說，不僅佛法是一種權教，就連導師佛陀也是智慧與慈悲的一種顯現，可以在眾生中化現種種身、種種相；而這些化現的唯一目的就是讓眾生返本還原，同歸一體。但是，如果把覺者所顯現的相好乃至美德，錯誤的作為自身所依止的終極目標，這實際上將成為一種靈性上的疾病。這將無法使人恢復到原本獨立而完整的生命狀態，反而會對教義亦或是導師產生一種不良的依賴。

然而，這至關重要的是，當力量或健康完全恢復時，這種依賴應該自

However—and this is really critical—that dependency is naturally let go of when strength or health is completely restored. Then it's possible, and even natural and desirable, to let go. Letting go before that is a misstep similar to abandoning the raft before safely reaching the other shore. It would be a kind of false sense of pride or an underestimating of one's own weakness. So there's a dynamic tension—between holding tight and letting go—that goes on in a practitioner's relationship to Dharma, to teachers.

The same applies to study. Studying the Dharma is for the purpose of absorbing philosophical, spiritual, medicinal, or therapeutic systems and structures that allow you to reframe thinking and seeing in such a way as to open up a direct encounter with the nature of things as they really are. Once this happens and the corresponding liberation occurs, there's no need for studying.

That's why there is this epithet for someone who has arrived at the stage of sagehood: “no need for further study.” But to drop the study before one directly penetrates is also a mistake because what you are relying on is an untamed mind, an unguided philosophical approach—and untended, without a compass, the mind will drift and wander. This is the nature of the unawakened mind: it drifts and wanders from one phenomenon, one teacher, one book to another. It's all very interesting, it's kind of an encyclopedia approach to knowledge, but in the end you have a grab bag of just information that doesn't really interconnect, integrate or penetrate. It doesn't really turn into a fire that lights up. It doesn't feed you but leaves you feeling empty, since it is just knowledge that does not bring liberation but instead a kind of over-stimulated perplexity.

So the wisdom that we are aiming for in practice is what the *Platform Sutra* calls “liberating knowledge” as opposed to just inquisitive knowledge, knowledge that is just there, that you carry in a bag or collect on a bookshelf. Liberating knowledge actually transforms and sets you free. Once the liberation occurs, you become the knowledge; the knowledge becomes you.

At that point, the only reason to continue studying the Dharma would be if you are intent on the bodhisattva-path to teach and transform living beings. In that case, study becomes

然隨之消失；此時的放手是可能的，甚至是自然而然的。但在此之前，放手是一種錯誤的做法，就像在安全抵達彼岸之前放棄竹筏一樣。那是一種低估自己弱點的我慢的舉動。所以，修行者與佛法和師父之間，存在著一種動態張弛的關係——在緊握和放手之間。

這同樣適用於學習上來。學習佛法是為了吸收哲學、靈性和醫學或治療的成就，從而使你能夠以打開一種直接相遇的方式，來重新思考和觀察事相的真實樣貌。一旦你認知了，並得到了相應的解脫，那就不需要再學習了。

這就是為什麼有聖人的階位叫「無學位」。但如果在沒有直接徹悟之前就放棄學習，這是一種錯誤的做法；因為這時你所依賴的是一顆不羈的心，一種無人指導的哲學方法——所謂不羈就是沒有一個指南針，心會飄蕩游移。未覺悟的心的特徵就是飄蕩游移：從一個現象飄移到另一個現象，從一位老師飄移到另一位老師，從一本書飄移到另一本書。這一切都非常有趣，就像是百科全書式的攝取知識的方法，但最後你只能收穫一堆信息，並沒有真正的互聯、整合或貫穿起來。這些信息沒有辦法成為一把真正可以燃燒的火炬，它不僅不能滋養你，只會讓你感到空虛，因為它只是知識，並不能帶來解脫，反而會帶來一種過度激勵的困惑。

因此，我們在修行中所追求的智慧是《壇經》所說的「解脫知見（liberating knowledge）」，而不僅僅是好奇心所驅使的知識，那些只能裝在書包裡或擱在書架上的知識。解脫知見實際上會轉化你並令你自由。一旦解脫了，你就成為了知見；知見也就成為了你。

在那一刻，繼續學習佛法的唯一動力就是，你立志要行菩薩道，要教化眾生。在這種情況下，你要學習瞭解眾生

**You cannot presume that if you know one culture, one dimension, or one book, you are going to be able to reach out and extensively teach and transform other living beings or even transform yourself. Such a narrow approach would be close to what the Catholic scholar Thomas Aquinas warned against: “Beware of the man with one book.”**

你不能想當然的認為只靠一種文化、一個維度或一本什麼書，就能廣泛地教化其他眾生，甚至轉化你自己。這種狹隘的想法會接近天主教學者托馬斯·阿奎那所警告的：「提防只鑽研一本書的人。」。

extremely important to understand living beings’ ways of thinking—their views, their habits, their emotions, their identities, their beliefs, their myths, blind spots and so forth; their psychology, the way they set up social structures, and so forth. Such study is study that is aimed at the liberation and transformation of others rather than accumulating knowledge for puffing and self-aggrandizement.

It is in the same way as a doctor takes up a detailed study of medicine: the purpose is to use the knowledge he or she acquires to treat people’s various illnesses. It is for that reason too that he continues to read and follow the various journals and the latest research and scientific breakthroughs. Not because he or she is in a competition game for one-upmanship with his or her colleagues, but rather to stay on top of the field and art of healing. It is for this exact reason that a Bodhisattva will not only study world-transcending Dharmas, like these sutras and texts, but will also master worldly teachings and ordinary, everyday dharmas because it gives the best window into the potentials and capacities and limitations of human beings across time and cultures.

This is one of the principles for why Master Hsuan Hua founded Dharma Realm Buddhist University (DRBU). It is a university that is meant to offer a broad study of the human condition, spanning across various disciplines and dimensions. Ultimately yes, the purpose is to teach and transform people, to guide them to their original nature, but also with the recognition that that work manifests very differently based on different ways of thinking, varying languages, diverse histories, unique psychological orientations, values and worldviews.

The point is not to say that one culture or worldview is superior to another; just to understand that people understand themselves and approach life in this or that way. If you are going to teach and transform them, you have to meet them where they are. You cannot presume that if you know one culture, one

的思維方式——他們的觀點、他們的習慣、他們的情感、他們的身份、他們的信仰、他們的故事、他們的盲點；以及他們的心理、他們建立社會結構的方式等等。學習變得非常重要，這種學習是為了解脫和度化眾生，而不是為了吹噓和自我膨脹來積累知識。

正如醫生要深入研究醫學一樣：目的是用所獲得的知識來治療人們的各種疾病。所以他才會不斷閱讀和翻閱各種期刊，以及關注最新的研究報告和科學突破。不是因為他或她正要和同事競爭，而是為了掌握前沿的治療方法和醫術水平。所以，菩薩不僅要學習出世之法，如經律論，還要通達世俗的方便教法和一般的日常世間法，因為這可以廣開佛門，跨越時間和文化背景來接引不同種性根器的人們。

這也是宣公上人創辦法界佛教大學的信念之一。這所大學旨在提供跨學科、多維度的廣泛的人類研究。不錯，究竟而言，是要引導人們回歸自性本源；但同時我們也應認識到，當面對不同的思維方式、不同的語言、不同的歷史、獨特的心理取向、價值觀和世界觀的眾生時，這項教化的工作也會有很大的差異。

重點不是說一種文化或世界觀優於另一種，而是要理解人們、了解他們自己面對生活的各種不同的方式。如果你要教化他們，就必須從他們的現狀開始入手。你不能想當然的認為只靠一種文化、一個維度或一本什麼書，就能廣泛地教化其他眾生，甚至轉化

dimension, or one book, you are going to be able to reach out and extensively teach and transform other living beings or even transform yourself. Such a narrow approach would be close to what the Catholic scholar Thomas Aquinas warned against: “Beware of the man with one book.”

The paradox I mentioned above also ties in with this metaphor of the eye disease that you will see in many of the Buddhist texts. What is particularly interesting about it is that the premise is that we have the inherent capacity to see and know and completely comprehend things as they truly are. We possess, you might say, an original seeing. This is called “buddha-nature,” the “essential nature,” or simply “the nature.” In the *Platform Sutra*, the Sixth Patriarch says,

*“Good and Wise Friends, the capacity of the mind is great and far reaching; it encompasses the Dharma Realm. When functioning, it is clear and distinct, discerning and responsive. It knows all. All is the one [the mind]; and the one [mind] is all. Things naturally come and go, but the essence of the mind is unimpeded. That is Prajna.”*

This is a very pragmatic approach to what the texts call “all-seeing” or “all-knowing”. It is really not based on learning this or that, but on the removal of the impediments, of klesha, afflictions that cover over and cripple this capacity.

That is why in the texts, our ignorance is not described as a deficiency but as a distortion. That is very different from a deficiency, which would mean that you don't have something, that you are missing this thing—hearing that, your impulse would be to want it, to seek it, to go after it. This misguided sense of lack is at the heart of what the texts called “ignorance,” (avidya)—better rendered as “misperceiving.” Buddha nature is presented in these texts as not yet fully functioning. Our ignorance is often described as a cataract. It is a distortion of vision. To correct your vision is just that: to correct it—not to replace it, not to get more eyes. You simply have to use the ones you have, but without blur and impediments. This changes the emphasis from seeking outside to get something you are lacking, to correcting and healing what you already have, bringing it into focus.

In the same way, to give another analogy, if I am

你自己。這種狹隘的想法會接近天主教學者托馬斯·阿奎那 (Thomas Aquinas) 所警告的：「提防只鑽研一本書的人。」

我上面提到的悖論也與佛經中常見的眼疾譬喻有關係。有趣之處在於，這個譬喻從根本上就認為我們本自具足這種能見能知，了知事相真實樣貌的能力。你可以說，我們天生擁有一種根本洞察 (original seeing) 的能力。這被稱為「佛性 (buddha-nature)」、「自性 (essential nature)」或者簡稱為「性 (the nature)」。在《壇經》中，六祖大師說：

『善知識，心量廣大，遍周法界；用即了了分明，應用便知一切。一切即一，一即一切；去來自由，心體無滯，即是般若。』

這對經文中說的「悉見 (all-seeing)」或「悉知 (all-knowing)」做了非常實用的詮釋。開顯自性的方法並非透過學習這個或那個，而是透過去除覆蓋和削弱在自性上的煩惱而實現的。

這就是為何在佛經中，我們的無明 (ignorance) 沒有被描述成缺失 (deficiency)，而是失真 (distortion)，兩者截然不同。前者缺失的意思是說你沒有這樣東西，缺少這樣東西。如果這麼說，你會本能的想要去獲取它，尋找它，追求它。這種被誤導的匱乏感是經文中所謂的「無明 (梵語 avidya)」的核心——更確切地說是「誤解 (misperceiving)」。眾生的佛性在這些經文中被解釋為尚未完全彰顯。我們的無明經常被比喻為白內障，它造成了視力上的失真 (視覺扭曲)。矯正你的視力就是：矯正它——而不是替換它，也不是擁有更多的眼睛。你只需要使用已有的眼睛，只要去除模糊不清和 (夜視) 障礙。工作的重點將從向外尋找自己缺少的東西，轉移到糾正和療癒你已經擁有的東西並使其聚焦上面來。

同樣的，再打一個比方，比如我用照



shooting with a camera and the photos are coming up blurry and screwy, my first impulse might be to say, “Oh, it’s a bad camera, I need to get a better camera.” A good photographer, however, will say that what you need to do is to focus your lens to the appropriate settings: aperture, depth of field, f-stop. If you are shooting something small, you have to get down to that. If you are shooting an expansive landscape you adjust to that. You’ll go, “Oh! This works pretty well! All I have to do is adjust the lens of the focus!”

So when the texts use this image of the distortion of the eyes, it is really quite interesting philosophically, but more importantly, it is psychologically very empowering, because it tells us to put the emphasis back on correcting our vision and not seeking outside. My teacher and the Sixth Patriarch stressed this again and again: do not seek outside (your own mind-ground). As the *Platform Sutra* says,

“...only because living beings cover over their own light with lust and craving for sensory experiences, become enslaved to things outside and disturbed within, that the World Honored One is roused from his samadhi to exhort them to cease, to not seek outside themselves, and instead to realize they are the same as the Buddha...”

相機拍照，拍攝出來的照片模糊而失真。我第一個反應可能是說：「哦，這台相機不好，我需要買一台更好的。」然而，一位好的攝影師會說，你需要做的是將鏡頭焦距調到合適的位置：光圈（aperture）、景深（depth of field）、光圈值（f-stop）。如果拍攝小物體，你必須靠近它。如果拍攝遼闊的景觀，你需要相應調整。這麼做以後，你會說，「哦！這方法真棒！我只需要調整鏡頭的焦距！」

因此經典裡使用視覺扭曲的圖像來做比喻，從哲學角度來看這非常的有趣，但更重要的是，從心理學的角度而言，這種比喻非常的有力量，因為它告訴我們應該把重點放回到矯正我們自身的視力上來，而不是向外尋求。正如《壇經》裡講的：

『……蓋為一切眾生自蔽光明，貪愛塵境，外緣內擾，甘受驅馳。便勞他世尊從三昧起，種種苦口，勸令寢息，莫向外求，與佛無二……』

那現在你應該如何矯正你的視力呢？對此佛教術語中的「見（view）」（梵語 *drṣṭi*；巴利語 *ditthi*）是核心要素。佛說「見」就是一些特定的觀點，一些根深柢固的習慣性思維

Now, how do you go about correcting your vision? A central element here is what in Buddhist technical language is called a “view” (Skt. *dr̥ṣṭi*; Pali *ditthi*). The Buddha said that there are certain views, certain deeply embedded habitual ways that we think or believe. These are not just mild attitudes, but deeply embedded, habituated ways that we look at things that are wrong. A “view” is not a simple, abstract collection of propositions, but a charged interpretation of experience which intensely shapes and affects thought, sensation, and action. However, the reason they are wrong is not simply because the Buddha said so or because they are a priori wrong, wrong on the face of it. Rather, they are wrong in a pragmatic sense: they do not work to liberate and awaken; instead, they distort our vision, obscure the Path, and so lead us away from liberation. In fact, wrong view is one of the *kleshas*. We might think of afflictions as emotional and mental states that obstruct awakening, but here it’s also the ways in which we think and view the world.

One example is that having the view that there is no cause and effect is a wrong view. Why is it a wrong view to deny causality? Because if you follow that, you will be making mistakes in cause and effect, but you won’t be thinking you are accountable for them. And then you won’t understand why things are so messed up. You place agency outside of yourself, in the gods, or destiny, or bad luck. You’ll go, Why is this happening to me? It must be fate. It’s probably chance. It’s chaos theory or so... If you go down this road, because you have that wrong view, you can never get a handle on changing the fate or destiny that’s evolving from your choices, because you don’t believe in causality. So it’s a wrong view, not theologically so to speak, but functionally, pragmatically, because it doesn’t lead to liberation.

Another wrong view is the view of a permanent or unchanging self. Why? Because it doesn’t accord with the way things are. This is why the texts say, such an unchanging permanent and immutable entity is “nowhere to be found.” Nothing in our normal experience never changes; and yet we ‘wrongly’ insist on clinging to such a view as a permanent ‘me’ and ‘mine.’ As a result we will

或行為。這些不僅僅是淺層的態度，而是根植於我們心中，深層次的、習慣性的觀察事物的錯誤方式。「見（view）」不是簡單、抽象的議題集合，而是對經驗的強烈詮釋並影響思想（*thought*）、感覺（*sensation*）和行動（*action*）。然而，它們之所以錯誤的原因，並非因為這是佛說的，或因為這是先驗式的錯誤（*a priori wrong*），或乍一看就是錯的。相反，它們在實用意義上是錯誤的：它們不是為了解脫和覺悟而工作，而是因為它們扭曲了我們的視野，模糊了正道，從而使我們遠離解脫道。事實上，邪見是煩惱（*kleshas*）的一種。我們可能認為煩惱只是阻礙覺悟的情緒和心理狀態，但在這裡，煩惱也可能是我們思考和看待世界的某種方式。

舉個例子，認為沒有因果關係就是一種邪見。為什麼說撥無因果（*deny causality*）是邪見？因為，如果你不承認因果，你就會在因果上犯錯誤，你也不會覺得自己應該對這些錯誤負責任，你也就不會明白為什麼事情會變得這麼糟。你把自己置身度外，而歸咎於老天、命運或厄運，而且你可能會說：「這樣的事情為什麼會發生在我身上？這就是命吧。這或許是一次偶然。這是混沌理論之類的東西吧等等……」如果你這樣下去，因為你有這種邪見，因為你不相信因果關係，你將永遠無法掌握改變命運的方法，因為這種命運其實是由你自己的選擇而演變而來的。之所以說是邪見，不是在神學上可以這麼說，而是在功能上、實用上，是因為它不能導向解脫。

另一種邪見是認為有一個永恆不變的自我（*self*）。為什麼呢？因為它與事實不符。這就是為什麼經文說，並沒有一個恆常不變的實體存在，它是「無處可尋（*nowhere to be found*）」的。在我們的平常經驗中，沒有什麼是永遠不會改變的；然而，我們卻「錯誤地」執著「我（*me*）」和「我的（*mine*）」是恆常的。有了這



be pushing our wrong view and demanding that the world considers us whole, complete, unchanging, permanent beings. Well, duh, it's not going to work that way.

Yet another wrong view is to think that sheer ritual and devotion will lead to Bodhi. In Pali, this is called *silabbata-parāmāsa* in Pali, a near-obsession with the performance of rites, rules and rituals with the mistaken idea that this alone will bring enlightenment. Those things can certainly be a support for cultivating a sensibility that leads to Bodhi. But in themselves, they do not. With this wrong view, you think that all you have to do is the rituals and devotion and then somehow the gods or whatever beings will give me liberation. It doesn't work like that!

Now, this does not mean that you don't do rituals and devotion. Rather, you do them with a right attitude, namely that they are about centering and cleansing oneself, they are about returning to one's own nature. The point is not to seek outside of yourself in the mistaken hope that all sorts of ritual performance that would somehow lead to liberation.

So, there are all these different wrong views. One of them is what the text here tonight talks about, the idea that the Tathagata, the Buddha, the Sage and awakening itself exist outside or that they're things—that they are material things or that they exist apart from the purification and centering of one's own nature. That is a wrong view. To cite that verse from the *Vajra Sutra* again,

*If one sees me in forms,  
If one seeks me in sounds,  
He practices a deviant way,  
And cannot see the Tathagata.*

And because that view is off, you'll spend your life to the end of your days frantically seeking for bodhi and awakening and coming up empty handed. As Huineng says in the *Platform Sutra*, such a frantic passage through life will only end in regret, because you are looking in the wrong place. So, return the light, illumine within, look within yourself. This very being is the buddha-ground. Buddha is this very mind. This mind is buddha. Okay? This is the emphasis. It is about returning, not running outside. ❀

種邪見，我們將不斷地想要把它強加於人，並且要求世界認可我們是完整的、完美的、不變的、永恆的一種存在。嗯，嘿，但這是行不通的。

另一種邪見是認為單單透過儀軌和虔誠就可以最終通向菩提。在巴利語中，這被稱為「戒禁取 (*silabbata-parāmāsa*, 又稱戒禁取見)」，一種近乎執迷於儀式、規則和儀軌的表現，錯謬地認為只有這樣做才能帶來覺悟。當然法會儀軌確實可以作為通向菩提的輔助修行方法，但就儀軌本身而言，並非菩提。當持有這種邪見，你會認為你只要虔誠做某些儀軌，就會有某個神靈或者某種眾生讓你解脫。但事實也並非如此！

現在，這並不是意味著你不要參加法會或修行儀軌。而是說，你要有正確的認識，也就是說法會的這些儀軌是為了訓練我們歸正自己、淨化自身，它們的目的是讓我們回歸自性。關鍵是不要在錯誤中來心外求法，在各種儀式的表相上向外去追尋解脫之道。

所以上面都是修行中常見的一些邪見。今晚在經典中講到的一個邪見是，認為如來、佛陀、聖人或覺悟是外在的，或者認為他們是一種事物——不管你認為他們是某種具體物質的存在，或者說他們獨立於個人清淨至中的自性之外，這些都是邪見。再引用《金剛經》裡的那句偈頌：

若以色見我，以音聲求我，  
是人行邪道，不能見如來。

因為你的見地是錯的，你窮盡一生瘋狂地向外尋找菩提和覺悟，而最終必將兩手空空。正如惠能大師在《壇經》中所指出的，這樣狂奔一生，只會以遺憾告終，因為你找錯了方向。所以迴光返照，反求諸己，當下即是佛地，佛即是現前一念心，即心即佛。Ok？迴光返照而不是向外馳求，這是重點。❀