

寶性論

談錫永◆譯著

《寶性論》為佛教的重要論典，本論建立了「七金剛句」，將佛寶、法寶、僧寶、如來藏、證菩提、功德、事業等這七個主題並列，以佛、法、僧三寶為觀修的因，並以佛及眾生依本具的如來藏為觀修的中心，經過實踐修行的歷程，最後證得佛果菩提，具足一切佛法功德，圓滿濟度眾生的事業。

透過本書作者精湛的分析與釋論，能幫助讀者清晰地掌握修行的脈絡，迅疾趨入究竟的解脫大道。

梵

本

新

譯

僧

大中觀系列

《寶性論》梵本新譯

譯著／談錫永

發行人／黃瑩娟

美術編輯／莊心慈

出版者／全佛文化事業有限公司

地址／台北市松江路 69 巷 10 號 5F

永久信箱／台北郵政 26-341 號信箱

電話／(02) 2508-1731 傳真／(02) 2508-1733

郵政劃撥／19203747 全佛文化事業有限公司

E-mail／buddhall@ms7.hinet.net

http：//www.buddhall.com

行銷代理／紅螞蟻圖書有限公司

地址／台北市內湖區舊宗路 2 段 121 巷 28 之 32 號 4 樓（富頂科技大樓）

TEL／(02)2795-3656 FAX／(02)2795-4100

初版／2006 年元月

初版二刷／2006 年 3 月

定價／新台幣 320 元

版權所有・翻印必究

（缺頁或破損的書，請寄回更換）

國家圖書館出版品預行編目資料

《寶性論》梵本新譯 / 談錫永著. - 初版
-- 臺北市：全佛文化，2006[民 95]
面； 公分. -- (大中觀系列)

ISBN 957-2031-90-2 (平裝)

1.論藏

222.1

94025435

B944.2
20071

寶性論

談錫永◆譯著

《寶性論》為佛教的重要論典，本論建立了「七金剛句」，將佛寶、法寶、僧寶、如來藏、證菩提、功德、事業等這七個主題並列，以佛、法、僧三寶為觀修的因，並以佛及眾生依本具的如來藏為觀修的中心，經過實踐修行的歷程，最後證得佛果菩提，具足一切佛法功德，圓滿濟度眾生的事業。

透過本書作者精湛的分析與釋論，能幫助讀者清晰地掌握修行的脈絡，迅疾趨入究竟的解脫大道。

梵
本
新
譯



悟

目錄

序（高崎直道）	6
自序	17
繙譯說明	21
《分別寶性大乘無上續論》根本論及釋論 （彌勒造論 無著釋論）	
序分	24
正分第一品	
甲 三寶建立	
第一金剛句：佛寶	36
第二金剛句：法寶	42
第三金剛句：僧寶	47
總說三寶皈依處	53

乙 成就建立

總說四不思議境界…………… 57

第四金剛句：如來藏（雜垢真如）

（一）總說…………… 63

（二）別說

一 • 如來藏十義…………… 64

（i）自性；（ii）因…………… 64

（iii）果；（iv）用…………… 69

（v）相應…………… 78

（vi）行相…………… 81

（vii）分位差別…………… 82

（viii）遍一切處性…………… 83

（ix）不變異…………… 84

（x）無差別…………… 100

二 • 如來藏九喻…………… 106

三 • 明九喻所喻…………… 113

四 • 四種不識如來藏有情…………… 121

五 • 答難…………… 126

正分第二品

第五金剛句：證菩提（離垢真如）

（一）總說 130

（二）別說

離垢真如八句義

（i）自性；（ii）因 132

（iii）果 133

（iv）業 135

（v）相應 138

（vi）示現 140

（vii）恆常 143

（viii）不可思議 145

正分第三品

第六金剛句：功德 148

（一）總說 149

（二）別說

一・十力 149

二・四無畏 150

三・十八不共法 150

四・三十二相 151

正分第四品	158
-------------	-----

第七金剛句：事業

(一) 兩種事業	158
----------------	-----

(二) 事業九喻	160
----------------	-----

一• 如帝釋天	161
---------------	-----

二• 如天鼓	163
--------------	-----

三• 如雲	166
-------------	-----

四• 如梵天王	168
---------------	-----

五• 如日	169
-------------	-----

六• 如摩尼寶	171
---------------	-----

七• 如谷響	172
--------------	-----

八• 如虛空	172
--------------	-----

九• 如大地	173
--------------	-----

(三) 說九喻義	173
----------------	-----

後分

甲 造論利益	178
--------------	-----

乙 如何造論	180
--------------	-----

丙 發願迴向	182
--------------	-----

校勘記	186
-----------	-----

附錄

1 《分別寶性大乘無上續論》根本頌	204
-------------------------	-----

2 《分別寶性大乘無上續論》梵本（羅馬字轉寫）	232
-------------------------------	-----

Preface

China has a long history of Buddhism since her encounter with it in the 1st century of the Common Era. As for her contribution to Buddhism, mention must first be made to the continuous translation of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese through different dynasties, and their preservation in a form of canon under governmental regulation. The Chinese Buddhist Canon, otherwise known as the Chinese Tripiṭaka, has gradually spread in the surrounding countries such as Korea and Japan in the East and Vietnam in the South, and thus contributed to the forming of a great cultural sphere of East Asian Buddhist tradition. And now it is worldly estimated as one of the most important source materials for modern Buddhist scholarship.

Modern Buddhist scholarship, started by Europeans' enthusiasm for Indian studies or Indology towards the end of the 18th century, is based fundamentally on the method of Philology and keeps importance on the literal understanding of the texts written in the original Indian languages, and therefore often contradicts with traditional hermeneutics. From this point of view, the Chinese canons were accused of their inaccuracy and regarded as less important than the equivalent Tibetan texts which are literally more true to the Sanskrit original. However, both Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist canons have their own merits, for example, many of the Sanskrit original texts that were lost are preserved in the archaic Chinese translations, while the comparative modernity of Tibetan

materials preserved the transmission of texts during the later phase of development of Indian Buddhism that were not transmitted into China. We Buddhist scholars should keep equal importance on all kinds of materials kept in various Buddhist traditions.

As for the modern Chinese Buddhist scholarship, we may say that it was not highly developed up to the middle of the last century. In such circumstances, an only exceptional figure as far as we know is Ven. Fazun (法尊), who translated the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and some works of Tsong kha pa from Tibetan materials into Chinese during the early 1930s. There were a few others such as Ji Xianlin (季羨林) who studied Inology in Europe and America before the second world war. Circumstances have changed after the war, and now there are many scholars active in the academic Buddhist field, especially in Tun-huang and Turfan studies and on Tibetan Buddhism as well. Master Tam Shek-wing is one of the brilliant figures among them.

Master Tam was initiated in Buddhist studies through entering into the order of rNying ma pa, an esoteric Tibetan Buddhist sect. So he may be called as a "priest scholar" well-versed in Tibetan Buddhist traditions. At the same time, however, he studied Sanskrit language and works of modern foreign scholars on Buddhism as well, and, with deep knowledge on his native Chinese classics and their thought, he started to translate texts in the Tibetan Buddhist canon newly into Chinese. His activity being thus following to Ven. Fazun after fifty years, he may deserve to be called, just as Fazun, a

Tripitakācārya, i.e. san-ts'ang fa-shih (三藏法師) of modern times.

The *Pao-hsing-lun* (寶性論) or the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, here translated by Master Tam, is a well-known important text on the Tathāgatagarbha doctrine, studied, discussed, and sometimes criticized among scholars since Obermiller's English translation from Tibetan source appeared in 1930s, especially after 1950 when its Sanskrit original text edited by E.H. Johnston and T. Chowdhury was published. So this new study and translation by Master Tam adds to the scholarship on the *Pao-hsing-lun*, with a unique significance as being translated from Sanskrit into Chinese in a semi-classical style (so the author says), and is to be regarded as a kind of revised Chinese version to be added to the Chinese canon. Another significance of his work is that he translated the text according to the way of interpretation or hermeneutic of the rNying ma tradition which regards the *Ratnagoṭravibhāga*, or the *Rgyud bla ma* (*Uttaratantra*), as of the ultimate meaning (nītārtha) of the Buddha's teaching against or in contrast to the dGe lugs pa's interpretation that treats it as belonging to the group of incomplete meaning (neyārtha) to lead to the ultimate. For him, who is a distinguished practitioner well trained in the rNying ma esoterism, this rNying ma evaluation of the *Pao-hsing-lun* and the Tathāgatagarbha doctrine in general also represents his firm conviction or belief. This may be his unique standpoint in comparison to usual scholars who assume their standpoint as neutral, keeping philological objectivity. We should estimate his work with this evaluation keeping in mind.

Now we should proceed to examine the translation. Master Tam's translation is mostly quite understandable even for those like me who, though accustomed with classical Chinese, don't know modern Chinese. So we can easily compare it with the old version translated by Ratnamati in the early 6th century. In his earlier translation from Tibetan, he criticizes the old translation as being inclined to interpret the thought from a substantial aspect. For example, he accuses the use of the character t'i (體) such as in 佛體 for buddhatva, 寶體 for svabhāva, and instead he suggests to use hsing (性) to replace t'i (體). But this also causes the arousal of the confusion between 佛性 as translation of Sanskrit buddhadhātu or Buddha nature, equivalent to ju-lai-tsang (如來藏), and buddhatva, the essence of the Buddha common to Buddhas and sentient beings, or buddhatā, the state of the Buddha, i.e. enlightenment (佛菩提 in old translation). Rather, the Chinese term t'i (體) has a sense of nature (性) or essential, proper nature, and not necessarily be interpreted as something substantial. For distinction between buddhadhātu as the state of cause and buddhatva as the essence, I wish to recommend to use the term 佛性 only for the former, while for the latter, to use 佛體 as used in the old translation, or to adopt a new term 佛體性 (體性 for -tva) in translation. Anyway, to fix technical terms in translation is desideratum for the readers. As for the term gotra, in Buddha- (or tathāgata-) gotra, the term 種性 seems most suitable, while ratnagotra may be rendered as 寶性 as adopted here (a literally better translation for ratnagotra is 寶山, a jewel mine). (To my understanding, ratnagotra is nothing but

tathāgatagarbha, although identified in essence with buddhatva).

Generally speaking, Master Tam's translation is well-arranged in making divisions and sections in accordance with doctrinal contexts, and very kind to the readers in using different font-sizes of letters for the basic verses and commentary verses respectively (this distinction is originally based upon the old Chinese translation, and adopted in my English translation for the first time against the numbering of verses given in the present Sanskrit edition), and using gothic characters for quotations. Of this last point, I wish to indicate a passage in his previously published translation where this principle is missed to be applied where a passage of the *Avataṃsaka sūtra* (or the *Tathāgatotpattisambhava-nirdeśa*) is quoted as the authority for the concept of the Buddha's qualities reserved in all sentient beings. Another point I wish to reach to the notice of the readers is that a passage of quotation (in pp. 90-91 of the previous translation) which the translator thought of as coming from the *Ratnamālāvadāna* (寶鬘喻論) ("Analogy of entering a castle"). This quotation is in fact quoted from the *Ratnaketu-paripṛccha*, equivalent Chinese translation being in the *Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra* (大集經) (寶髻菩薩會第十一, Taisho vol. 13, p. 181a) and in the *Mahā-ratnakūṭasūtra* (大寶積經) (寶髻菩薩會第四十七, Taisho vol. 11, p. 668a). The same sutra is again quoted in p. 99 (= Taisho vol. 13, pp. 175c-176a), and the translator mistook it again as from the *Ratnamālāvadāna* with the title 寶鬘喻論.

One more point that readers should pay notice to is the prose

commentary passage on verse 96 as illustration to the 9 examples of covering of defilements on the tathāgatagarbha after finished explanation of its essential nature in 10 aspects. Doctrinal point here is that in the former passage the text explained the essential nature (dharmatā) existing "as far as the end of the future" (aparāntasama), i.e., forever constantly, while hereafter the text is going to explain the apparent state of the tathāgatagarbha as having defilements covering over it since the beginningless time (anadisamnidhya) but not associated by nature (asambaddhasvabhāva) and at the same time having associated by nature (asambaddhasvabhāva) with pure characters (śubha dharma).

In spite of the few unsatisfied points mentioned above (which have been corrected in the present edition), I heartily recommend this work to the world of Buddhist scholarship as a pioneering work which will lead the modern Chinese scholarship on Buddhism to a further development.

Jikidō Takasaki
President, Tsurumi University, Yokohama
Professor Emeritus, University of Tokyo

序

佛法自公元一世紀已傳入漢土，源遠流長。若論中國對佛教的貢獻，首要提及的自然是在歷代不斷的佛典繙譯，使不少佛家經典，在國家監掌譯事下得以保存。漢傳佛典，或稱為漢譯三藏者，漸次傳播至鄰近的國家，如東方的韓國及日本，以及南方的越南，由是對形成東亞佛學傳統的偉大文化，作出貢獻。如今漢譯佛典為當代佛學研究最重要的研究資料之一。

近代有關佛學的學術研究，始自十八世紀歐洲人對「印度學」(Indology)的熱忱。其治學方法，主要依據「語文學」(Philology)，着重從文字上理解各種印度文寫成的經典，然這樣的理解則與傳統的詮釋相違。由此源自歐洲的佛學研究來看，漢譯佛典的準確性往往遭受批評，且被認為不比相應的藏譯佛典重要，因為西藏的繙譯在譯文上較忠於梵文原文。然而，漢譯與藏譯的佛典實各有所長，例如，不少已佚失的梵本佛典，唯保留於古漢譯本中；西藏比較後期的繙譯，則保留了於印度佛教後期傳入西藏的經論，而這些佛典卻未曾傳入漢土。我們作為佛教學者，應對佛家各宗派所傳的文獻，皆平等視其重要性。

至於漢土近代的佛學研究，可以說直至上世紀中葉，實未曾有長足的發展。在此情況下，我們只知道有一位出類拔萃的法尊法師，於三十年代繙譯了《現觀莊嚴論》(Abhisamayālaṃkāra)以及宗喀巴大士(Tsong kha pa)的

部分著作；此外，尚有如季羨林等數位在二次世界大戰前於歐美研究「印度學」的學者。戰後，此情況改變了許多，如今不少中國學者皆活躍於佛學界，尤其是對敦煌、吐蕃以及藏傳佛教等課題的研究。談錫永上師正是其中的一位表表者。

談上師對佛學的研究，乃自其對藏傳佛教甯瑪派的修學。由是可說，他是一位精通藏傳佛家宗派的「修行學者」。同時，他亦學習梵文，披讀當代國外學者的研究，且對其自身的中國文化與傳統思想有深刻的認識。談上師近年把西藏佛典繙譯為漢文，此事業遙距法尊法師已五十年；亦正如法尊法師一樣，談上師可堪稱為當代的「三藏法師」(Tripiṭakācārya)。

談上師所譯的《寶性論》(*Ratnagotravibhāga*)，是有關如來藏學說的重要論著。自 Obermiller 於三十年代把它由藏文譯為英文以來，此著名論典即廣為學者研究及討論，有時甚至予以批判，尤以五十年代之後，E.H. Johnston 及 T. Chowdhury 所整理梵文原論的出版為然。談上師此書，是對於《寶性論》研究新添的學術論著。此與其他研究所不同者，乃自梵文本譯為近乎文言體的漢文(如作者所說)，故亦可視其為漢譯經藏中，新添重新整理的漢譯本。談上師此譯的另一特色，是他依甯瑪派的觀點來作詮釋及繙譯，亦即視《寶性論》(即《無上續論》*Uttaratantra*)為佛陀教法中的了義(nīrtha)經論，而與格魯派視此論為不了義(neyārtha)的說法大相逕庭。談上

師乃一位出眾的甯瑪派學人，此依據自宗觀點來詮釋《寶性論》及如來藏學說，實亦代表了其個人對自宗的堅定信念。相對一般學者僅持客觀的態度來作哲學討論，這或即是談上師治學的獨特之處。我們衡量他的著作時，應當把上來的評價持之於心。

以下我們將討論譯文。談上師的譯筆，即使對於我等只習慣於古漢文而不懂白話文者，亦易讀易解，是故我們可以容易持之與六世紀初勒那摩提（Ratnamati）的舊譯本作比較。談上師於其先前依藏譯本之繙譯中，批評舊譯傾向於詮釋（如來藏）思想為實有的本體，例如，他批評舊譯所用「體」之一字，如把 *buddhatva* 譯為「佛體」、把 *svabhāva* 譯為「實體」。由是，他建議繙譯為「性」來代替「體」。然而，這也衍生出同以「佛性」繙譯 *buddhadhātu* 及 *buddhatva* 的混淆：前者為「佛性」，即相當於「如來藏」；後者指諸佛及有情皆具有的「佛自性」，亦即 *buddhatā*，佛的證境（於舊譯則譯為「佛菩提」）。「體」之一字，亦具有「性」或本質之意，不一定詮釋為實有的本體。為分別 *buddhadhātu* 為因位、*buddhatva* 為本質，我提議「佛性」一詞只用於前者，而後者則可沿用舊譯的「佛體」，或用一個新的名相：「佛體性」（將 *-tva* 譯為「體性」）。此等名相如何取捨，則有待讀者。至於 *buddha-gotra* 或 *tathāgata-gotra* 中的 *gotra* 一詞，譯為「種性」實最為洽當，以 *ratnagotra* 亦可同樣譯為「寶性」故（若直譯 *ratnagotra*，則以「寶山」為準）。依我所理解，*ratnagotra*（「寶性」）無非即「如來藏」（*tathāgatagarbha*），從本質而