

大智度論摘譯

卷第一 緣起論

EXCERPTS FROM THE TREATISE ON THE GREAT PERFECTION OF WISDOM ROLL ONE: ON ARISING OF CONDITIONS

龍樹菩薩 著 Written by Bodhisattva Nāgārjuna
姚秦三藏法師 鳩摩羅什 中譯
Translated into Chinese by Tripiṭaka Master Kumārajīva of the Yaoqin
dynasty

English translation © 1996 Dharmamitra.
All rights reserved.
Reprinted with permission of Kalavinka.

問曰。一切有爲法
皆無常相。應是第一義
。

云何言無常非實。
所以者何。一切有爲法生
住滅相。前生次住後滅
故。云何言無常非實
。

答曰。有爲法不應
有三相。何以故。三相不
實故。若諸法生住滅
。是有爲相者。今生中亦
應有三相。生是有爲相
故。如是一一處亦應有三
相。是則無窮。住滅亦如
是。若諸生住滅
。各更無有生住滅者。不
應名有爲法。何以故
。有爲法相無故。以是
故。諸法無常非第一義
。

復次若一切實性無
常則無行業報。何以故
。無常名生滅。失故。譬
如腐種子不生果。如是則
無行業。無行業云何有果
報。今一切賢聖法有果
報。善智之人所可信受。

Question: All conditioned dharmas are characterized by impermanence. It should be the case that this is the supreme meaning. Why? All conditioned dharmas are characterized by production, dwelling and extinction. [This is the case] because initially they are produced, then they dwell, and later they become extinct. Why then do you say that impermanence is not actual?

Reply: It should not be the case that conditioned dharmas possess the three characteristics. Why [not]? Because the three characteristics are not real. For instance, all instances of production, dwelling and extinction of dharmas are characteristics of that which is conditioned. Now, production [itself] should also be possessed of the three characteristics because production is [also] a conditioned dharma. In like fashion, at all points [during production] there should exist [all] three characteristics. If this were the case, then this would be endless [and hence absurd]. This would also be the case with regard to dwelling and extinction.

If it were the case that all instances of production, dwelling and extinction did not each possess production, dwelling and extinction, then they should not be referred to as conditioned dharmas. Why [not]? Because they would not possess the characteristics of conditioned dharmas. On account of this, the [teaching that] “all dharmas are impermanent” does not represent the supreme meaning *siddhānta*.

Furthermore, if all things [on the level of their] actual nature were impermanent, then there would be no carrying forth of karmic retribution. Why [not]? Because impermanence refers to disappearance due to [the process of] production and extinction. This is analogous to a rotten seed which does not [have the ability to] produce a fruit. If this were the case, then there could be no carrying forth of karma. If there were no carrying forth of karma, how could there be resultant retribution?

Now, in the Dharma of all of the worthies and sages there is [the teaching of] resultant retribution. This is something which can be believed in and accepted by



不應言無。以是等無量因緣。說不得言諸法無常性。一切有為法無常。苦無我等亦如是。如是等相名為對治悉檀。

第一義悉檀者。一切法性一切論議語言。一切是法非法。一一可分別破散。諸佛辟支佛阿羅漢所行真實法。不可破不可散。上於三悉檀中所不通者。此中皆通。

問曰。云何通。

答曰。所謂通者。離一切過失。不可變易不可勝。何以故。除第一義悉檀。諸餘論議諸餘悉檀皆可破故。如眾義經中所說偈：

各各自依見
戲論起諍競
若能知彼非
是為知正見

不肯受他法
是名愚癡人
作是論議者
真是愚癡人

若依自是見
而生諸戲論
若此是淨智
無非淨智者

此三偈中。佛說第一義悉檀相。

☞待續

those possessed of wholesome wisdom. One should not say that it is nonexistent. For this reason, dharmas are of a non-impermanent nature. On account of innumerable reasons such as these, [I] say that one cannot maintain that all dharmas are of an impermanent nature. [The teachings] that all conditioned dharmas are impermanent, that they are suffering, and that they are not-self are all similar in this regard. [The teachings which set forth] characteristics such as these fall within the scope of the therapeutic *siddhānta*.

[The Supreme-meaning (pāramārthika) Siddhānta]

As for the “supreme-meaning *siddhānta*,” the nature of all dharmas, all dialectical discourse, all categorizations of “correct Dharma” and “non-Dharma”,—all of them can be refuted and disintegrated through discrimination. The true and actual Dharma practiced by the Buddhas, Pratyekabuddhas, and Arhats cannot be refuted and cannot be disintegrated. Whatever is not reconciled within the three *siddhāntas* treated above is all reconciled herein.

Question: How then are they reconciled?

Reply: That which serves to reconcile transcends all defects, cannot be changed and cannot be vanquished. How is this so? Because aside from the supreme-meaning *siddhānta*, all other dialectical positions and all other *siddhāntas* can be refuted. This is as referred to in verses spoken in the *Multitude of Meanings Sutra* (*ārthavargīya sūtra*):

Everyone relies on his own view.
Frivolous discourse generates disputes.
If one has knowledge of another’s errors,
This passes for knowledge of the correct view.

If one cannot bear to accept another’s dharma,
Such a one is a foolish person.
Whosoever engages in these debates
Is truly a foolish person.

If one relies on one’s own view of what is right
And thus begets frivolous discourse,—
If this constitutes pure wisdom,
Then there is no one not possessed of pure wisdom.

In these three verses the Buddha describes the characteristics of the supreme-meaning *siddhānta*.

☞To be continued