

On Translation and Interpretation (continued)

A Lecture by Dr. Henry Rosemont, Jr. at Berkeley Buddhist Monastery on April 5, 2013 | Chinese Translation by Wei Zhang and Yihuan Shi

翻譯與詮釋 (續)

आर्यालोकितेश्वरो बोधिसत्त्वो गम्भीरां प्रज्ञापारमिताचर्यां चरमाणो व्यवलोकयति स्म

亨利·羅斯蒙博士講於柏克萊佛寺 2013年4月5日
張煒、石義環 中譯



BODHI FIELD | 菩提田

Someone who reads like a fool or a well-meaning preacher at best. You are not going to get a serious thinker, a profound thinker — and that of course is one reason so many Western philosophers have simply ignored Confucianism until very recently, and still regard it only marginally.

Thus, as translators, I would suggest you think less of simply key individual concepts and the terms that denote them, but rather think in terms of *concept clusters*. When you want to attribute a particular idea to a person, think of it in your target language, i.e. your native language, then think about the other terms that cluster around it, and see how many of them you can find. And if you don't find very many, you should be very nervous about attributing the basic concept to the speakers/writers of the object language. Even in English, you will find different *concept clusters* at different periods of time. In the late medieval or early Renaissance period, for example, the description, analyses, and

那便是讓孔子的言論讀起來不知所云，或者頂多讓孔夫子看起來像一位充滿善意的訓導者。那是不能夠吸引一個嚴肅的思想家，一個深刻的思想者（來讀孔子的），這也是為什麼長久以來如此多的西方哲學家都忽視了儒家思想，直到近來才有所改觀。然而即便是現在，西方的哲學家也僅僅是略知《論語》的皮毛而已。

因此，作為一個翻譯者，我建議你們少從一個單一的概念以及描述這個概念的術語著手，應該從概念組的角度入手。當你想要為他人貼上一個特定的概念標籤時，首先掂量這個概念在譯入語（也就是你的母語）裏是什麼意思，進一步再檢視是否能找到與這個概念相互關聯的一群術語（概念組），並試看看你能找到多少。如果你找不到很多，你應該感到非常憂慮，因為這個概念標籤可能有問題。即便在英語裏，你

evaluation of human conduct centered on the concept of *honor*, and you had words like *chivalric*, you had *sakes*, you had *shents*, *boons*, *liegeful*, *varlet*, *gentle*, and *villain*. These and several other terms clustered around *honor*, and were essential for any and all discussions of what and who were honorable, and what and who were not. That vocabulary is no longer in use. That is not the way we hold moral discussions. Most of those words we don't even know well, except those you might have come across in reading Chaucer, or Robin Hood when you were young. I assume you have all used the expression, "for Pete's sake" or "for goodness' sake." How many of you know what a sake is? It was a very important word in moral thinking during the medieval period. Or, to go a little farther west, or east — depending on what direction you started from — consider the concept-cluster centering around the concept of *Dharma*: *karma*, *moksha*, *dubkha*, *varna*, *nirvana*, *samsara*, *skandas*, and related terms. When Hindus want to talk about the descriptions, analyses, and evaluation of human conduct, that's the concept cluster they use. Most of these words have no close English parallels, especially *karma* and *dharma* — and no one would dream of translating them. (They shouldn't use "salvation" for *moksha*, either, in my opinion.)

Roger and I see the notion of concept clusters as very important for issues of translation. When you want to work with a text and you are focusing on the religious dimensions, think carefully about theology, think of grace, think of prayer, and think of other words that tend to cluster around "religion" in your native tongue, and see what kind of analogies there are, or are not, in the object language. That can serve as an important check on your interpretation of the text. You will be much less inclined to use the word "moral" to translate *yi*, when you realize that none of the other terms we associate with "moral" are found in the same way in classical Chinese. The imposition of our concept clusters on the authors of texts from cultures very different from our own is pernicious because it does not allow the others to speak for themselves.

Of course you are always walking a tightrope: how to give the others their full "otherness" without making them *wholly* other. When you make them wholly other, you can dismiss them. You can treat them like so many grains of sand on the beach — I don't have to pay attention to this, this can't be serious. And, you can kind of keep your cultural sense of superiority and condescension toward the other, or not even care about them, as so few Americans seem to have cared deeply about how much "collateral damage" by U.S. forces have been suffered by the peoples of Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, to take only some

也會發現同一個概念，在不同的時期，竟有不同的概念組。例如在中世紀末期或者文藝復興初期，描述、分析、評價人類行為的詞語圍繞在 "honor(榮耀)" 這個概念上。與「榮耀」相關的概念組是：chivalric(騎士風範)，sake(目的)，shents(羞辱)，boons(恩惠)，liegeful(忠心耿耿)，varlet(無賴)，gentle(溫文爾雅)，和villain(惡棍)。這些詞彙或概念都與「榮耀」相互關聯，這些詞彙在當時非常重要，因為它們總被用來議論某人某事是否高尚，是否值得尊崇。然而這套詞彙，現代人已經不復使用，我們不再用這些詞彙來討論道德問題。而且大部份的詞彙我們甚至都不太瞭解，除非你在年少時期讀過喬叟(Chaucer)的作品或者羅賓漢的故事，那麼或許你會覺得有些字還頗為熟悉。你們肯定都使用過這兩種措辭 "for Pete's sake" (天哪)，或者 "for goodness' sake" (看在老天爺份上)，但有多少人了解 "sake" 的意涵？這個字在中世紀時，是談論道德非常重要的一個語彙。或者，讓我們說得再遠一點，考慮一下圍繞著法(Dharma) 這個詞彙的概念組：我們有業(karma)，解脫(moksha)，苦(duhkha)，種姓(varna)，涅槃(nirvana)，輪迴(samsara)，五蘊(skandhas)，諸如此類。當印度教徒想要描述、分析、評價人類行為時，用的就是這組概念。這些詞彙在當代英文中找不到任何對應的語詞，尤其是業(karma)和法(dharma)，而且沒有人有勇氣把他們翻譯出來。至於有些人將解脫(moksha) 翻譯成救贖(salvation)，個人並不認同這種翻法。

安樂哲和我把概念組的觀念視作翻譯過程中很重要的內容。當你準備翻譯一篇文章，而且內容是聚焦於宗教的不同向度及義理內涵。此時你需要仔細研究「神學」，仔細思量「恩賜」、「祈禱」等字眼，同時也要在你的母語裏思維與「宗教」相關的概念語彙，繼而再察看對方的語言裏是否有類比的字眼。這個方法可以協助你所詮釋的文章完成很重要的核對。當翻譯者意識到與 "moral(道德)" 有關的西方術語並不存在於中國的古文裏時，就不再傾向使用 "moral(道德)" 來翻譯中國字的「義」。硬將個人語言文化的概念組，強力施加於與己文化差異極大的作者身上，是毫無益處而且有害的，因為這表示翻譯者不允許他人呈現自己的觀點。

所以在翻譯這條路上，翻譯者自然會一直處在走鋼索的心境，你會戰戰兢兢地小心權衡：如何在尊重他人文章語言及文化的 "他異性 (otherness)" 上，卻



recent examples of the “other.” They seem so other, so wholly other, it is difficult for us to connect with them as fellows in any sense.

Those are some of the concerns that we have had, and I do hope you will take the idea of concept clusters seriously in your own translation efforts because it can serve as an effective check on imposing an ideology on a text that is alien to its authors.

Continuing with our interpretation of what the *Analects* is about, and hence our translation of it, Roger and I rendered the term *junzi* as “exemplary persons.” All other translators have rendered the term differently: “superior man,” “noble man,” “gentleman,” and even the ugly “manhood-at-its-best.” “Gentleman” tends to be the most common, made popular by Waley in his wonderful translation of the text almost 80 years ago now. But Waley was an Englishman, and when he began the translation of the *Analects*, “gentleman” meant something not altogether dissimilar from what I think *junzi* means, save for the implied sexism. But we don’t live in England, we live in an America where there are supposedly no hierarchies and overwhelmingly we see the word “gentlemen” only in the plural on the doors of men’s restrooms. We don’t see or use the word very often, and when we do, we tend to think of “stuffed shirts” of one kind or another.

The other English terms used for *junzi* seem even more elitist and sexist, and consequently would surely make the text off-putting to a large segment of contemporary readers. Now given that 1) model emulation is a key element in Confucian learning, and 2) that the classical Chinese language is not marked for case, number, or gender, it seemed straightforward to us to render the term as “exemplary persons” and consequent “they” as pro-form rather than “he.”

Now even though we have the grammar on our side, some critics might want to argue that the China of Confucius

又不讓它們成為 “純然的他者 (wholly Other)” 。當你把文章翻譯成「純然的他者」，與自己文化的讀者無法產生關聯，那你不如別翻了，你可以繼續懷抱著自己文化上的優越感和自認高人一等，或者乾脆保持冷漠，但是就是別翻了。因為你會將文章處理成沙灘上無數的沙粒一般，沒有讀者會注意或關心，更不會認真看待它。舉例來說，幾乎沒有多少美國人深切地關心過美軍對伊拉克、巴基斯坦和阿富汗的人民帶來多少傷害。這些異國人民看上去如此地於我們無關，如此地「純然的他者」，以至於我們很難將他們聯想成為自己的同胞或夥伴。



這些是安樂哲和我在翻譯過程中所遭遇過的問題，我非常希望你們在自己翻譯的崗位上能認真對待概念組的問題，因為它可以成為翻譯者很有效的檢查工具，它協助你檢查翻譯者是否將一個連原文作者都感到陌生的意識形態強加到翻譯的文字上。

讓我們繼續如何詮釋及翻譯《論語》的話題。我和安樂哲把書中的術語「君子」詮釋為 “exemplary persons (典範人物)” ，其他的譯者則有不同的翻法，譬如：“superior man (出眾之人)” 、“noble man (高尚者)” 、“gentleman (紳士)” ，甚至還有不甚優雅的 “manhood-at-its-best (雄雄男子漢)” 。“Gentleman” 是君子一詞最普遍的翻譯，它是亞瑟·威利 (Arthur Waley) 的傑作，自從八十年前他翻譯《論語》一書後，“gentleman” 的譯詞開始變得流行。威利是英國人，當他著手翻譯《論語》時，那個年代所謂的 “gentleman” ，除了字眼裏面暗藏的性別主義，其實和我所認知的「君子」並沒有太大的差異。我們並不住在英國，我們所住的美國，按理來說是沒有任何階級主義的地方，“gentleman” 這個詞通常只出現在男性洗手

really was a patriarchal society, it really was oppressive, sexist, and so on. That, of course, is simply another interpretation. But it's not clear, at least for the early Confucians, that they were quite as sexist as they were pointed out to be. Mozi, for example, berates the Confucians for treating women as equals with respect to the performance of rituals. Some of Michael Nylan's exemplary scholarship has been to show that, at least with respect to middle class women, the classics would not have been preserved in the early Han had it not been for them, their erudition, and their education.



Still another example of the relation between translation and interpretation hinges on how and what we think about the languages we are translating from and to. Classical Chinese is almost wholly an analytical language in the sense that it is not inflected, apart from a context, no character has a singular grammatical function. It is only in a context that you can say that this should be a verb, this a noun, that should be an adjective, this should be an adverb. The classical language does not unambiguously express grammatical relations, as most Indo-European languages do, or modern spoken languages do. More than that, Roger and I have argued that it seems to be the case that nouns default to verbs in classical Chinese. It is more an event language – like Hebrew – than a thing language – like Greek, or most Indo-European languages.

So when we came to the famous passage of 12.11, which is usually called the rectification of names, we preferred to think of it as the rectification of roles. It simply reads *jun jun, chen chen, fu fu, zi zi* (君君, 臣臣, 父父, 子子). The passage is usually translated as “the ruler should rule, the minister should minister, the father should be a father and the son should behave like a son,” which is clearly concerned with “things” broadly defined, a concern with essences, of course. But we attribute a dynamism to the language, and

間的門上，而且還是以複數的形式出現。美國人不經常看到或使用這個詞，而當我們使用它的時候，總會不由自主地聯想起那種言談浮誇，舉止華而不實，或者表現得過度一本正經的人。

其它英文版本的「君子」翻譯，看來似乎隱含了更多的菁英主義和性別歧視，因此肯定會招致大批當代讀者的厭惡。我們之所以將「君子」詮釋為“exemplar persons (典範人物)”，乃基於以下兩點：第一，向典範學習是孔子教學的要點；第二，中國古文沒有大小寫、單複數或性別之分，因此我們把「君子」詮釋為“exemplar persons (典範人物)”並以「他們」而不是「他」做為替代詞來指射，也就顯得理所當然了。

儘管我們有了中國文字基本文法的撐腰，一些評論家可能還是會提出反駁，認為孔子所在的先秦時期，本來就是一個父權主導的社會，裏面充滿著壓迫及性別歧視。當然，這是某一部份人的詮釋。早期的儒家，是否真的像評論者所言的男權至上，這一點尚不明確。例如，墨子曾經嚴厲斥責儒家在禮教中平等對待兩性的做法。麥可·奈藍教授(Michael Nylan)許多出色的學術研究也顯示，如果沒有古代小康之家的女性，沒有她們的博學和教養，早期漢族的傳統經典是無法傳承下來的。

接下來的例子還是關於翻譯和詮釋，不過重點是放在我們該如何看待被翻譯的語言(又稱源語言)和翻譯後的語言(又稱譯入語)。文言文的語言特點在於它幾乎完全是一個分析型語言，也就是它不具備詞性變化，如果文字脫離上下文，單一的語素就無法展現語法的功能。中國文字只有處在有上下文的脈絡中，人們才得以判別那個單字是動詞、名詞、形容詞或副詞等詞類。文言文與大多數的印歐語系的語言(及其現代口語)不同，文言文並沒有清楚的語法關係。除此之外，安樂哲和我對中文語法提出了一個主張(證明也屬實)，那就是在文言文中，名詞經常活用為動詞。所以古漢文更像希伯來



equally attribute to Confucius a concern for people to appropriately discharge the responsibilities of their place(s) in society, hence our translation reads: “The ruler rules, the minister ministers, the father fathers and the son sons.”

Now, we thought at length about the issue before translating it that way, in part because of the nature of which nouns in English go easily to verbs and which do not. It is straightforwardly the task of the ruler to rule. “Ministers minister” is maybe minimally suspect because we usually think of a minister as ministering to his flock which of course is not what an official would do. “Fathers father” is more iffy because “to father” will usually be taken in the biological sense of “to sire.” But we thought it would all come together by concluding with “the son sons,” which is positively ungrammatical in English and we knew that of course. But, we do think that our translation does capture the spirit as well as the letter of the passage. How do you know the person is a good son? Not by inner qualities, but by how well he sons. How well he engages in sonning. What makes one a good ruler? Not inner qualities of loving the people and things like that, but by how ably he rules. You see the qualities in the action, you see it in the behavior. Or so it seemed to us that that what Confucius was about.

I hope you can all see clearly now that how we have interpreted the text has affected significantly the way we have elected to translate it. That is why the book is so thick, we have written much more than the translation itself because we thought we are obliged to tell you what we thought the text was about and we had to tell you in some detail what we thought the English language was about and what the Chinese language was about, so you would know where we stood and therefore could evaluate our translation of the text on your own. We hope that our fellow translators will also do the same for their readers.

What I am suggesting here, is that we must be as highly sensitive to the nuances of the contemporary world in which we live as we are to the ancient world which produced the text that we are working from. Neither one is more important than the other. They are equally significant. Let me give one final example of this point, taking Analects 1.11, a couple of examples having to do with grammar and so on. From this page I gave you from 1.11, the last line of which was translated by James Legge as: “If for three years, he does not alter from the ways of his

文，是「事件語言」，而不是希臘語或多數印歐語系般的「事物語言」。

因此當我們讀到《論語·顏淵》篇中著名的齊景公問政，人們通常稱道孔子在這段對話裏落實了「正名」說，而我們寧可將「正名」詮釋成一場「角色的整頓」。這段讀起來簡單的「君君，臣臣，父父，子子」，英語一般翻譯為 “the ruler should rule, the minister should minister, the father should be a father and the son should behave like a son. (在上者應當治國，為臣者應當輔弼，父親應當是人父，兒子的舉止應當像兒子)” 這種翻譯很顯明地著重在世人約定成俗或普遍定義的「人情事理」本質。但是，如果能在翻譯的語言上注入動態的活力，也就更能表現出孔夫子對人們是否合宜地履行社會職責的關注。因此我們的翻譯就變成：“The ruler rules, the minister ministers, the father fathers and the son sons. (在上者治國，為臣者輔弼；父者盡人父之職，子者盡人子之道。)”

這個翻譯在定案前花了我們好長的時間思考，部份原因是在英語裏有些名詞可以簡單地轉變為動詞，但有些名詞不可以。「君君」翻譯成 “The ruler rules”，將統治者治國的職責很直接明瞭地傳達；「臣臣」翻譯成 “Ministers minister”，我們尚有些許疑竇，因為在現代人的思維中，大臣服事於人民，然而古代的官員並非如此；至於「父父」的翻譯讓我們有些遲疑了，因為 “to father (當父親)” 經常會被理解為生理或血緣意義上的「當上父親」。可是當我們用了 “the son sons” 來結語，所有的翻譯也就順理成章了。我們當然也知道 “the son sons” 的句式在英語裏絕對不符合語法，但是我們認為這樣的翻譯，確實抓住了整篇章句的字面意思以及精神內涵。你如何知道這個人是否是好兒子？不是只看他內在的品性，而是看他當兒子當得有多好，他是如何行人子之道。如何定義一個好的統治者？一個在上位者，不僅要擁有熱愛人民的內在品質，還要觀察他治理國家有多出色。你可以從一個人的行徑及表現判斷品性，我們認為這就是孔子想要表達的。

我希望你們現在都能夠比較清楚地理解到：翻譯者對本文的詮釋是如何深切影響翻譯字句的揀擇。這也是為什麼我們翻譯的《論語》頁數那麼厚，因為我們補充了很多翻譯以外的資料。我們認為有義務告訴讀者，也必須仔細地告訴讀者，翻譯者是如何理解《論語》裏的章句，不管是從英文還是中文的角度。如此一來，讀者便能懂得翻譯者所持的立場，從而評價我們的譯作。我們希望翻譯界的同仁們，都能為他們的讀者做同樣的事情。

我這番提議的本懷是，我們應該對現今所處的世界，和誕生我們手頭上翻譯作品的那個古老世界，抱有同樣的敏

father, he may be called filial.” Arthur Waley rendered the passage: “If for whole three years of the mourning, he manages to carry on the household exactly as in his father’s day, then he is a good son indeed.” Raymond Dawson, the Oxford translator made it, “If for three years, he makes no change from the ways of his father, he may be called filial.” And finally D.C. Lau: “If for three years, he makes no changes to his father’s ways, he can be said to be a good son.” For Roger and me, these four translations all share the implication that if the son follows his father’s ways for three years, you can jolly well be sure that he’s going to do it for the rest of his life and, therefore, will be a good son indeed. That really does suggest the classical arch-conservatism of the Confucian way of life. You simply do it the way it has always been done.

The key word in the text is *gai*, and it has a number of meanings: one is to change, to alter, to correct, and also to reform. So we made it, “If for three years, the son refrains from reforming the ways of his father, he is a filial son.” We don’t think that this does any violence whatsoever to the nature of the text. “Refrains from reforming,” is within the direct semantic range of the term *gai*. But I hope you will hear a difference in the nuance of meaning of our sentence. It doesn’t say the son can’t change things, but rather that you shouldn’t do for the first three years, following your father’s death. That is very Confucian. Don’t give up the old until you have tried it, if you will. Make sure you understand what is going on before you make a change, appreciate that change is really needed, and appreciate as well that the function(s) the old way used to serve are no longer being served. We don’t think the other translations capture that.

There is also Chapter 15 of the *Xiaojing*, which fairly straightforwardly supports our rendering of the passage. It is clear in this chapter that if a ruler doesn’t have anyone who will remonstrate with him, he can’t be a good ruler. He’s got to have seven ministers who will remonstrate with him. If a father doesn’t have any children who will remonstrate, he can’t be a good father. It’s very clear in the text, when things are not going well, you must remonstrate.

Well, these are some of the concerns that have influenced my views of translation in general, and of the text of early Confucianism in particular. I could

感高度，因為這兩個世界同等重要。現在，請容我用《論語·學而篇》做為最後的實例，再一次地解釋翻譯及詮釋之間的關係。孔子說：「三年無改於父之道，可謂孝矣。」理雅各 (James Legge) 的翻譯為：“If for three years, he does not alter from the ways of his father, he may be called filial. (如果父親去逝三年內，其子還能延續父親生前定下的規矩習慣而不更改，他可以被稱為孝。)” 亞瑟·威利 (Arthur Waley) 則翻譯成：“If for whole three years of the mourning, he manages to carry on the household exactly as in his father’s day, then he is a good son indeed. (如果在整整三年的服喪期中，他能夠完全像他父親在世時一樣，操持承擔家庭的事務，那他確實就是一個好兒子。)” 英國牛津的翻譯者雷蒙·道森 (Raymond Dawson) 的翻譯為：“If for three years, he makes no change from the ways of his father, he may be called filial. (如果父親去逝內三年，兒子始終跟隨父親生前之道，他可以被稱為孝。)” 劉殿爵教授的翻譯則是：“If for three years, he makes no changes to his father’s ways, he can be said to be a good son. (做兒子的在父喪三年內，能夠不更改父親生前所訂下的行為規則，他便是一個好兒子。)” 對於我們來說，這四種翻譯都享有同樣的暗示，那就是如果子輩在父親去世三年內，都遵循了父親生前之「道」，那麼毫無疑問地這個孩子盡其餘生都會堅持此「道」，此等人是真正的賢孝之子。這段章句也確實暗示了儒家思想中經典的大保守主義：執守傳承。

我們認為這篇章句的關鍵字是「改」。這個字有若干意思，它意謂著“change (變化)”，“alter (修改)”，“correct (改正)”以及“reform (革新)”。因此我們的翻譯是“If for three years, the son refrains from reforming the ways of his father, he is a filial son. (父親逝世三年內，兒子如果能夠避免革新已故父親的道統，可算孝子了。)”我們不認為這個翻譯破壞了原文的含義。“Refrains from reforming (避免革新)”並沒有超出漢字「改」的語義範圍，但是我希望你們可以從我們的英譯中讀出些許微妙的差別。孔子這段話沒有說做為兒子的盡其一生都不能變動，只是在父親過世後的前三年不應有所更動。這的確非常儒家思維，所謂故舊不遺，棄舊圖新前，應該首先溫故；在你想做任何變化之前，先確定自己明白事情原委，理則明，明方能變矣；你也要領會，一旦放棄固有的事物，舊有的功能便無法持續。我們覺得其它的翻譯都沒有抓住這一點。

在《孝經》第十五章的諫諍篇中，孔子所說的話也直接支援了我們對「改」的詮釋。孔子說，如果統治者身邊沒有任何諫官，他便不會成為一個明君，所以一個天子必需擁有七個敢於勸誡的大臣；同樣地，如果做父親的沒有任何孩子向他直言勸告，他也無法成為一個好父親。這番話很清晰的表明，當有些人事不是朝正面發展的時候，你必須勸「改」。

總而言之，這些便是我在翻譯中所關注的問題，它們大

go on to argue why “Confucianism” is also a term that should be brought to rest as translation of *ru*, but have already said enough, I hope, to begin a fruitful discussion. If I had to sum up all that I’ve been saying, it would be that we should never ask whether we should give an interpretation to the texts we translate, because we cannot do otherwise. Rather should the question be, “which interpretation gives this text its full due?” Thank you very much. ❀

體上影響了我的翻譯視角及觀點，尤其左右了我對早期儒家著作的翻譯。我原本要繼續討論為什麼我認為不該再使用“Confucianism”來翻譯「儒」字，但是我滔滔不絕說得夠久了，也希望這些話足已引起有效的討論。如果我必須對這篇講演進行總結，那就是：我們永遠都不該問翻譯者能否詮釋本文，因為這是我們的本份。我們應該問的是：「哪一種詮釋能夠完整表達本文的意涵？」今天晚上，謝謝你們，我對諸位銘感在心。 ❀

苦 聖諦

復次，諸比丘，何謂苦聖諦？生是苦，老是苦，病是苦，死是苦，怨憎會是苦，愛別離是苦，求不得也是苦，簡而言之，五取蘊是苦。

Suffering

This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of Suffering: Birth is suffering; decay is suffering; illness is suffering; death is suffering. Presence of objects we hate is suffering; Sseparation from objects we love is suffering. Briefly, the fivefold clinging to existence is suffering.



復次，諸比丘！何謂苦集聖諦？愛欲引導再生，喜與貪伴隨而起，無論何時何處，追求愛欲，即：欲愛、有愛、無有愛。 集 聖諦

This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the Cause of Suffering: Thirst, that leads to rebirth, accompanied by pleasure and lust, finding its delight here and there. (This thirst is threefold), namely, thirst for pleasure, thirst for existence, thirst for prosperity.

ORIGIN OF SUFFERING

滅 聖諦

復次，諸比丘！何謂苦滅聖諦？此即愛欲之消逝無餘、捨離、滅盡、解脫、無染。

CESSATION OF SUFFERING

This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the Cessation of suffering: (it ceases with) the complete cessation of this thirst—a cessation which consists in the absence of every passion—with the abandoning of this thirst, with the doing away with it, with the deliverance from it, with the destruction of desire.

道 聖諦

復次，諸比丘！何者是苦滅道聖諦？此即八支聖道：正見、正思惟、正語、正業、正命、正精進、正念、正定。

PATH

This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the Path which leads to the cessation of suffering: that holy eightfold Path, that is to say, Right Belief, Right Aspiration, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Means of Livelihood, Right Endeavor, Right Memory, Right Meditation.

—《大念處經》

— from the mahasatipatthana Sutra