

TRACKING THE "HUMAN" IN HUMANISTIC BUDDHISM (I)

Sandra A. Wawrytko, Ph.D.

Departments of Asian Studies and Philosophy
San Diego State University

The ultimate goal of Buddhism is total enlightenment, but to achieve that we must first learn to be good human beings. [1]

Perhaps Buddhism's greatest strength has been its endless ability to adopt and adapt to new environments and cultural contexts. Buddhist practitioners down through the ages have been amazingly adept at applying Creative Hermeneutics, [2] that is, serving as effective messengers for the underlying meaning of Buddhist Dharma in innovative ways. As we seek to translate Buddhism into a fitting form for the contemporary world, Humanistic Buddhism demonstrates great potential to "speak" to every individual, initially as a human being but also as a "buddha to be."

Chinese Chan Master Hui-neng was most adamant about the need for a humanistic outlook in propagating Buddhism. As he approached the end of his own life, Master Hui-neng was asked to communicate his instructions for forthcoming generations of Buddhist practitioners. His response emphasizes that realization of our Buddha nature presupposes an understanding of our non-Buddha nature. Any aspirants must acquaint themselves with the nature of ordinary sentient beings. ...To seek Buddhahood without such knowledge would be in vain even if one spent eons of time in the search. ...Knowing Buddha means nothing else than knowing sentient beings, for the latter ignore that they are potential Buddhas, whereas a Buddha sees no difference between himself and other beings. [3]

Accordingly, the message of Buddhism must be recast in ways appropriate to today's audience, sentient beings who are human beings, but human beings who have been conditioned by and accustomed to experiences unknown centuries or even decades ago. From space travel to virtual reality, environmental crises to life extension, world conflicts to globalization, new opportunities and challenges confront us each day. To be effective in the world, Buddhism must demonstrate an awareness of the challenges and opportunities confronting human beings in our ever-changing world.

Several dimensions of this creatively hermeneutical task will be explored here. First we must consider (I) possible **definitions** of humanism, whether applied to Buddhism or in other contexts.

Messengers must choose their words carefully if they are to communicate their message to the fullest extent possible. The term "humanism" has been and continues to be applied in a variety of contexts, not all of which are compatible with the goals of Humanistic Buddhism. At one extreme, human beings are assumed to be members of an inherently superior species, contradicting Buddhist egalitarianism. At the other extreme, biological and anthropological paradigms place human beings at the same level as other species, reducing them to the lowest common denominator of survival priorities. Such a view is equally inconsistent with Buddhist views. Consequently, the humanistic element intended by Buddhism requires careful redefinition.

Next we will delve the core meaning of the self, (II) **who** we as human beings think we are. This involves a curious coalescing of Buddhist doctrine and cognitive science. Intriguing parallels exist between the analysis of the construction of human consciousness set forth by Buddhism over many generations of empirical investigation and the corresponding analysis undertaken by contemporary science. Significantly, both sets of explorations conclude that the notion of a separate self has no metaphysical basis nor evidence of being an objective reality. However, the two viewpoints diverge with regard to the next step beyond the revelation of the illusory self. While Buddhism sees the *skandhas* as a fruitful point of departure for a deeper realization, the cognitive scientist tends to see deconstructed consciousness as the end of the discussion.

This leads to an exploration of (III) **how** we have come to our conceptions of our nature. We need to understand the process whereby consciousness is constructed, as well as Buddhism's subsequent deconstruction of the illusory self. Understanding the component parts of our imagined identity allows us to disengage the "self"-deluding mechanism. A form of self-forgetting is required to prepare the way for a comprehending our actual identity.

Such discussions culminate in (IV) revelations about **why** we have lost sight of our nature. At the core of this nature, including our human nature, we find Chan's mind of no-mind (*wu-xin*). The reports of various Buddhist masters are cited to demystify the fundamental core of our being, lingering beneath our sense of being a mere human being. Like the open expanse of the sky, it is empty (*kong*) yet all-encompassing, devoid of any and all discriminations and differentiations. Beneath the misleading layers of confusions, delusions, and illusions our true home can be found.

Finally, we must consider (V) **where** homecomers are to be found, as concrete manifestations and exemplars of Humanistic Buddhism in action. Examples are again drawn from various Buddhist practitioners' ways and means to **return** to our true nature, ways to prepare for a homecoming to one's true nature. Working within the confines of the human experience to communicate their own awakening process, these individuals can inspire others to aspire to the same experiences. Rather than shutting themselves off from the ranks of ordinary human beings, these extraordinary awakened beings went "back down the mountain" to live in the midst of deluded sleepwalkers. Compassionately they helped others to see into their own deeply hidden resources of Buddha-nature,

original nature, using the most mundane, yet powerfully evocative events, images, and metaphors drawn from everyday life.

I. Definitions of Humanism: Buddhist and Non-Buddhist Views

As we open ourselves to the potentials of a Humanistic Buddhism for today's world, it becomes apparent that a need exists for a timely clarification of the qualifying term "humanistic." Without such a clarification, we run the considerable risk of having the entire project undermined by preconceptions and prejudices concerning humanism that are antithetical to the goals of this innovative and upāyic rethinking on the part of contemporary Buddhists.

Let us begin with a few definitions of the reigning notions of humanism within English parlance:

Humanism

Devotion to human interests; system concerned with human (not divine) interests, or with the human race (not the individual); Religion of Humanity [4]

A moral or intellectual system that regards the interests of mankind [sic] as of supreme importance, in contradistinction to individualism or theism [5]

A system of thought that centers on human beings and their values, capacities, and worth [6]

Humanist

one versed in human history or the knowledge of human nature; one versed in the humanities [7]

The above definitions either imply or blatantly espouse a human-centered, even human-obsessed, worldview. Generally humanism in this sense has been associated with a dramatic shift in civilizations away from a cosmos conceived as being dominated by gods and divine forces to a more rationalistic and "scientific" approach in which reality is subject to human understanding and hence control. Among the ancient Greeks, the sophist Protagoras (c. 490-421 b.c.e.) was a key propounder of such a view ("Man is the measure of all things"), while in China Confucius (551-479 b.c.e.) is often credited with a similar stance (see, for example, Lun Yu, 11:11).

The ever-increasing power of human reason, demonstrated by the success of science and technology in controlling Nature, has led to a worldwide proliferation of a form of humanism

grounded in a nearly absolute faith in our ability to create and recreate the world in our own image. Perhaps the epitome of "humanism" in its contemporary incarnation is to be found in self-congratulatory reactions to the recent "cracking" of the human genetic code, touted in bold front page headlines and hailed as "a pinnacle of human self-knowledge." [8] Speaking for many, U.S. President Bill Clinton's reaction to the break through insinuated that humans possess a privileged access to the realm of the divine: "Today we are learning the language in which God created life." [9]

However, the self-assured anthropocentrism apparent in such sentiments is diametrically opposed to the all-encompassing egalitarianism, even trans-species-ism, of Buddhist Dharma. The common definitions quoted above are products of the very egoism that is to be eradicated by Buddhist practice, an eradication essential for eliminating the *duhkha* recognized in the First Noble Truth as the common condition of all sentient beings, not only human beings. Accordingly, a Buddhist humanism would consider humans as the primary audience for Buddhist doctrines, without assuming their inherent superiority *vis-à-vis* other species. [10] The priority is not to be in control of Nature as a whole, but to get in touch with our deepest inner nature so that we may harmonize with, rather than attempt to conquer, all that is natural.

In direct contrast to this highly vaunted sense of human superiority, another tendency exists to reduce human beings to nothing but their "animal" nature. Rather than assuming that humans have unique possession of free will, some argue for a strict pan-determinism that makes us mere pawns in Nature's global chess game. Hence, we are goaded on by instinctual impulses and "hard-wired" behaviors geared for survival. Accordingly biologist Randy Thornhill and anthropologist Craig T. Palmer recently theorized that rape is a genetically developed strategy, a form of sexual selection designed to insure the "survival of the fittest." [11] Similarly, incidents of mob violence and "wilding" have been explained away as "natural" remnants of a herd mentality: from out of control sports fans to groups of groping young males on the prowl. [12] A high-tech version of social Darwinism has even arisen, or so argues author Paulina Borsook, complete with view of a human nature that "reduces everything to the contractual, to economic rational decision making," while devaluing intersocial connections. [13] Such deterministically-oriented definitions of the human being are, of course, equally at odds with Buddhist notions as the anthropocentric paeans to human uniqueness mentioned previously.

Nonetheless, not all intellectuals espouse extreme views of human nature. Buddhism can find support for its egalitarian interpretations of the human place in the universe among some contemporary scientists. For example, responding to the recent genetic code-cracking, evolutionary biologist and geneticist Jon Seger of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, observed: "Looking at the genome, and taking it as a kind of image of who we are, places us squarely with the rest of nature. ...You can see the same genes in flies, worms, monkeys, mice and people. ...There's nothing

peculiar or distinctive about us." [14] Scientists are beginning to acknowledge the essential interconnectedness of reality that Buddhists have known for millennia and espoused in the doctrine of *pratītya-samutpāda*, interdependent or co-dependent origination. Thus, C. Robert Cloninger of Washington University in St. Louis avers: "Nothing is simple, and everything depends on everything else." [15]

Through ego eradication the delusion of an isolated and privileged human self is exchanged for a deeper and broader reality of the basis of our being. In the process one comes to understand that being is shared among all species. Friedrich Nietzsche's "Human, All Too Human" (*Menschliches, Allzumens-chliches*) thereby evolves into what is "Human, and Beyond/Beneath Human." In espousing a Humanistic Buddhism, then, we must begin with a radical revisioning of humanism, and be willing to reconsider what it means to be human. We require a humanism that allows us not only to be all that we can be as human beings, but further to recognize that the being we already are is so much more than merely human. More specifically, we need to realize our inner resources, our original or root (*ben*) nature, our inherent Buddha Nature.

II. Who We Are: Tracking the True Self

In Buddhism, we should start from our Essence of Mind. [16]

Venerable Master Hsing Yun has succinctly, and astutely, declared: "Human nature is the basis of all Buddhism." [17] It was a human being, Siddhartha Gotama, who, having become awakened, the Awakened One (the Buddha), set forth the Dharma and its corresponding practices. These were then imparted to his fellow human beings, from one generation to the next, over thousands of years of human history and across innumerable human cultures. But precisely what is the nature of being human all about, within the context of Buddhist doctrine and practice? How does our human nature help or hinder the awakening process? What are its potentials and its impediments? In other words, what are the essential components of this nature from which we begin our quest to return to a deeper, largely hidden nature?

Our task here is one of intellectual tracking, to sniff out the trail left by/leading to our innate nature, the true self, within Buddhist philosophical literature. A famous set of drawings from twelfth century China demonstrates the importance of this question within Buddhism. See Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 1 India and China* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), pp. 279-281; and Calkin, "Ten Bulls: The Zen Oxherding Pictures," Nyogen Senzaki and Paul Repts trans., *in Entering the Stream: An Introduction to the Buddha and His*

Teachings, Samuel Bercholz and Sherab Chodzin Kohn eds. (Boston: Shambhala, 1993), pp. 211-222. [18] In a series of ten pictures the true self is represented by an errant ox that is tracked, captured, and ultimately "tamed." This parallels our attempts to locate the basis of our being by seeking the self. Many lack even the awareness that such an ox exists, or that it has "wandered off." They blithely assume that they are already in full contact with and possession of their true identity, oblivious of being steeped in dangerous delusions.

Once we recognize our loss of the true self, we need a strategy to recapture it. Special knowledge is required to read its faint tracks, so we can trace where it has gone. A more profound wisdom is required to undertake the tracking process successfully, and then proceed to catch, pacify, and ride on the ox/self (drawings three through six). Having accomplished these tasks, one must first transcend the ox, leave behind our attachment to the concept of a self as a thing, concepts, or mere intellectual construct to be "captured." Then one must go on to transcend, or let go of one's fixation with, oneself, or again, the artificial construct of a reified self that exists somewhere "out there." The final two drawings call first for the ultimate emptying out of emptiness to delve into the very source of things, concepts, and constructs, and thence a return to the human world, to live in the world without being of the world.

An interesting parallel exists here to Master Hui-neng's discussion of Buddha-Knowledge (*fo zhi*) or enlightenment in the *Platform Sūtra* (chapter seven). The Master attempts to explain to an arrogant monk, Fa Da, why mindless recitation of a sūtra, in his case the *Lotus Sūtra*, falls short of actual practice. Four stages in the process toward awakening are noted. It is first necessary to open (*kai*) one's eyes, oneself, to the sight of Buddha-Knowledge, implying that most humans are not only "sleepwalkers" but sleepwalkers whose eyes are firmly shut. Under such conditions, it is impossible to have any visual contact with what is literally before our very eyes. But to be an active participant in the process, we need to actually see (*shi*, literally show or demonstrate) what is there to be seen. Only then are we in a position to awaken (*wu*) to Buddha-Knowledge, or recognize its existence. Finally, one is able to enter into (*ru*) Buddha-Knowledge. At this point enlightenment, like the "lost" ox, is no longer an external "thing" to be sought after but constitutes what one is, one's innermost nature.

Even before the tracking begins, we must insert a correction to prevailing "revelations" about self in the "humanistic" circles of western psychology and science, where ignorance allows the illusion of originality. For example, declarations concerning "Post-modernist notions of personality" naively assume that the notion of self as a construct is an unprecedented product of contemporary life: [19]

We are becoming fluid and many-sided. Without quite realizing it, we have been evolving a sense of self appropriate to the restlessness and flux of our time. This mode of being differs radically

from that of the past and enables us to engage in continuous exploration and personal experiment. [20]

From a Buddhist standpoint, such an analysis is fatally flawed by seething ethnocentrism. While western awareness of self may indeed be in a process of becoming, moving in the direction of fluidity and multi-dimensionality, it is presumptuous to conclude that this is a universal human phenomenon. Just such a self was recognized and expounded upon by Śākyamuni Buddha 2,500 years ago and included among the three distinguishing characteristics of existence: impermanence (*anicca*), malaise (*dukkha*), and non-self (*anātman*). Hence, the much vaunted post-modern personality is not new, but rather represents a coming to terms with what has always been the case. Western thought is simply catching up with Buddhist sociological and psychological insights. Moreover, the "restlessness and flux of our time" is actually a long-standing accompaniment of the human condition, not at all unique to contemporary experience.

Similarly, western scientists display complacent ignorance concerning non-western resources available in their search for self-consciousness. A glaring example is found in the work of Nobel Laureate Francis Crick, entitled *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul*. As it turns out the hypothesis referred to (actually concerning consciousness rather than the soul *per se*) is not the least bit astonishing to millions of Buddhists around the world:

The Astonishing Hypothesis is the "You," your joys and your sorrows, your memories and your ambitions, your sense of personal identity and free will, are in fact no more than the behavior of a vast assembly of nerve cells and their associated molecules. [21]

Despite superficial differences in terminology, Crick's thesis is identical to that of the Buddhist doctrine of the *skandhas* (discussed below) and thus clearly not "so alien to the ideas of most people alive today that it can truly be called astonishing." His call for the initiation of "the *experimental* study of consciousness in a serious and deliberate way," [22] sounds exceedingly odd given the generations of Buddhist practitioners from many cultures who have taken their own consciousnesses as their laboratories over several millennia and recorded their findings in hundreds of volumes of text. One response to Crick's claims is that ethnocentrism should have no place in scientific inquiry, and even Nobel Laureates require continuing education. [23]

An objective examination of the available scientific evidence reveals that ancient Buddhist accounts of the self are corroborated by recent research within a variety of fields, from cognitive psychology and evolutionary biology to neuroscience and neurology. Careful consideration of these accounts is warranted to avoid or temper the hasty interpretations of data being advanced. Over the

centuries of single-minded searching, Buddhist literature has evolved highly sophisticated analysis that clearly would be useful for any open-minded investigation of the self. In what follows I shall only be able to point to the faintest tracks left by our elusive ox, hoping thereby to inspire a more thorough hunt.

III. How We Are: The Deconstructed (Ego) Self of Buddhism

To study the buddha way is to study the self.

To study the self is to forget the self.

To forget the self is to be enlightened by the ten thousand dharmas.

To be enlightened by the ten thousand dharmas is to free one's body and mind and those of others.

No trace of enlightenment remains, and this traceless enlightenment is continued forever. [24]

The Buddhist version of self has become a focal point of the teachings, texts, and practice, especially in Chan schools. The complexity of these doctrines is staggering. For example, eight forms of cognition (*vijñāna*) have been distinguished, ranging from the mundane five senses to the transcendental "storehouse" consciousness (*ālaya-vijñāna*). By comparison, the tri-level Freudian construction of a self compounded of the Id ("it"), Ego ("I"), and Super-ego ("over-I"), as well as the assumed dualism of conscious and unconscious, seem woefully simplistic. The discussion offered here is, of necessity, overly-simplified. [25]

What precisely is the self that, as Zen Master Dogen puts it, the Buddhist seeks to forget, to free? To distinguish this self from the primal original nature, we can refer to it as the erroneously-evolved ego-self. In the seminal doctrine of the Five *Skandhas* a detailed description of the process whereby the deluded construction of ego-consciousness occurs is offered. Considerable parallels exist between the Buddhist analysis and that of contemporary cognitive science. By comparing these accounts, we will have a clearer view of the origins of our estrangement from the real self or our Buddha nature.

The Five Skandhas of Buddhism[26] Compared with the Cognitive Science Model [27]

1) Rūpa (Form)

The construction process begins with the five senses (sight, sound, touch, smell, taste) plus the "sixth" sense of mind (*manas*). Data is received by the sense organs from a world awash with sensory projections, which will then be processed as experiences of objects assumed to exist outside

of us. Thus the "ignorance-form" leads us to assume the existence of an "external" world of sensible forms.

Correspondingly, for the cognitive scientist, the basic physical equipment of the body, inclusive of the brain, is the prerequisite for sense data to occur. The neurological underpinnings of this process are now being explored in experiments with human beings as well as other sentient beings. The brain, as the collection point for the various incoming data of the five sense, can be considered a kind of "executive" sense organ, one which receives and also executes commands or directives on the basis of what is received.

2) *Vedanā (Sensation)*

Once the data from the various sense organs have been sent to the brain, they become processed as sensations. Our sensations or feelings serve as a "defense mechanism" that protects and insulates our initial ignorance from the glare of reality. These feelings take three general forms: pleasure or attraction, pain or repulsion, and indifference. The rudimentary visual, auditory, tactile, olfactory, and gustatory sensations arise in this way, creating a primal response to the data being presented to us from assumed sense objects.

Cognitive science accounts for sensations in terms of the firing of neurons in response to the stimuli presented by sensory data. Researchers believe that they have located sections of the brain that have evolved over the millennium to specialize in certain kinds of data, such as visual or olfactory, sent by the sense organs. Thus, each sense has its own "relay station" in the cortex of the brain, where the data are collected for further processing. Their evidence derives from the fact that artificial stimulation of these brain areas can result in various "sensations," as if actual data had been relayed to the brain. In other words, we can create the illusion of incoming sense data, which attracts us, repulses us, or leaves us indifferent.

3) *Saññā (Perception)*

The "perception-impulse" is responsible for the recognition of sense data, a more complex processing of the original sense data in relation to the organism itself. Consequently, we react or respond to the perceptions through impulses of hatred, desire, and stupidity, Buddhism's Three Poisons. We do not simply see, hear, feel, smell, and taste, but see the source of our perception as something, feel it as something, etc., which elicits a response of hatred (intense dislike) or desire (intense liking) or ignorance (indifference).

From the viewpoint of the cognitive scientist, as the sensory data are being processed in specialized portions of the brain, they are then "coordinated and synchronized by the thalamus into a similar rhythm of electrical activity." This has the effect of reinforcing the stimuli, strengthening their impact on the organism. As Crick observes concerning the visual sense, a "constructive process" is at work during perception: "What you see is not what is really there; it is what your

brain believes is there. ... a symbolic interpretation of the world." [28]

4) *Saṅkhāra (Mental Formations)*

Intellectual constructs, concepts, and categories then begin to arise based on our perceptions. The incoming sense data are edited. What is useful or familiar to the organism is selected out for attention; while the "irrelevant" data are ignored, receding into the background where they are virtually unperceived or beneath perception. The discriminating mind interprets the "facts" in terms of its own past experiences and future needs. Acts of volition or desire are thereby stimulated; we want this, seek to avoid that, and dismiss the rest.

In scientific terms, "synchronized cells ... fire a coherent wave of messages back down to the thalamus." [29] In response to the now heavily interpreted data, attraction or avoidance is experienced by the organism. The brain instructs it to follow through on past patterns of behavior to insure its survival, following a kind of inductive logic.

5) *Viññāṇā (Consciousness)*

As the end result of previous layering of thought and emotion, consciousness emerges through the assumption that there is an ego self functioning as the source of sensations, perceptions, and conceptions. This evolves into a sense of consciousness of self as a self. It is an "amalgamation"-- "the intuitive intelligence of the second skandha, the energy of the third, and the intellectualization of the fourth combine to produce thoughts and emotions," encompassing "the six realms as well as the uncontrollable and illogical patterns of discursive thought," such as dreams, hallucinations, and even time itself. [30] All of these are assumed to be the possession or, the expression of, a central self, the one who senses the sensations, perceives the perceptions, conceives the conceptions, dream the dreams.

The cognitive scientist refers to this as the "binding process": "All the responses received by the thalamus within one cycle of its scan are perceived in a single image, a single moment of consciousness. The images appear so fast that they appear continuous ... consciousness ... is the dialogue between the thalamus and the cerebral cortex, as modulated by the senses." [31] Like the flickering images of an old style film, the single celluloid images are coalesced into a continuous, seemingly unified whole. We see what we expect to see: an experiencer who stands behind the experiences, the one who possesses those experiences.

Once we understand the fivefold process of successive accretions that is responsible for the construction of consciousness, the illusion of ego-self can be deconstructed. The illusory layers are peeled off one by one. In exposing the causal function of ignorance in this process, its corresponding cure likewise becomes manifest. Ultimately the emptiness of the commonly held concept of self is revealed: original nature or Buddha nature. When false notions of self have been forgotten, the actual reality becomes accessible.

However, one cannot find what one does not consider lost, and so a careful analysis of the causal chain leading to the creation of ego-self has been made in Buddhist literature. This is possible due to the experiences of innumerable practitioners, beginning with Śākyamuni Buddha, who delved their own assumed sense of identity and found it wanting. The human being is much more than we have been led to assume and been conditioned to believe-and also much less. Apart from the Five *Skandhas*, no "I" can be uncovered: "Mere suffering exists, but no sufferer is found; The deeds are, but no doer is found." [32] The Buddha's stream of consciousness doctrine of the self, devoid of any underlying ground of permanence, resonates with contemporary theories of consciousness based on the research of cognitive science:

All physical theories, ...describe only functions-such as memory, attention, intention, introspection-correlating to specific physical processes in the brain. But none of these theories can explain why the performance of these functions is accompanied by subjective experience. [33]

Once we change how we think about ourselves qua human and beyond/beneath, a corresponding change will take place in how we talk about ourselves as well as how we behave:

Now, what does it mean to deliver oneself by one's own Essence of Mind? It means deliverance of the ignorant, the delusive, and the vexatious beings within our mind. ... [34]

The empirical proof for these assertions about our illusory self lies in the experience of true self, known as no-mind (*wu-xin*) in Chan, to which we now turn our attention.

IV. Why Are: Chan's Mind of No-mind (Wu-xin)

There is something bright and clear, without falsity, without biases, tranquil and unmoving, possessed of vast consciousness, fundamentally without birth or death and discrimination, without names and forms and words. It engulfs space and covers all of heaven and earth, all of form and sound, and is equipped to function. ... when we use the word Mind, it is not the ordinary person's mind that falsely engenders discrimination: rather, it is the silent and motionless Mind in each person. ... As soon as it is brought up, you awaken to it: then, like a person drinking water, you know yourself whether it is cool or warm. It cannot be described or explained to anyone else. It's just luminous awareness covering heaven and earth. [35]

Just as Daoist *wei-wu-wei* (action without [artificial] action) deconstructs the artificial activity of *wei*, *wu-xin*, the mind of no-mind or more accurately the mind of non-mind, is a deconstruction of the artificiality of *xin*. In a sense, Chan can be seen as an internalization of the Daoist configuration of the *wei/bu-wei* duality as the superficial appearance that blocks the deeper reality of *wu-wei*. The terminology now changes to the false dualism of mind (*xin*) versus not mind (*bu-xin*), obscuring the underlying ground of no-mind (*wu-xin*). Reflecting its naturalness, this is also the "everyday mindedness" (*pin chang xin*) so rarely found among the ranks of deluded humanity. Daoism's homecoming motif is echoed by Chan literature as well:

Everyone thinks that Buddha is different from everyday human beings. ... Our own Buddha nature is Buddha. Of course, sentient beings are like orphans who never knew their own home. ... Once in a long while, man realizes Buddha nature within himself. [36]

The *wu-xin* doctrine rejects the very definitions of self that have been most popular in western philosophy and psychology. Hence, it is the most radical notion of self conceivable, penetrating to the very root of our cherished hopes and aspirations, daring to confront the inconceivable reality of non-self. The Buddhist negations of what is perceived as common sense elements of reality are not simple denials (*bu*) however. Instead, we are brought to the recognition that the essential reality exists without the illusions of (*wu*) soul, *cogito*, ego, material embodiment, or even social roles.

No-mind

Buddhist Negations	False Concepts
without (<i>wu</i>) ātman	soul or spirit
witahout thinking	Cartesian <i>cogito</i>
without consciousness or self-consciousness	ego; consciousness of self as a self
without physical body	material embodiment
without personality, personae	social masks worn and roles played

When each of these misconceptions is exorcized, the end result is the same as in the deconstruction of consciousness-emptiness. A contemporary Korean Master describes it as follows:

Before thinking, your mind was like a sheet of white paper. Then you wrote down 'one,' and 'God', and 'nothing,' and so on and so forth. When you cut off all thinking, you erase all these names and forms and return to your original emptiness. What am I? I don't know. When you keep the great question, you keep the mind that doesn't know. Don't-know mind is empty mind. There are no words, no speech. So there is no one, no God, no nothing, no mind, no emptiness. This don't-know mind is very important. I is don't know, don't know is I. Only this. This is your true self. So always keep don't-know mind. [37]

And so the self/ox has been tracked to its root source, and brought back to the very world from which we set out on our excursion! Many delusions and "taints" are thereby removed: ego, soul, social roles, "sins," "evil deeds," "envy," and "jealousy." With these errors left behind, we move forward to the "formless Ch'an Hui" or "repentance." We repent or let go of the errors of the past, the products of our ignorance and delusion. Thus, we are self-delivered from our self-inflicted "sins." [38]

Definite benefits accrue for society as a whole when human nature is thus clarified and its obscuring dusts swept away. The deconstructed self ceases to pose any danger to either itself or others. Quite the contrary! As we repent of past misdeeds, and empty them out, we are filled with "Supreme Buddhahood. "We "take refuge in the Buddha within ourselves" as incarnate physical beings. [39] That is, we remain human beings among human beings, yet bolstered by a strength that goes beyond/beneath the merely human: Humanistic Buddhism. Japanese Zen Master Hakuin Ekaku (1686-1769) offers the logical final step in the tracking process, what follows after awakening from the delusory dream of ego self:

Forget yourself and become the universe! [40]

V. The Return to Awakening: Where Are the Homecomers to be Found?

Who has been capable of following the advice of Master Hakuin? Where can we find homecomers, able to point the way home for us? We must make a final move from theoretical constructs to lived practice, to see how human beings have in fact gone beyond and beneath their own humanism. Hence, our discussion will conclude with few concrete examples of Buddhist practitioners conveying their trans-human experience in very human terms.

In addition to being Masters of Buddhist practice, each of our chosen homecomers is a Master of Buddhist *upāya*, the expedient or skillful means that allow for effective communication of one's

experience, a form of communication that allows others to benefit from and apply that experience in their own human, all to human lives. Like true bodhisattvas, they inspire others to aspire to the same experience, the same mastery, the same homecoming.

Three instances of *upāyic* encounters from three Masters will be presented and analyzed here, illustrating different kinds of "skillful means" that share the common goal of pointing to the true self or original nature.

Milarepa (1052-1135) is considered to be one of the most celebrated of the Tibetan Buddhist masters. He can literally be said to have taken the Dharma into the streets or, more appropriately, the back roads of his mountain haunts by means of his itinerant lifestyle. Some 100,000 sung verses were spontaneously composed by Milarepa to express his teachings to a diverse range of students.

Patrul Rinpoche (1808-1887) is a more recent Tibetan master, who uses his own life as material for his Dharma lessons late in life. A member of the Nyingma lineage, his style and language can be quite shocking to those unfamiliar with a straightforward approach to spirituality.

Hsing Yun (1927-), a contemporary Chinese Master and avid proponent of Humanistic Buddhism, has adapted his Dharma talks to a variety of audiences around the world. His works range from scholarly commentaries on Buddhist *sūtras* to modern retellings of famous stories, and personal anecdotes with latent lessons.

NOTES

- [1] Venerable Master Hsing Yun, *Readings in Humanistic Buddhism: Part I* (San Diego: BLIA, 1996), p. 1.
- [2] This five stage model of Creative Hermeneutics was developed by the late Dr. Charles Wei-hsun Fu (1933-1996), to promote the revitalization of various philosophical traditions in Asia, including Buddhism. See for example: "A Creative-Hermeneutical Investigation into the Formation and Development of the *Pratītya-samutpāda Thought*," *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal*, 4, Taipei, 1991, 169-199 and "Creative Hermeneutics: Taoist Metaphysics and Heidegger," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 3, 1976, 115-143.
- [3] *The Platform Sutra*, chapter ten, A. F. Price and Wong Mou-Lam trans., in *The Diamond Sutra and the Sutra of Hui Neng* (Berkeley: Shambala Publications, Ltd., 1969), p. 109. Elsewhere Hui-neng observes: "If there were no human beings there would be no Dharmas; hence we know that all Dharmas are made for men" ; chapter two, p. 30.
- [4] *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 580.
- [5] *The Cassell Paperback English Dictionary*, Betty Kirkpatrick ed. (London: Cassell Publishers Limited, 1990), p. 662.
- [6] *The American Heritage Dictionary*, 3rd edition (New York: Dell, 1994), p. 408.
- [7] *The Cassell Paperback English Dictionary*, p. 662.

- [8] Nicholas Wade, “Genetic Code of Human Life is Cracked by Scientists,” *The New York Times*, June 27, 2000, A1.
- [9] President Clinton, as quoted by Wade, A1.
- [10] As Venerable Master Hsing Yun has observed, “Sakyamuni Buddha was born among people, he lived among people, he became enlightened among people, and he preached among people,” p. i.
- [11] Craig T. Palmer and Randy Thornhill, *A Natural History of Rape* (MIT Press, 2000).
- [12] For more details, see Natalie Angier, “In the Crowd’s Frenzy, Echoes of the Wild Kingdom,” *New York Times*, July 9, 2000, Week in Review, 4.
- [13] Paulina Borsook, *Cyberselfish: A Critical Romp Through the Terribly Libertarian Culture of High Tech* (Public Affairs, 2000), as reviewed by Michiko Kakutani, “Silicon Valley Views the Economy as a Rain Forest,” *New York Times*, July 25, 2000.
- [14] Quoted by Natalie Angier, “A Pearl and a Hodgepodge: Human DNA,” *New York Times*, June 27, 2000, A21.
- [15] Quoted by Angier, A21.
- [16] *The Platform Sutra*, chapter six, p. 49.
- [17] Venerable Master Hsing Yun, p. 1.
- [18] The original Daoist series consisted of eight scenes:
1. The Search for the Bull
 2. Discovering the Footprints
 3. Perceiving the Bull
 4. Catching the Bull
 5. Taming the Bull
 6. Riding the Bull Home
 7. The Bull Transcended
 8. Both Bull and Self Transcended
- Master Kuo-an Shih-Yüan (fl. 1150; known in Japan as Calkin Shi on) added two additional scenes to go beyond the final vision of Daoist No-thingness and return the seeker to the mundane world:
9. Reaching the Source
 10. In the World
- See Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 1 India and China* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), pp. 279-281; and Calkin, “Ten Bulls: The Zen Oxherding Pictures,” Nyogen Senzaki and Paul Repts trans., in *Entering the Stream: An Introduction to the Buddha and His Teachings*, Samuel Bercholz and Sherab Chodzin Kohn eds. (Boston: Shambhala, 1993), pp. 211-222.
- [19] Michiko Kakutani, “An Era When Fluidity has Replaced Maturity,” *New York Times*, March 20, 1995, B1.
- [20] Robert Jay Linton, *The Protean Self*, as quoted by Kakutani, B1.
- [21] Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul* (New York: Charles

Scribe’s Sons, 1994), p. 3.

[22] Crick, xii.

[23] Little room for hope lurks in Crick’s blunt declaration: “Without a few initial prejudices one cannot get anywhere” ; p. xii. Near the end of the work Crick intones a self-fulfilling prophecy, albeit unintentional: describing the “strikingly human characteristic ... our almost limitless capacity for self-deception” he concludes “The very nature of our brains-evolved to guess the most plausible interpretations of the limited evidence available-makes it almost inevitable that ... we shall often jump to wrong conclusions, especially about abstract matters” ; p. 262.

[24] Japanese Zen Master Dogen, “Enlightenment as Everyday Life” (Genjokoan), *Shobogenzo*, Hakuyu Taizan Maezumi trans., included in *Entering the Stream*, p. 206.

[25] For a more indepth discussion of the topic of consciousness in Buddhism see Hsüan Tsang’s *Ch’eng Wei-Shih Lun (The Doctrine of Mere-Consciousness)*, Wei Tat trans. (Hong Kong: Ch’eng Wei-Shih Lun Publication Committee, 1973), a massive 800 page bilingual tome.

[26] Derived from the essay of Tibetan Master Chogyam Trungpa (1940-1987), “The Development of Ego,” in *Entering the Stream*, pp. 74-82. See also Thich Nhat Hanh, “One is All, All is One: The Five Aggregates,” *The Miracle of Mindfulness*.

[27] Adopted from Sandra Blakeslee, “How the Brain Might Work: A New Theory of Consciousness,” *New York Times*, March 21, 1995, B7. See also Crick.

[28] Crick, pp. 26, 31, 33.

[29] Blakeslee, B10.

[30] Chogyam Trungpa, p. 79.

[31] Blakeslee, B10.

[32] Buddhaghosa, *Visuddhimagga* (PTS), p. 513, as quoted by Walpola Rahula, *What the Buddha Taught* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1974), p. 26.

[33] The views of philosopher David Chalmers as paraphrased by John Horgan in *The End of Science: Facing the Limit of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age* (New York: Broadway Books, 1997), p. 181.

[34] *Platform Sutra* chapter seven, p. 51.

[35] Korean Sn Master T’aego (1301-1382), 13. “The Mind-Ground,” *A Buddha from Korea: The Zen Teachings of T’aego*, trans. J. C. Cleary (Boston: Shambhala, 1988), pp. 101-103.

[36] Sokei-an (1882-1945), *The Zen Eye: A Collection of Zen Talks by Sokei-an*, Mary Farkas ed. (New York: Weatherhill, 1993), p. 4. A similar parable of The Lost Son appears in the fourth chapter of the *Lotus Sūtra*.

[37] Seung Sahn (1927-), *Dropping Ashes on the Buddha: The Teaching of Zen Master Seung Sahn*, 13. “You Must Become *Completely Crazy*,” Stephen Mitchell ed. (New York: Grove Press, 1976), p. 35.

[38] *Platform Sutra*, chapter seven, p. 50.

[39] *Platform Sutra*, chapter seven, p. 53.

[40] Hakuin, poem on an enso scroll from the Belinda Sweet Collection; included in John Stevens, *Sacred Calligraphy of the East* (Boulder & London: Shambhala, 1981), p. 190.

~ to be continued ~

探討人間佛教的「人」(二之一)

華珊嘉 著

聖地牙哥州立大學·亞洲研究和哲學系教授

滿和 譯

無上菩提是佛教的終極目標，然欲達此境界，首須學習將人做好。[註 1]

也許由於佛教最大的力量在於能夠不斷擷取以及適應新的環境和文化背景，佛教的修行者長遠以來均能採用創造性的詮釋法，[註 2]亦即以創新的方式有效地傳遞佛法的含意。人間佛教試圖將佛法以順應現代社會的方式呈現，證明自身有極大潛力向每個「人」，亦即「未來佛」說法。

中國禪宗的惠能大師最堅決主張弘揚佛法時必須具有人間性。當他將要圓寂時，有人問他對後學有何開示，他的回答強調要證得佛性，必須先要了解我們的非佛性。任何發心修行的人必須先了解一般的人性……不了解人性的人，即使修行無限長的時間，也無法開發佛性……認識佛陀意謂著認識有情眾生，因為一般有情眾生忽略了他們都有成佛的潛能，然而一位開悟的佛祖並不認為他和其他眾生有何不同。[註 3]

因此，佛法的弘化方式必須能順應今天的當機眾生，也就是那些飽受累世習氣影響的人們。從太空旅行到現實生活，從環境的危機到生命的延續，從世界性的衝突到全球化的型態，我們每天所面臨的是新的機會和挑戰。要在世間有效地弘法，佛教必須對人類在變化無常的世間中所面臨的挑戰和機會有所警覺。

此篇文章要探討此一創造性詮釋學的幾個層面。首先，我們要考慮到：(一)應用在佛教或其他方面的 Humanism 的可能定義。如果要將佛法儘可能的傳達出來，弘法者必須慎選用字。「humanism」一直被廣泛地應用在各方面，但是並非所有的應用都符合人間佛教(Humanistic Buddhism)的目標。其中有一種邊見，認為人類天生是高等的品類，此一想法違背佛教的平等觀。另一種邊見，是屬於生物和人類學的範疇，他們把人類歸在與其他物種相同的層次，即把人類簡化為最低等的共同起源。此一觀點也不符合佛法。因此，佛教想要達成的人間化(humanistic)必須仔細地重新定義。

接下來我們要探討自我 (self) 的中心意義，(二)身為人類的我們認為自己是什麼人。這包含了佛教教義和認知科學間很奧妙的交集之處。我們可以發現，長久以來佛教藉觀察所探討的人類意識構造，和現代科學的分析之間有許多非常有趣的相似點。兩方面的探討結果，都同樣認為個別的自我 (separate self) 既沒有形而上的基礎，也缺乏客觀實有的證明，這一點顯得意義非凡。但是，有關下一步驟對於假我的觀點，兩組的意見不同。佛教把五蘊 (skandhas) 視為進入深層體悟的基點，然而認知科學家們卻傾向把分解了的意識當作討論的終點。

這一點引導我們進一步探討(三)我們如何認識自性。我們必須了解意識構成的經過，以及佛教對假我的解構。因為了解假我的成分才不致陷入「我」執所造成的無明機制中，因此如果要了解真我，就必須先忘我。

這種討論的結果可以得知(四)為何我們會忽略本性。在這含括人性的核心裡，我們發現了無心的禪心。由於人往往執著於人相，所以許多佛教祖師大德的語錄常被引述，以解除眾生對執著於人相的迷執。我們唯有「空」去一切分別妄想，才能如虛空一般，擁有一切，無所不包。在層層妄想無明底下的那個東西，才是我們的本來面目。

最後，我們必須考慮(五)何處可以找到返本歸真的人？他們是實踐人間佛教的具體典範。從許多佛教行者回歸自性的方法及預備回歸自性的前行中，我們可以找到許多的實例。他們以其人生體驗，宣說悟道過程，從而啟發他人發心求得相同的體證。他們並不遠離各階層人士，反而走出山門，和迷夢中的眾生一起生活。他們基於慈心悲願，用日常生活中通俗而有力的事例、形象及譬喻，幫助眾生看到本自具有的佛性。

一、Humanism 的定義：佛教和非佛教的觀點

當我們探討人間佛教 (Humanistic Buddhism) 在當今世界的潛力時，適時的為 humanistic 這個字下定義，似乎有其必要性。否則，我們會冒很大的危險，因為 humanism 的舊觀念及偏見與現代佛子以革新及方便為考慮所標舉的宗旨相悖，從而破壞了整個規畫。

首先我們來看一下，在英文語法中有關 humanism 的定義：

Humanism (人本主義)

熱衷於人類的權益；有關人類 (非天人) 的權益的系統，或有關人類 (非個人) 的系統；人道宗教。[註 4]

一種道德或知識的系統，把人類的權益當作是最重要的事，不同於個人主義或多神主義。[註5]

一種思想系統，主要關於人類和他們的評價，能力和價值。[註6]

Humanist (人類學者／人本主義者)

精通人類歷史或人性知識的人；精通人文科學的人。[註7]

以上的定義不是暗示就是明顯支持一種以人為中心，甚至於執著於人的世界觀。一般來說，humanism (人本主義) 的意義和文明的急遽改變有關，即脫離過去神明主宰宇宙萬物的觀念，進展到一種比較理性和「科學」的方法，促使人們以為現實可以被人類了解並加以控制。古希臘人當中，詭辯學者普泰格拉斯 (490~421 b.c.e.) 是贊同此一觀點 (人類是所有事物的衡量者) 的主要倡導者，而中國的孔子 (551~479 b.c.e.) 也經常被認為有類似的立場。(請看《論語》，*Lun Yu*, 11:11)

由於科技控制大自然的成功展現人類的智力不斷增進，已經導致全球性人本主義的昌盛，蓋因我們相信自己有絕對的能力，可以依照我們的想像創造和再造世界。最近由於基因密碼的破解使人們沾沾自喜，並在頭條新聞中以粗體字列出「人類認識自我」的推崇字眼。或許可以說是當代人本主義 (humanism) 具體而微的表現了。美國總統柯林頓對此一突破之舉回應道：「今天我們正在學習上帝創造生命的語言。」[註9] 這番話代表了大眾的心聲，暗示人類握有直達天界的通道。

但是，這種自稱以人類為中心的主義，顯然和佛教具包容性的平等觀，甚至超越種族的觀點，是對立的。以上所提的共通定義正是自我主義的產物。而自我主義是佛法修持中所要去除的，就是去除四聖諦中第一聖諦的有情眾生，不僅是人類的「苦」。因此，佛教的 humanism 應該把人當作是說法的主要對象，而不是強調人類與生俱來比其他生物優越。[註10] 優越地位不應來自對大自然的控制，而應該是觸及我們最深層的本性，如此我們才能和一切自然和諧共處，而不是要征服他們。

與此一膨脹人類高度優越感相對的另一個趨勢，是把人類貶到只有「獸」性而已。有些人不認為人類有獨特的自由意志，而主張人類只不過是大自然在全球棋賽中的棋子，我們是為了生存而被本能的衝動和頑強的習性所驅使。因此，生物學家蘭迪·松希爾和人類學家克來格·巴碼最近提出一個理論說：強暴是一種用來保證「適者生存」的性的基因發展策略[註 11]。同樣的，暴民的暴力事件和「撒野」被解釋為一種群眾心理的「自然」的遺留物：從失控的運動球迷到一群群徘徊的年輕男子。[註 12]一種高科技版本的社會達爾文主義已經產生了，如作家葆林娜·玻素的補充，認為人性論「把每件事都簡化為契約式的，經濟式的理性決策」，而不重視社交的互動關係。[註 13]這種傾向於決定論的定義，和前述謳歌人類優越的看法一樣，都與佛法的觀點相悖。

但是，並非所有的知識分子對人性的看法都很極端。在當代的科學家中，也可以發現贊同佛教物我平等觀的人。例如，對最近基因解碼的反應，鹽湖城猶他大學的進化生物學家和基因學家強·賽格觀察到：「基因圖呈現人類的形貌，把我們和大自然的其他生物放在一起公正地審視……從基因圖，你可以了解到蒼蠅、蟲類、猴子、老鼠和人類有相同的基因……我們人類沒有特殊優越之處。」[註 14]科學家們開始認知到佛教徒早在幾千年前就已經知道的緣起法則。聖路易華盛頓大學的羅伯·柯寧格斷言：「沒有一樣東西是獨立的，每樣東西都和其他東西相關。」[註 15]

透過去除我相，人類唯我獨尊的迷思被轉化為更深廣的真理基礎。在此過程中，人類了解其存在和其他物種有相通之處。如弗瑞德·尼采從「人類，就是人類而已」進化到「人類，與超／次人」。弘揚人間佛教 (Humanistic Buddhism) 必須先對 humanism 進行徹底的修正，並且重新思考它對人類的意義。我們所需要的是：不只讓我們成為一個人，而且還可以進一步讓我們認知自己可以超越「僅僅」是人的 humanism。更確切地來講，我們需要了解我們的內在資源，也就是我們的本性——我們本自具有的佛性。

二、我們是誰：探討真我

在佛教裡，我們應該從心的本質開始。[註 16]

星雲大師言簡意賅地宣稱：「人間性是佛教的基礎。」[註 17]悉達多太子是由人而開悟成佛，弘揚佛法。這些佛法傳授給當時的人們，一代傳一代，在人類歷史中流傳了幾千年，而且跨越了無數的文化區域。但是，佛教的教義和修持當中所指的人性是什麼呢？人性如何幫助或阻礙我們開悟呢？它的潛能和障礙是什麼呢？換句話說，這個讓我們開始追尋回歸到深層本性的東西，其主要成分是什麼呢？

在這裡我們從事的一種是知性的探討，俾使我們在佛教典籍中，嗅出我們本性所遺留下來或引導我們領悟真實自性的蹤跡。由十二世紀中國一組著名圖畫，可以得知這個問題在佛教的重要性。請看 Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 1 India and China* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), pp. 279-281; 及 Calkin, "Ten Bulls: The Zen Oxherding Pictures." Nyogen Senzaki and Paul Reps trans., in *Entering the Stream: An Introduction to the Buddha and His Teachings*, Samuel Bercholz and Sherab Chodzin Kohn eds. (Boston: Shambhala, 1993), pp. 211-222. [註 18]在這十牛圖中，遊走的牛代表真實自性，它從被人追蹤、捕捉，最後被「馴服」，係用來比喻我們以追尋自我的方式來找到我們為人的基礎。很多人甚至不知道有這隻牛的存在，或者以為它已經「走失」了。他們洋洋得意，以為自己已經完全接觸到並且擁有真實的自我，其實他們在不知不覺中已經陷於危險的迷惑裡。

一旦我們發覺真如自性已經迷失，就必須想辦法再把它找回來。我們需要有殊勝的知見來判別它模糊的蹤跡，如此才可以追蹤它到哪裡去了。要想追蹤成功，必須要有甚深智慧，然後去捕捉、安撫，並騎在牛／自我身上。(圖 3~6)。完成這些工作以後，必須超越牛，也就是必須捨棄將「我」執著為一件事、一個觀念、一個有待捕捉的概念，然後必須繼續超越，或者去除對於我相的執著，或者去除有一個實我存在某處這種造作出來的想法。最後的兩幅圖係告訴我們首須空掉空的觀念，以探究事物、觀念和結構的本源，然後再回到人世間，以超越世間的方式生活在世間。

在惠能大師《壇經》第七品講佛之知見時，可發現一項有趣的相似點。大師試著向傲慢的法達法師解釋：為何以輕心慢意讀誦經典（這裡指《法華經》）並非真正的修行，並說明開悟的四個階段。首先必須「開」佛之知見，意指大多數的人不但像「夢遊者」一樣，而且還緊閉雙眼。在這種情況下，我們根本無法觀照實相。如果我們要參與這個過程，我們必須確實「示」其所然，如此才能「悟」入佛之知見，或有所察覺。最後，才能「入」佛之知見。在這時，菩提正覺就像「迷失」的牛一樣，不再是往外尋找的「東西」，而是一個人最內在的本性。

即使在追蹤牛跡開始之前，也必須糾正西方心理學和科學在「humanistic」範疇中有關自我的「啓示」。他們的無知導致人們對本體的錯誤觀念，例如，「後現代的人格觀」天真地認為自我的想法是現代生活前所未有的產物：[註 19]

我們變得流動且多面向。雖然並沒有完全察覺到這一點，我們已經在發展出適應多變時代的自我感。這種存在的方式和過去非常不一樣，使得我們可以從事不斷的探索和個人的嚐試。[註 20]

從佛教的觀點來看，這種高漲的人種優越感造成極大的缺陷。儘管西方人對於自我的覺醒的確正在形成，並且趨向流動及多元化，但我們可以大膽地說這是極為普遍的人類現象。早在兩千五百年前，釋迦牟尼佛已宣稱這個自我包括了三種存在的特性：無常、苦和無我。因此，過度渲染的後現代人格並非新的觀點，而是對現實的妥協之道。西方思想只是趕上佛教的社會學和心理學的觀點。甚至「多變的時代」實際上早就伴隨人類，而非現代人才有的經驗。

相同地，西方科學家在探究自我意識時，對於非西方的資源，展現出自滿的無知。諾貝爾·勞瑞特·法蘭斯·克理克的著作《令人震撼的假設：以科學方法追尋靈魂》就是一個很明顯的例子，他的假設（主要是關於意識，而非靈魂）對全世界數百萬的佛教徒而言，一點也不震撼。

令人震撼的假設是「你」：你的歡喜和悲傷，你的回憶和雄心，你個人的身分認同和自由意志，只不過是由很多神經細胞及其相關分子匯集而形成的行為而已。

[註 21]

撇開在術語上有表面上的差別不說，克理克的論點相當於佛教對「蘊」的看法（下面會討論到），因此並非「和現代人的觀點有很大的不同，所以不能稱為令人震撼的」。他呼籲要開始「以很嚴謹而有計畫的方式來對意識做實驗的研究」，[註 22]此話聽來奇怪，因為幾千年來已經有很多來自不同文化背景的佛教行者，早已對他們的意識進行實驗，並且將他們的發現記錄在無數的典籍裡。其中有人對克理克的回應，認為人種優越感在科學探討中無法佔有一席之地，即使是諾貝爾·勞瑞特也需要再教育一番。[註 23]

如果客觀地檢視現有的科學證據，可以發現：古代佛教徒對於自我的描述可由認知的心理學、進化的生物學、神經科學和神經學等許多不同的領域加以確認。仔細考量這些敘述的內容，可以避免或緩衝人們對先進的資訊草率下定義。經過幾世紀以來專精一志的探究佛教典籍已經發展出高度繁複的分析，對於任何抱持開放胸襟研究自我的人而言，顯然十分有用。以下我僅指出吾人模糊的牛跡，希望能啟發一些人做更徹底的探討。

三、我們如何認識自性：佛教對我的分解

研究佛道即研究自我。

研究自我即忘了自我。
忘了自我即了悟萬法開悟。
了悟萬法開悟即解脫自他身心。
開悟之跡不存，無跡之開悟永在。[註 24]

佛教對自我的看法已經成為教義、佛經和修行的重點，尤以禪宗為然。這些教義的複雜性令人吃驚。例如，認知作用即已分為八種型態，從入世的五識到超越的「藏識」。比較之下，佛洛伊德所說 Id（「本我」），Ego（「自我」）、Super-ego（「超我」）的自我三層結構，及意識和潛意識的二元論，實在是太過簡單了。這裡的討論必然是過度簡化了。[註 25]

正如同日本的道元禪師所說，什麼是佛教徒想要忘記或解脫的我呢？為區分這個我和原初的本性，我們可以說這個「我」是錯誤發展的自我。初期五蘊的教義，詳細描述自我意識產生無明的過程。在佛教的分析和現代認知科學的分析之間，有許多類似之處。比較這些敘述的內容，可以讓我們比較清楚地了解到遠離真如佛性的根源何在。

佛教的五蘊[註 26]和認知科學模式的比較[註 27]

1.Rūpa（色）

產生的過程先有五塵（色、聲、觸、香、味）加上「第六」意識。資訊由五根從感覺投射的世間中接收之後，被認為是外在的經驗而加以處理。因此，「無明一色」讓我們以為自己所感覺到的事物是「外在」的世界。

相對地，對認知科學家而言，身體的基本器官，包括腦部，是感官資訊產生的先決條件。目前此一過程經由人身及其他眾生身上的實驗而得到神經學的支持。頭腦，是五根蒐集資訊的集合點，可以被認為是一種「執行的」感覺器官，它蒐集資訊，並根據蒐集而來的資訊下達指令。

2.Vedanā（受）

各器官所收到的資訊傳送到腦部之後，便被轉化為感覺。我們的感覺或感受就好像「防衛裝置」，在無始無明和強烈的現實之間加了一道保護的絕緣體。這些感覺有三種形式：樂

受，苦受，或捨受（不苦不樂受）。基本的視覺、聽覺、觸覺、嗅覺和味覺正是從假想的對境呈現的訊息所產生的最初反應。

認知科學解釋感受，認為是神經細胞對感覺訊息所帶來的刺激而產生的反應。研究人員相信他們已經能確定腦部不同的區域，經過多年的進化之後，職司諸根所發出的訊息，如視覺、嗅覺等。因此，每一感覺在腦部的皮質層有自己的「轉播台」，將訊息蒐集起來後再處理。研究人員以人為方式刺激這些腦部區域，如同確實的資訊已經傳到腦部，結果產生不同的感覺，由此得到印證。換句話說，我們可以製造虛妄的感官訊息，從而產生樂受、苦受、捨受。

3.Saññā（想）

「想—衝動」負責認識感覺的訊息，是一種比處理生物體本身的原始感覺訊息更為複雜的過程。我們透過佛教所謂的三毒—瞋、貪和愚癡的衝動，對「想」有所反應。我們不只是單純的看、聽、觸、嗅、嚐，而是看到我們「想」成它是某種的東西，感覺到它是某種東西等等，從而引發瞋恨（極端的不喜歡）、貪欲（極端的喜歡）或癡（無關緊要）的反應。

從認知科學家的觀點來看，當感覺的訊息在腦部特定的區域處理過程中，「由丘腦聯繫調和成一種類似電力活動的律動」。這種有強化刺激的效果，能加強對生物體的影響。就好像克理克（Crick）對視覺的觀察，即「想」的時候有一種「創造的過程」在作用著。「你所看到的並非真相，而是你的腦部認為的東西……一種對世間事物的象徵性詮釋」。[註 28]

4.Saṅkhāra（行）

根據「想」，開始產生知識、觀念和分類。輸入的感覺訊息被編輯著，凡是對生物體有用或熟悉的訊息會被挑選出來，特別加以注意，而「不相關」的訊息則不被理睬，退回到完全不會被經過「想」或在「想」以前的情況。分別心根據過去的經驗和未來的需要來詮釋「事實」，從而在刺激下產生我要這個、我要設法避開，或忘卻不理等「行」或欲望的行為。

依科學的術語則是，「同步運作的細胞……發出一種訊息一致的波動到丘腦」。[註 29] 為回應目前被高度詮釋的資訊，生物體產生喜歡或迴避的感受。腦部根據歸納邏輯，指示生物體遵照過去行為模式來行事，以確保其生存。

5.Viññāṇa（識）

思想和情緒分層運作之後，因為假想有一個我是感覺、想像和觀念的來源而產生了意識。這發展成一種把假我當作我的意識感。這是一種「合併」——將「第二蘊的直覺認知，第三蘊的動能，和第四蘊的賦予理智合起來產生思想和情緒」，包括了「六境以及無法控制和不合邏輯的散漫思想型式」，例如作夢、幻想，甚至於時間本身。[註 30]所有的這些被認為有一個自我為中心來擁有或表達。這個我可以感覺、想像、構思和作夢。

認知科學家認為這是「盲目的過程」：「丘腦在它的範圍內接收到的所有反應，被當作是一個影像，也就是一個短暫的意識。那些影像出現得很快，所以看起來好像是連續的。……意識……是丘腦和大腦皮質層之間的對話，被感覺調整」。[註 31]就好像是舊式影片閃過去的影像，單獨的影像被結合成一種連續的，好像整體的畫面。我們看到想要看的東西：站在經驗後面持有經驗的人。

一旦我們了解到持續增強的五種過程形成意識的結構，自我的假相即可破解。虛幻一層一層地剝落了。當此一過程中無明的作用暴露出來時，對治的方法便出現了。最後我相的空性，也隨之顯現，那就是本性或佛性。當忘卻了自我的妄念，真如自性就垂手可得了。

但是，人無法找到他認為沒有遺失的東西，因此佛教典籍中這些體驗是對自我產生的因果關係做仔細的分析記載。這種分析始於釋迦牟尼佛，繼而有無數行者探究到自我的實體根本不存在。人類的實際情況與所假定的和被左右的觀點有所差距，有時遠超過，有時大不如。離開了五蘊，則「無我」，所以「只有痛苦，沒有受苦者；只有業行，沒有作者。」[註 32]佛陀認為我的意識流，不具永恆性，這種教義和現代認知科學所研究出來的意識理論是相行不悖的。

所有的物理理論……只描述功能——如記憶、注意力、意念、內省——與腦部特殊物理過程是相關的。但是這些理論都無法解釋為什麼這些功能伴隨著主觀的經驗產生作用。[註 33]

一旦我們改變對自己與人類的想法，我們談論自己和表現行為的方式也會改變。

現在，何謂以自己心的本質來自我度脫呢？這意謂著從自己心內的無明、妄想、苦惱中能解脫出來。……[註 34]

假我可以從真我的體驗中得到明證。真我即禪宗所說的無心，現在我們將注意力轉到這個問題上。

四、為何我們是這樣的：無心的禪心

有一樣東西明亮澄清，沒有虛假，沒有偏見，如如不動，擁有廣大的意識，不生不死，無名、無相、無字。涵容廣大，覆天蓋地，包含所有的形狀和聲音，而且可以發揮功能……當我們提到心這個字眼，它不是一般人虛妄分別的心，而是每個人如如不動的心。……一旦覺悟，如人飲水，冷暖自知，無法言詮。它是含天括地，明明白白的覺知。[註35]

就好像道家的「為無為」(非造作的行為)，瓦解了人為的造作；「無心」，乃無心之心，或更準確的來說，是非心之心，瓦解了心的人為造作。由於外相往往障礙了更深層的無為真理，禪可以被視為道家的為／不為二元觀念的內化。現在的術語變成心與非心的錯誤二元論，導致潛在的無心無法顯現出來。就其天真自然的本質而言，無心也就是在迷惑的人性當中很不容易發現的「平常心」。禪宗典籍對道家的「歸真」觀念呼應道：

人往往認為佛陀和一般人不同……我們的佛性就是佛。當然，有情眾生就像不知家在何處的孤兒。……長久以後的一個機緣，人類察覺到本自具有的佛性。[註36]

無心的理論駁斥了西方哲學和心理學上對於我的定義。無心是有關我的最究竟的觀點，它直指人寶貴願心的根源，讓我們敢於面對不可思議的無我真理。佛教不僅對我們一般所認為的真理以「無」來否定，而是讓我們了解存在的本質是泯除靈魂、我思、自我、物質實體，甚至社會角色等一切的妄想，此即所謂的「無」。

NO-MIND (無我)

BUDDHIST NEGATIONS 佛教的否定	FALSE CONCEPTS 錯誤的觀念
without (wu) ātman 無我	soul or spirit 靈魂或精神
without thinking 無想	Cartesian <i>cogito</i> 笛卡爾的「我思」
without consciousness or self-consciousness 無意識或無自我意識	ego; consciousness of self as a self 自我; 把自我意識當作我
without physical body 無實體	material embodiment 有實體
without personality, <i>personae</i> 無自性	social masks worn and roles played 戴上社會面具和角色的扮演

當這些錯誤的觀念被驅除時，結果就是意識的瓦解——空。當代一位韓國大師描述如下：

想之前，你的心就像一張白紙。然後，你寫下「一」和「神」和「無」等等。當你截斷所有的思想，擦掉所有的假名、相狀，回到原來的空時，我是什麼呢？我不知道。當你心中有此大疑時，你的心就是不知道。不知道的心就是空的心。沒有文字，沒有

語言。所以沒有一，沒有神，沒有心，沒有空，什麼都沒有。這個不知道的心是非常重要的。我是不知道，不知道是我。就這樣，這是你的真實自我。所以要常保持不知道的心。[註 37]

因此，當自己／牛被追到它的本源，再帶回到我們開始遠行的現實世界裡時。很多迷惑和「染污」，如：自我、靈魂、社會角色、「罪惡」、「邪行」、「羨慕」和「嫉妒」等，都被去除了。由於這些錯誤去除了，我們邁向「無相懺悔」，懺除過去因為無明迷惑所造下的惡業。於是，我們從自己所造的「罪業」中解脫出來了。[註 38]

掃除塵垢，人性清明，能為整體社會帶來福利。這時的我對自己或他人不會帶來危險。相反地，當我們懺悔過去的錯誤，把它們空掉時，我們充滿著「至高無上的佛性」。我們「皈依自性佛」，如同化身。[註 39]也就是說，我們還是人類當中的人，只是有一股力量支撐我們超越到人以上而已，這就是人間佛教。日本的白隱禪師（1686~1769）提出追蹤過程的最後一步，從自我的迷夢中覺悟之後的境界將是：

忘了你自己而且變成了宇宙！[註 40]

五、回到覺悟：到哪裡可以找到回歸自性的人呢？

誰能夠遵照白隱禪師的指示來做呢？我們到哪裡能夠找到已經回歸自性而且可以引導我們的人呢？我們終須從理論的構想進展到實際的修持，來看看人類實際上如何超越人性。因此，我們將舉出一些佛教行者超越人性的體驗實例作為結論。

我們所舉出來的典範，不但是佛教修行的大師，而且都是具有佛法善巧方便（upāya）的大師，他們善於傳達他們的修行經驗，讓他人也可以自利利他。他們如同活菩薩一般，鼓舞他人發願獲得相同的體證，相同的善巧，並且同樣找到自己的本性。

在此我們將分析三位大師善巧方便的事蹟，他們的「方便法門」或有不同，但直指真我或本性是共同的目標。

密勒日巴尊者（1052~1135）被認為是西藏佛教中最著名的大師級人物之一。他藉著雲遊的方式將佛法帶到市街上，或者更恰當地說，將佛法帶到他來往的山區。密勒日巴尊者曾即興作了大約十萬頌詩偈，將佛法傳給各個階層的人士等。

帕圖仁波切(1808~1887)是近代的西藏大師，晚年以他的生活作為弘法的教材。他隸屬寧瑪派，對於不習慣以直截了當的方式追求精神層面的人士而言，他的方式和語言是非常震撼的。

星雲大師(1927~)，乃當代中國大師，致力倡導人間佛教，以佛學講座的方式在世界各地向各種人士弘法。他的作品從佛教經典的學術論著到現代的著名故事，也有富含教育意味的個人軼事。

【註釋】

[註 1] Venerable Master Hsing Yun(星雲大師), *Readings in Humanistic Buddhism: Part I* (San Diego: BLIA, 1996), P.1.

[註 2] 此創造性詮釋學五個階段的模式是由已故的傅偉勳教授(1933~1996)為復興亞洲許多哲學傳統，包括佛教，而發展出來的。請參見〈關於緣起思想形成與發展的詮釋學考察〉，《中華佛學學報》第 4 期(台北:1991 年)第 169~199 頁;和"Creative Hermeneutics: Taoist Metaphysics and Heidegger," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 3, 1976, pp.115~143.

[註 3] 《壇經》第十品，摘自 A. F. Price and Wong Mou-Lam trans., *The Diamond Sutra and the Sutra of Hui Neng* (Berkeley: Shambala Publications, Ltd., 1969), p. 109. 在其他品中，惠能觀察到：「若無世人，一切萬法，本自不有。故知萬法，本自人興。」；第二品，第 30 頁。

[註 4] *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951), p.580.

[註 5] *The Cassell Paperback English Dictionary*, Betty Kirkpatrick ed. (London: Cassell Publishers Limited, 1990), p.662.

[註 6] *The American Heritage Dictionary*, 3rd edition (New York: Dell, 1994), p.408.

[註 7] *The Cassell Paperback English Dictionary*, p.662.

[註 8] Nicholas Wade, "Genetic Code of Human Life is Cracked by Scientists," 《紐約時報》，2000 年 6 月 27 日，A1 版。

[註 9] 柯林頓總統，Wade 所引用，A1 版。

[註 10] 星雲大師觀察到，「釋迦牟尼佛出生在人間，生活在人間，成佛在人間，說法在人間」第 i 頁。

[註 11] Craig T. Palmer and Randy Thornhill, *A Natural History of Rape* (MIT Press, 2000).

[註 12] 欲知詳情，請看 Natalie Angier, "In the Crowd's Frenzy, Echoes of the Wild Kingdom", 《紐約時報》，2000 年 7 月 9 日，Week in Review，第 4 版。

[註 13] Paulina Borsook, *Cyberselfish: A Critical Romp Through the Terribly Libertarian Culture of High Tech* (Public Affairs, 2000), 如同 Michiko Kakutani 所評論, 「矽谷把經濟視為雨林」, 紐約時報, 2000 年 7 月 25 日。

[註 14] Natalie Angier 所引用: "A Pearl and a Hodgepodge: Human DNA," 《紐約時報》, 2000 年 6 月 27 日, A21 版。

[註 15] 引自 Angier, A21。

[註 16] 《壇經》, 第六品, 第 49 頁。

[註 17] 星雲大師, 第 1 頁。

[註 18] 原始道教系列包括八景:

1. 尋牛
2. 見跡
3. 見牛
4. 得牛
5. 馴牛
6. 騎牛歸家
7. 忘牛存人
8. 人牛俱忘

廓庵師遠禪師後來增加另外兩景, 超越道家無物的最後想像, 然後將找牛的人回到現實生活當中:

9. 返本還源
10. 入廓垂手

請參見 Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 1 India and China* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), pp.279~281; 及 Calkin, "Ten Bulls: The Zen Oxherding Pictures," Nyogen Senzaki and Paul Repts trans, in *Entering the Stream: An Introduction to the Buddha and His Teachings*, Samuel Bercholz and Sherab Chodzin Kohn eds. (Boston: Shambhala, 1993), pp.211~222.

[註 19] Michiko Kakutani, "An Era When Fluidity has Replaced Maturity," 《紐約時報》, 1995 年 3 月 20 日, B1 版。

[註 20] Robert Jay Linton, *The Protean Self*, Kakutani 所引用, B1 版。

[註 21] Francis Crick, *The Astonishing Hypothesis: The Scientific Search for the Soul* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994), p.3.

[註 22] Crick, xii.

[註 23] 在 Crick 直率的宣稱當中, 看不出希望: 「開始時沒有偏見就無法達到目標」; 第 xii 頁。在作品將近結束時, 克里克發出一種自我完成的預言, 雖然是無意的: 形容道「非常顯著地, 人類的特色……我們

幾乎無限地自欺」他結論「我們頭腦的特色——進化到將有限的證據推斷為最合理的詮釋——變得幾乎不可避免的……以致於我們常下錯結論，尤其是有關抽象的事物」；第 262 頁。

[註 24] 日本道元禪師著，〈現成公案〉，("Enlightenment as Everyday Life")，《正法眼藏》(*Shobogenzo*)，由 Hakuyu Taizan Maezumi 翻譯為英文，收錄於 *Entering the Stream*, p.206。

[註 25] 如果要更深入討論佛教的意識問題，請看玄奘大師著，韋達譯《成唯識論》(*The Doctrine of Mere-Consciousness* 中英文版)，(香港：成唯識論編輯委員會，1973 年)，第 800 頁。

[註 26] 引自西藏大師創巴仁波切 (1940~1987) 的論文，"The development of Ego" (自我的發展)，收錄於 *Entering the Stream*, pp.74~82. 也請看 Thich Nhat Hanh, "One is All, All is One: The Five Aggregates," *The Miracle of Mindfulness* (一行禪師，〈一即一切，一切即一：五蘊〉，《正念的奇蹟》)。

[註 27] 摘自 Sandra Blakeslee, "How the Brain Might Work: A New Theory of Consciousness,"《紐約時報》，1995 年 3 月 21 日，B7 版。也請參見 Crick 之著作。

[註 28] Crick, pp.26, 31, 33.

[註 29] Blakeslee, B10.

[註 30] Chogyam Trungpa, p.79.

[註 31] Blakeslee, B10.

[註 32] 佛音論師，《清淨道論》(*Visuddhimagga*) (PTS)，第 513 頁，Walpola Rahula 在 *What the Buddha Taught* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1974)，p.26 中引用。

[註 33] 哲學家 David Chalmers 的觀點，正如同 John Horgan 在 *The End of Science: Facing the Limit of Knowledge in the Twilight of the Scientific Age* (New York: Broadway Books, 1997) 所解釋的，第 181 頁。

[註 34] 《壇經》，第七品，第 51 頁。

[註 35] 太古普愚禪師 (T'aego, 1301~1382)，13. "The Mind-Ground," *A Buddha from Korea: The Zen Teachings of T'aego*, trans. J. C. Cleary (Boston: Shambhala, 1988), pp.101~103.

[註 36] 佐佐木指月 (Sokei-an, 1882~1945)，*The Zen Eye: A Collection of Zen Talks by Sokei-an*, Mary Farkas ed. (New York: Weatherhill, 1993), p.4. 相同的譬喻，遺失的兒子出現在《法華經》第四品。

[註 37] 崇山 (1927~)，*Dropping Ashes on the Buddha: The Teaching of Zen Master Seung Sahn*, (《彈灰在佛身》) p.13. "You Must Become Completely Crazy," Stephen Mitchell ed. (New York: Grove Press, 1976)，p.35.

[註 38] 《壇經》，第七品，第 50 頁。

[註 39] 《壇經》，第七品，第 53 頁。

[註 40] Belinda Sweet 收藏白隱慧鶴 (Hakuin) 墨寶中的詩句，收錄在 John Stevens, *Sacred Calligraphy of the East* (Boulder & London: Shambhala, 1981), p.190.

~待續~