

大佛頂首楞嚴經淺釋

THE SHURANGAMA SUTRA WITH COMMENTARY

【卷九】ROLL NINE

宣化上人講 COMMENTARY BY THE VENERABLE MASTER HUA
國際譯經學院記錄翻譯 TRANSLATED BY THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSLATION INSTITUTE
修訂版 REVISED VERSION

「除是之餘，無所言說」：除了「是」字之外，他不講了。所以你覺得：「啊！這真是一字禪，這個真是高僧啊！他說這個法真是妙到極點，我也不懂。」你不懂那就是妙了。所以好像我現在講這個經，你們懂了，那就不妙了。你若說不懂，「啊！講來講去，法師說什麼呢？」哦！那就是妙了。因為你不懂，就是妙；你若明白了，就不妙了。

為什麼不妙呢？你明白了嘛！你沒明白那個東西就是妙。所以你若想「妙」，就不要學佛法了，你不學，就不知道，這就是妙。他就只說一個「是」字，你無論說什麼，他還是說一個「是」字。為什麼？他以為他就由這個「是」字上開悟了，那麼他也這樣告訴你，傳給你法！Transmit Dharma to you!

四者是人。有無俱見。其境枝故。其心亦亂。有人來問。答言亦有。即是亦無。亦無之中。不是亦有。一切矯亂。無容窮詰。

這第四種的矯亂，就是有、無矯亂。什麼叫有無矯亂呢？他又說是「有」，又說是「無」；又說「無」不是「有」，「有」就不是「無」。他也不知道是有，也不知道是無，這就好像那喝酒喝醉了的人那麼亂講。

Commentary:

Aside from saying “yes,” he does not speak. He doesn't say anything but “yes,” so you think, “Oh! This is really One-Word Chan. He must be a lofty Sanghan. The Dharma he speaks is so wonderful that I don't even understand it.” It's wonderful precisely because you don't understand it. For example, if you understand what I'm now lecturing in this Sutra, then it's not wonderful.

“The Dharma Master keeps talking and talking, but I don't understand what he is saying,” you may say.

In that case, it's wonderful for you. Simply because you don't understand, it is wonderful. Once you understand it, it's not wonderful anymore. Why not? Because you understand it! Whatever you don't understand is wonderful. Therefore, if you want the wonderful, don't study the Buddhadharma. If you don't study, then you won't know it and it will be wonderful.

Regardless of what you say, he says “yes.” Why is that? He believes he has become enlightened on account of the word “yes,” and so he's transmitting that Dharma to you.

Sutra:

Fourth, this person perceives both existence and nonexistence. Experiencing this branching, his mind becomes confused. When anyone comes to ask questions, he tells them, “Existence is also nonexistence. But within nonexistence there is no existence.” It is all sophistry and does not stand up under scrutiny.

Commentary:

His fourth fallacious theory concerns existence and nonexistence. What is this theory? He says things both exist and do not exist. But

「四者」，「是人有無俱見」：他在這個行陰裏邊，也見到有，又見到無。見到這個行陰，像水波浪似的這麼行，遷流不息，他說是「有」。在這個遷流不息的時候，有斷的地方，他又說是「無」。「其境枝故」：他這個境界生出來一個叉枝，就好像木頭生出一個旁枝來。所以他說這「有」也是，「無」也是。「其心亦亂」：他這個心裏也亂了，爲什麼他心裏亂了呢？就因爲他自己沒有真正的智慧，沒有真正的定力。這智力和定力，他不平等、不平均，所以在這個時候，他就生出一種執著，自己也找不著頭緒了，就有個錯路，他也不知道哪一條路是對了。

「有人來問」：若有人來請法，向他請開示，「答言亦有，即是亦無」：他說，也有，也就是沒有。「亦無之中，不是亦有」：可是沒有的，就不能是有。亦有就是沒有，但是沒有可就不是有，你說這究竟是個什麼道理？「一切矯亂」：這就是個矯亂的道理，矯枉過正，說得自己也不知道說些個什麼。所以我說這是他說醉話。

「無容窮詰」：無容，你不能和他講道理的，這個樣子怎麼辦呢？就是我那個辦法，你打他兩個嘴巴，看看他還說是有、是沒有？你這麼打他一個嘴巴，他若說：「你怎麼打我？」「你沒有嘛！我打你也是沒有啊！」還有那個辦法，你拿刀把他殺了說：「嘿！殺了你。」看看他有沒有？這無容窮詰，就是不可以和他講道理，沒有道理可講的，也不要問他了。

he says things that don't exist cannot also exist and things that exist cannot also not exist. He does not know whether it's existent or nonexistent. He talks wildly, like a drunkard.

Fourth, this person perceives both existence and nonexistence within the formations *skandha*. He perceives the formations *skandha* to be like waves flowing ceaselessly, so he says that it exists. He says the pauses within the ceaseless flow are nonexistence. **Experiencing this branching, his mind becomes confused.** His state has produced a branching off, just like on a tree, so he declares that things both exist and do not exist. His mind is confused because he doesn't have any true wisdom or *samadhi*. His wisdom and his *samadhi* are not balanced. At this point he becomes attached and cannot find his way out of the mess. He's confronted with a wrong road and doesn't know which road is right.

When anyone comes to ask questions and request instruction in the Dharma, **he tells them, "Existence is also nonexistence.** Things that exist also do not exist. **But within nonexistence there is no existence.** But things that do not exist cannot come into existence." What already exists is also nonexistent. However, what is nonexistent does not exist. Ultimately, what kind of theory is that? **It is all sophistry.** That kind of reasoning is fallacious. He doesn't know what he's saying. That's why I said that he talks like a drunkard.

And what he says does not stand up under scrutiny. There's no way to hold a reasonable discussion with him. What can you do then? You can only use my method, which is to slap him across the mouth and see if he still talks about existence and nonexistence. If you slap him, he might react by asking, "Why did you hit me?"

"But you don't exist, remember? So my slapping you also doesn't exist!" There's another tactic—you can take a knife and say, "Hey! I'm gonna kill you," and see whether or not he exists. You cannot reason with him. What he says cannot stand up under scrutiny, and you shouldn't ask him about it.

