

Currently a MMK pa~ncadhA or pa~ncataya; that is, a pentapla. Ideal form is a septapla, or saptidhA/saptitaya (??) consisting of the Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tibetan texts, along with the translations of Kukkurovaca, McCagney, Streng, Kalupahana, and Inada; Bocking; and Garfield.

	Original (From McCagney)	कुकुरोवाच	McCagney	Streng	Bocking
1:0	अनिरोधम् अनुत्पादम् अनुच्चेदम् अशाश्वतं अनेकार्थम् अनानार्थम् अनागमम् अनिर्गमं । यः प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शिवं देशयाम् आस संबुद्धस् तं वन्दे वदतां वरं ।		I greet the best of teachers, that Awakened One, Who taught liberation, the quieting of phenomena, Interdependent origination which is; Nonceasing and nonarising, nonmomentary and nonpermanet, Nonidentical and nondifferent, noncoming and nongoing.		No arising and no ceasing No permanence and no severance No identity and no difference No arriving and no departing. To the one who can expound this matter of causality And completely extisnguish all sophistries I bow my head in reverence: The Buddha, greatest of all teachers.
3:7	प्रतीत्य मातापितरौ यथोक्तः पुत्रसंभवः चक्षूरूपे प्रतीत्यैव मुक्तो विज्ञानसंभवः ।	As a son's becoming is said to be dependent upon a mother and father, Thus the becoming of vignition is said to be dependent on an eye and forms [which are the object of visual perception.]	As the birth of a son is said to be dependent upon a mother and father, So the arising of consciousness is dependent upon eye and form.	As the birth of a son is said to occur presupposing the mother and father, Knowledge is said to occur presupposing the eye being dependent on the visible forms.	No corresponding passage.
5:1	नाकाशं विद्यते किञ्चित् पूर्वम् आकाशलक्षणात् अलक्षणं प्रसज्येत स्यात् पूर्वं यदि लक्षणात् ।	No space whatsoever is found prior to a characteristic of space. If it were prior to a characteristic, it would be consequently misthought (to be) uncharacterized.	Space does not occur prior to some characteristic of space. If it would exist prior to having a characteristic, it follows that there would be space without a characteristic.	Space does not exist at all before the defining characteristic of space. If it would exist before the defining characteristic, then one must falsely conclude that there would be something without a defining characteristic.	Before there was the characteristic of space There was no dharma of space If space had been pre-existent Then it would have been without characteristics.
5:7-8	तस्मान् न भावो नाभावो न लक्ष्यं नापि लक्षणम् आकाशं आकाशसमा धातवः पञ्च ये परे । ७ ।परे । अस्तित्वं ये तु पश्यन्ति नास्तित्वं चाल्पबुद्धयः भावानं ते न पश्यन्ति द्रष्टव्योपशमं शिवं । ८	Therefore, space is not some being, not some non-being, not something characterized, not some characteristic. The other five elements are similar/equal to space (in this respect). But those small-minded ones who see isance and nonisance Of beings, they do not see the auspicious pacification of the visible. (Of appearances)	Therefore space is neither an existent nor a nonexistent, neither the characterized nor a characteristic. The other five elements are the same as space. But those of inferior insight who see only the existence and nonexistence of beings Do not see the emancipating cessation of appearances.	Therefore space is neither an existing thing nor a non-existing thing, neither something to which a defining characteristic applies nor a defining characteristic. Also, the other five irreducible elements can be considered in the same way as space. But those unenlightened people who either affirm reality or on-reality Do not perceive the blessed cessation-of-appearance of existing things.	Know therefore that space is neither existent nor non-existent Neither a characteristic nor a characterisable And that the other five are the same as space. The superficial see dharmas As having the characteristics of existence or non-existence. And thus are unable to perceive The calm serenity of the cessation of views.

7:16	प्रतीत्य यद् यद् भवति तत् तच् चान्तं स्वभावतः तस्माद् उत्पद्यमानं च शान्तम् उत्पत्तिर् एव च ।	Whatever dependent thing becomes, is essentially peaceful. Therefore the arising and the process of arising are peaceful.	That which comes into being dependently, that is inherently peaceful. Therefore arising and presently arising are peaceful.	Whatever comes into existence presupposing something else is without self-existence. [As there is] an allayment of “being originated,” so [also] of that which is originated.	If a dharma arises from conditions Its nature will be calm extinction. Therefore arising and the moment of arising Would both be nirvanic.
7:34	यथा माया यथा स्वप्नो गन्धर्वनगरं यथा तथोत्पादस् तथा स्थानं तथा भण्ण उदाहृतं ।	As magic trick, as a dream, as a city of celestial beings, So arising, so remaining, so destruction [FILL]	As illusion, as dream, as an imaginary city in the sky, So have arising, endurance, and destruction been illustrated.	As a magic trick, a dream or a fairy castle. Just so should we consider origination, duration, and cessation.	Like an illusion, like a dream Like a Gandharva-city; The arising, abiding and ceasing of which we speak Have marks such as these.
8:5-6	धर्माधर्मौ न विद्येते क्रियादीनाम् असंभावे धर्मे चासत्यधर्मे च फलं तज्जं न विद्यते । ५ फले सति न मोक्षाय न स्वर्गायोपपद्यते मार्गः सर्वक्रियाणां च नैरर्थक्यं प्रसज्यते । ६	In the nonbecoming of action, etc., neither dharma nor adharma is found, In dharma and in false dharma, the fruit born of them is not found. If there is no fruit, it follows that the path is not to liberation, not to heaven. It is consequently misthought that all action is devoid of purpose.	Neither [action] in accord with the teaching nor [action] not in accord with the teaching occurs in the existence of activity, etc. The effect does not exist in [action] in accord with the teaching nor in [action] not in accord with the teaching, so it does not occur. Where the effect does not exist, the path goes not to heaven and Not to liberation, and the purposelessness of all activities follows.	If the producing action, etc. do not exist, then neither can the true reality nor false reality exist. If neither the true reality nor the false reality exists, then also the product born from that does not exist. If there is no real product, then there also exists no path to heaven nor to ultimate release. Thus it logically follows that all producing actions are without purpose.	? If you fall into causelessness Then there is no cause and no effect. No doing and no doer And no dharma of deed involved. If there are no dharma of doing, Then there is no sin or merit Where there is no sin or merit No recompense for sin or merit exists either. Where there is no recompense for sin or merit, There is also no nirvana. And whatever one may do Is completely vacuous and without effect.
8:12-13	प्रतीत्य कारकः कर्म तं प्रतीत्य च कारकं । कर्म प्रवर्तते नान्यत् पश्यामः सिद्धिकारणं । १२ एवं विद्याद् उपादानं व्युत्सर्गाद् इति कर्मनः कर्तुस् च कर्मकर्तृभ्यां शेषान् भावान् विभावयेत् । १३	The agent is dependent on the action dependent on the agent. We see that karma proceeds not otherwise; this is the established cause(ing).	The agent depends on action and that depends on an agent. We see no other established reason action sets in motion. Thus from the “rejection” of the agent and of actions and agents, the Method for knowledge of clinging and all the rest about beings should come to light.	The producer proceeds being dependent on the product, and the product proceeds being dependent on the producer. The cause for realization is seen in nothing else. In the same way one should understand the “acquiring” on the basis of the “giving up,” etc. of the producer and the product. By means of [this analysis of] the product and the producer all other things should be dissolved.	The doer exists by virtue of the deed. The deed exists by virtue of the doer. This is how we establish the meaning of “deed” There is nothing beyond this. In the same way that we negate deed and doer, So (we refute) reception and the recipient. All other dharmas too Should be negated thus.
13:3	भावानां निःस्वभावत्वम् अन्यथाभावदर्शनात्	Because there is observation of the transformation of one thing into another (other-becoming), There is	Since beings are viewed as having no self-nature in a changing nature and a being lacking self-nature does not	[An opponent says:] There is non-self-existence of things [since] a thing, by observation,	Since all dharmas vary We know that they have no nature. Dharmas without a nature do not

¹ Nair=vrrdhi form of nir, used in compounds.

	अस्वभावो भावो नास्ति भावानां शून्यता यतः । अस्वभावस् च भावो स्ति ।	essence-devoidness of beings. A being without essence does not exist, wherefore there is emptiness of beings. {A being is without essence, wherefore...}	exist, Then openness [is the self-nature] of beings.	[becomes] something else. A thing without self-existence does not exist—due to the emptiness of existing things.	exist Because all dharmas are empty.
13:7-8	यच्च अशून्यं भवेत् किं चित् स्यच्च चून्यम् इति किंचन न किं चिद् अस्त्य् अशून्यं च कुतः शून्यं भविष्यति । ७ ।इति-अपि । शून्यता सर्वदृष्टीनां प्रोक्ता निःसरणं जिनैः येषां तु शून्यतादृष्टिस् तान् असाध्यान् बभाषिरे । ८		If something would be nonopen, then nothing would be “open.” If nothing is nonopen, why will there be open? The conqueror taught openness as the refutation of all views. But those who hold openness as a view are called irremediable.	If something would be non-empty, something would [logically also] be empty But nothing is non-empty, so how will it become empty? Emptiness is proclaimed by the victorious one as the refutation of all viewpoints; But those who hold “emptiness” as a viewpoint—[the true perceivers] have called those “incurable”.	If dharmas which are not empty exist Then empty dharmas should exist But in reality non-empty dharmas do not exist How can there be empty dharmas? The Great Sage speaks of the emptiness of dharmas In order to wean us from all views. If you then reinstate a view of “emptiness” You cannot be taught by all the Buddhas.
15:5	भावस्य चेद् अप्रसिद्धिर् अभावो नैव सिध्यति भावस्य ह्य् अन्यथाभावम् अभावम् ब्रुवते जनाः		Again, where is the being without self-nature or other-nature? Indeed, it demonstrates that a being exists in self-nature or in other-nature.	If there is no proof of an existent thing, then a non-existent thing cannot be proved. Since people call the other-existence of an existent thing a “non-existent thing.”	Without self-nature or other-nature How could there be any dharmas at all? If there is self or other-nature Dharmas can be established.
15:6-7	स्वभावं परभावं च भावं चाभावम् एव च ये पश्यन्ति न पश्यन्ति ते तत्त्वं बुद्धशाने । ६ कात्यायनावादे चास्तीति नास्तीति चोभयं ओभयं । कुकुरोवाच । प्रतिषिद्धं भगवता भावाभावविभाविना । ७	He who sees being, nonbeing, other-being, and own-being (essence), Sees not the thatness in the Buddha’s teachings. In the Katyayana Discourse, both “Is” and “Is not”...	Those who see self-nature and other-nature, being and nonbeing, Do not see the truth in the Buddha’s teaching. In the instructions to Katyayana, both “it is” and “it is not” were demonstrated by the Buddha as causing the appearance of being and nonbeing.	Those who perceive self-existence and other-existence, and an existent thing and a non-existent thing, Do not perceive the true nature of the Buddha’s teaching. In “The Instruction of Katyayana” both “it is” and “it is not” are opposed By the Glorious One, who has ascertained the meaning of “existent” and “non-existent.”	If a person sees existence and non-existence, And sees self-nature and other-nature, (Seeing) thus he does not see The true meaning of the Buddha-dharma. The Buddha is able to extinguish both existence and non-existence As it says in the sutra, In the “Instruction to Katyayana” “Separate from existence and separate from non-existence.”
15:10	अस्तीति शाश्वतग्राहो नास्तीत्युच्चेददर्शनं	[To say] “Is,” is eternity-grasping; [to say] “Is not,” is a nihilistic view.	“It is” is grasping for eternity. “It is not” is the view of nihilism.	“It is” is a notion of eternity. “It is not” is a nihilistic view.	Fixed existence is attachment to permanence.

	तस्माद् अस्तित्वनास्तित्वे नाश्रीयेत विचक्षणः ।	Therefore, those of discerning vision would not have recourse to isance and isnotance..	Therefore, existence and nonexistence would not be resorted to by the wise.	Therefore, one who is wise does not have recourse to “being” or “non-being.”	Fixed non-existence is attachment to severance. Therefore the wise man Should not be attached to either existence or non-existence.
16:1	संस्काराः संसारन्ति चेन् न नित्याः संसारन्ति ते संसारन्ति च नानित्याः सत्त्वे प्यु एष समः क्रमः ।		If dispositions transmigrate, they transmigrate as not permanent and they transmigrate as not impermanent. It is the same process for a sentient being.	When conditioned elements continue to change, they do not continue to change as eternal things. Likewise they do not continue to change as non-eternal things. The argument here is the same as for a living being.	As for the predispositions transmigrating, If they are permanent they should not transmigrate, Nor should they if impermanent. It is the same, too, with living beings.
16:4-5	संस्कारानां न निवाणं कथं चि उपपद्यत् सत्वस्यापि न निवाणं कहम् चिद् उपपदत् । ४ न भदने न उच्यन्त उदयव्ययधमिनः संस्काराः पूवव सत्त् भदयते न न मुच्यते । ५		How does the liberation from dispositions even happen? How does the liberation of a sentient being also happen? Rising and ceasing events are neither bound nor free. Dispositions are neither bound by nor released by the previously mentioned sentient being.	The final cessation of the conditioned elements certainly is not possible at all. Nor is the final cessation of even a living being possible at all. The conditioned elements, whose nature is arising and destruction, neither are bound nor released. Likewise a living being neither is bound nor released.	The predispositions becoming extinct? Such would never be the case. Living beings becoming extinct? This too could not be right. Predispositions have the characteristics of arising and ceasing. Not bound, not liberated Living beings too, as formerly explained, Are not bound and not liberated.
16:9-10	निर्वाष्याम्य् अनुपादानो निर्वाणं मे भविश्यति इति येशां ग्रहस् तेषाम् उपादानमहाग्रहः । ९ न निवाणसमारोपो न संसारापकषणम यत्र कस् तत्र संसारो निराणं किं विकप्ल्यते । १०	“Free of clinging, I will be extinguished;” “I will have nirvana;” Of those who say this, there is a huge grasping of clinging. Where there is neither an addition of nirvana nor a removal of samsara; There, what samsara is discriminated from what nirvana?	[For] those who say, “Nirvana will be mine,” their grasping of The nongrasping of freedom is a gigantic grasping. Neither is nirvana only samsara nor is samsara removed away. Where there is nirvana there is samsara. Which is falsely discriminated from which?	“I will be released without any acquisition.” “Nirvana will be mine.” Those who understand this hold too much to “a holding on” [i.e., both to the acquisition of karma and to a viewpoint]. Where there is a super-imposing of nirvana [on something else], nor a removal of existence-in-flux, What is the existence-in-flux there? What nirvana is imagined?	“If we do not receive dharms We will attain nirvana”. Such persons as these are themselves the ones in bondage to receiving. Nirvana is not something special, Separate from birth and death. The meaning of thusness being thus, How can there be any distinctions?
17:3-4	तत्र यच् तनेत्य् उक्तं कर्म तन् मानसं स्मृतं चेतयित्वा च्यत्तूक्तं त तु कायिकवाचिकं । ३ वाग्विशन्दोविरायो याश्चाविज्ञप्तिसंज्ञिताः अविज्ञतय वान्याः स्मृता विर्तयस् तथा । ४		Karman, which is here called “volition,” is mindfulness of what is present in the mind. Further, that called will in action, that is bodily and verbal. Uninterrupted words and deeds, which are false ideas that do not inform, Are called opposite to cessations by means of mindfulness.	Thus, that action which is called “volition”: that is considered [by tradition] as mental; But that action which is a result of having willed: that is considered [by tradition] as physical or verbal. Sound, gesture and that which does not rest which is considered as unknown,	The thought of which the Buddha speaks May be termed “mental karma”. That which arises from the thought Is speech and body karma. The karma of body and the karma of speech, Performed and non-performed karma. Within these things

				Also the other unknown which is considered to be at rest;	Is both goodness and non-goodness.
17:13-14 +15str eng	इमां पुनः प्वक्स्यामि कल्पनां यत्र योज्यते ।यात्र । मक्कग्नि । बुद्धै प्रयेक्बुद्धिश् च श्रावकैश् चानुवर्णितां ।१३ एत्रं यता विप्रनाशस् तथऋणम् इवर्म् च ।व् त्.फ़ । कुक्कुरोवच चतुर्विधो धातुतः स प्कृत्या व्याकृतश् च सः ।१४		Again, I will explain where this assumption is employed by awakened ones, by self-awakened ones, and by disciples who praised it. What is imperishable is like a promissory note and an action like a debt. It [what is imperishable] has four kinds of elements and it is indeterminable in primordial substance.	In rebuttal I will explain the interpretation which can be made to fit [the facts], That which is followed by the Buddha, the self-sufficient enlightened ones and the disciples. As “that which is imperishable” is like a credit [on an account statement], so an action is like a debt. [The imperishable is] of four kinds in its elements; in its essential nature it cannot be analyzed. [An imperishable force] is not destroyed qua destruction; rather it is destroyed according to spiritual discipline....	We will now further expound, In relation to actions and their rewards, (Truths) which all Buddhas, Pratyekabuddhas And sages admire and praise. The non-disappearing dharma is like a bond, Actions are like the goods owing. Its nature is neutral Its classification is fourfold.
17:20-21	शून्यता च न चोच्चेदः संसारश् च न शाश्वतं कर्मणो विप्रणाशश् च धर्मो बुद्धेन देशितः ।२० कर्म नोत्पद्यते कस्मात् निःस्वभावं यतस् ततः यस्माच् च तद् अनुत्पन्नं न तस्माद् विप्रणश्यति ।२१		Openness is not disruption, and samsara is not permanence. The imperishability [i.e., continuing through their fruits] of the two actions is the teaching elucidated by the Buddha. Why does karman not arise? Because it is without self-nature. Since it does not arise, therefore it does not perish.	“Emptiness,” “no annihilation,” existence-in-flux, “non-eterneity,” And the imperishable reality of action: such was the teaching taught by the Buddha. [Nagarjuna refutes the above arguments:] Why does the action not originate? Because it is without self-existence. Since it does not originate, it does not perish...	Although empty, it is not severed Though it exists, it is not permanent. Karma and reward never disappear This we call the teaching of the Buddha. All dharmas are fundamentally non-arising Since they have no fixed nature. All dharmas are also non-ceasing Because they do not arise.
17:26-27	कर्म क्लेशात्मकं चेदं ते च क्लेशा न तत्त्वतः न चेत् त तत्त्वतः क्लेशाः कर्म स्यात् तत्त्वतः		If karman has defilements as self, the defilements are not real. If they are not real defilements, how would karman be real? Actions and defilements are	An action is that whose “self” is desire, and the desires do not really exist. If these desires do not really exist, how would the action really exist?	If all actions within the world Arise from the afflictions, And these afflictions are not real, How can (actions) then be real? The afflictions and karma

	<p>कथं ।२६ कर्म क्लेशाश् च देहानां प्रत्ययाः समुदाहृतः कर्म क्लेशाश् च ते शून्या यदि देहेषु का कथा । २७</p>		<p>mentioned as conditioning causes of the body. How are actions and defilements open if they are that [open] in bodies?</p>	<p>Action and desire are declared to be the conditioning cause of the body. If action and desire are empty, what need one say about "body"?</p>	<p>Are said to be the causes of bodies Afflictions and actions being empty, How much more so the bodies?</p>
<p>18:6-12</p>	<p>आत्मेत्य अपि प्रज्ञापितम् अनात्मेत्यपि देशितम् बुद्धैर् नात्मा न चानात्मा कश्चिद् इत्य् अपि देशितं । ६ निवृतम् अभिधातव्यं निवृत्ते चित्तगोचरे अनुत्पन्नानिरुद्धा हि निर्वाणम् इव धर्मता । ७ सर्वं तथ्यं न वा तथ्यं तथ्यं चातथ्यम् एव च नैवातथ्यं नैव तथ्यं एतद् बुद्धानुशासनं । ८ अपरप्रत्ययं शान्तं प्रपञ्चैर् अप्रपञ्चितं निर्विकल्पम् अनानार्थम् एतत् तत्त्वस्य लक्षणं । ९ प्रतीत्य यद् यद् भवति न हि तावत् तद् एव तद् न चान्यद् अपि तत् तस्मान् नोच्चिन्नं नापि शाश्वतं । १० अनेकार्थम् अनानार्थम् अनुच्चेदम् अशाश्वतम् एतत् तल् लोकनाथानां भुद्धानां शासनां ऋतं । ११ संभुद्धानां अनुत्पादे श्रावकाणां पुनः क्षये ज्ञानं प्रत्येकबुद्धानाम् असम्सर्गात् प्रवर्तते ।१२</p>		<p>The term "atman" pointed out causes it to be distinct from the term "anatman." Neither a self nor a nonself are pointed out by the buddhas. Where the range of thought is renounced, that which can be stated has ceased to be valid. Indeed, the nature of events is like liberation, nonarising and nonceasing. Everything is factual, nonfactual, both factual and nonfactual, Neither factual nor nonfactual. This is the instruction of the Buddha. Unconditioned by another, peaceful, not constructed by means of imaginings, Free from false discriminations and without purpose, this is the mark of reality. First off, what arises depending on that is neither identical to nor different from that. Therefore that is neither disrupted nor permanent [neither annihilated nor eternal]. Nondifferentiated, nonidentical, nomomentary, nonpermanent, This is the immortal teaching of the buddhas, lords of all the worlds. When accomplished buddhas do not arise and sravakas cease to be, pratyeka buddhas with independent knowledge come forth</p>	<p>There is the teaching of "individual self", and the teaching of "non-individual self"; But neither "individual self" nor "non-individual self" whatever has been taught by the Buddhas. When the domain of thought has been dissipated, "that which can be stated" is dissipated. Those things which are unoriginated and not terminated, like nirvana, constitute the Truth. Everything is "actual" or "non-actual," or both "actual-and-non-actual," Or "neither-actual-nor-not-actual": This is the teaching of the Buddha. "Not caused by something else," "peaceful," "not elaborated by discursive thought," "Indeterminate," "undifferentiated": such are the characteristics of true reality. Whatever exists, being dependent [on something else] is certainly not identical to that [other thing]. Nor is a thing different from that; therefore, it is neither destroyed nor eternal. The immortal essence of the teaching of the Buddhas, the lords of the world, is Without singleness or</p>	<p>The Buddhas may teach that there is a self, Or teach that there is no self. Within the true character of dharmas, There is neither self, nor non-self. The true character of dharmas, Is severance of mind, actions and speech. With no production and no cessation Calm extinction, like nirvana. All (things) are real, unreal, Both real and unreal, and Neither unreal nor not unreal, This is called the Buddha's Dharma. To know for oneself, not following others, Calm extinction, without sophistries, No differences and no distinctions; This is termed the "true character". If dharmas arise from conditions, They neither are, nor differ from, their conditions. That is why we call the real character "Not cut off and not permanent." Not one and not different, Not permanent and not cut off; This is the flavour OF the sweet nectar of the Buddha's teachings. If the Buddha had not emerged in the world, And the Buddha-dharma had utterly ceased. The insight of the Pratyekabuddhas Would have arisen quit separately.</p>

				<p>multiplicity; it is not destroyed nor is it eternal.</p> <p>If fully-developed Buddhas do not arise [in the world] and the disciples of the Buddha] disappear,</p> <p>Then, independently, the knowledge of the self-produced enlightened ones is produced.</p>	
21:17	<p>सद्भावस्य स्वभावेन नासद्भवश्च युज्यते निर्वाणकाले चोच्चेदः प्रशमाद् भवसंतटेः ।</p>		<p>By means of the self-nature of a real existent, a nonreal existent does not occur.</p> <p>At the time of nirvana there is annihilation of the uninterrupted series of births and transmigrations on account of calmness.</p>	<p>If there is self-existence of something which is intrinsically existing, the non-existence does not obtain.</p> <p>At the time of nirvana there is destruction of the cycle of existence as a result of the cessation.</p>	<p>∅ dharma abiding in its own self-nature Should not be both existent and non-existent. Nirvana extinguishes the continuity And thus falls into severance.</p>
22:11	<p>शून्यम् इति न वक्तव्यम् अशून्यम् इति वा भवेत् उभयं नोभयं चेति प्रज्ञप्त्यर्थं तु कथ्यत</p>		<p>I am not saying that “what is open” or “what is not open” could exist or “both” or “neither.” They are said only for the purpose of teaching.</p>	<p>One may not say there is “emptiness”, nor that there is “non-emptiness.”</p> <p>Nor that both [exist simultaneously], nor that neither exists; the purpose for saying [“emptiness”] is for the purpose of conveying knowledge.</p>	<p>Emptiness cannot be expressed Non-emptiness cannot be expressed Both, and neither, cannot be expressed They are discussed merely as conventional names.</p>
22:14-16	<p>स्वभावतश्च शून्ये स्मिंश्चिन्ता नैवोपपद्यते परं निरोधाद् भवति बुद्धो न भवतीति वा । १४ प्रपञ्चयन्ति ये बुद्धं प्रपञ्चातीतम् अव्ययं ते प्रपञ्चहताः सर्वे न पश्यन्ति तथागतं । १५ तथागतो यत् स्वभावस् तत् स्वभावम् इदम् जगत् तथागतो निःस्वभावो निःस्वभावम् इदं जगत् । १६</p>		<p>In what is open by nature, this thought: “The Buddha exists or does not exist after death” does not occur.</p> <p>Those who imagine the Buddha, who is beyond being described by false statements, Are all destroyed by idle fancy. They do not see the Tathagata.</p> <p>What self-nature is the Tathagata, that self-nature is the world. The Tathagata is without self-nature and the world is without that self-nature.</p>	<p>Concerning what is empty by its own nature, the thoughts do not arise that: The Buddha “exists” or “does not exist” after death.</p> <p>Those who describe in detail the Buddha, who is unchanging and beyond all detailed description— Those, completely defeated by description, do not perceive the “fully completed” [being].</p> <p>The self-existence of the “fully completed” [being] is the self-existence of the world. The “fully completed” [being] is without self-existence [and] the world is without self-existence.</p>	<p>Within the emptiness of such a nature One may speculate yet nor discover Whether, after the passing of the Thus-Come He can be distinguished as existent or non-existent.</p> <p>The Thus-Come transcends sophistries Yet men still produce sophistries. Sophistries destroy the eye of insight. Such as these do not see the Buddha.</p> <p>The nature of the Thus-come Is the very nature of the world The Thus-Come has no nature The world, also, has no nature.</p>
23:6-9	<p>स्वभावतो न विद्यन्ते शुभाशुभविपर्ययाः</p>		<p>Errors of purity and impurity do not occur naturally. How are defilements dependent on</p>	<p>The errors as to what is salutary and non-salutary do not exist as self-existent entities</p>	<p>The perverted views of purity and impurity Therefore have no self-nature</p>

	<p>प्रतीत्य कतमान् क्लेशाः शुभाशुभविपर्ययान् । ६ रूपशब्दरसस्पर्शा गन्धा धर्माश् च षड्विधं वस्तु रागस्य द्वेषस्य मोहस्य च विकल्प्यते । ७ । ।दोषस्य । रूपशब्दरसस्पर्शा गन्धा धर्माश् च केवलाः गन्धर्वनगराकारा मरीचिस्वप्नसंनिभाः । ८ अशुभं वा शुभं वापि कुतस् तेषु भविष्यति मायापुरुक्षकल्पेषु प्रतिबिम्बसमेषु च । ९</p>		<p>errors of purity and impurity? Physical form, sound, taste, touch, smell, and events are imagined as Six substantially existing things having desire, hatred, and delusion. Physical form, sound, taste, touch, smell, and events are Made-up imaginary cities in the sky, like dreams and mirages. Where will purity or impurity be in these People equal to illusions and like shadows?</p>	<p>Depending on what errors as to what is salutary and non-salutary are then impurities? Form, sound, taste, touch, smell, and the dharmas: this six-fold Substance of desires, hate, and delusion is imagined. Form, sound, taste, touch, smell, and the dharmas are Merely the form of a fairy castle, like a mirage, a dream. How will “that which is salutary” or “that which is non-salutary” come into existence In a formation of a magical man, or in things like a reflection?</p>	<p>How, then, can the defilements arise With these two as their cause? Form, sound, scent, taste, touch, and the other dharmas. Make up six kinds (of dharma) These six kinds (of dharma) Are the root of the three poisons. Form, sound, scent, taste and touch And dharmas; these six kinds Are all empty, like flames or dreams Or like a magic Gandharva-city.</p>
23:10-12	<p>अनपेक्ष्य शुभं नास्त्य् अशुभं प्रज्ञपयेमहि यत् प्रतित्य शुभं तस्माच् चुभं नैवोपपद्यते । १० अनपेक्ष्याशुभं नास्ति शुभं प्रज्ञपयेमहि । यत् प्रतीत्यशुभं तस्माद् अशुभं नैव विद्यते । ११ । अविद्यमाने च शुभे कुतो रागो भविष्यति अशुभे विद्यमाने च कुतो द्वेषो भविष्यति । १२ ।अविद्यमानेअक्कग्नि ।</p>				
23:13-16	<p>अनित्ये नित्यम् इत्य् एवम् यदि ग्राहो विपर्ययः नानित्यं विद्यते शुन्ये कुतो ग्राहो विपर्ययः । १३ अनित्ये नित्यम् इत्येवम् यदि ग्राहो विपर्ययः</p>		<p>If the error “there is permanence in impermanence” is so seized, Impermanence does not occur. Where is error seized in what is open? If the error “there is permanence in impermanence” is so seized, “Impermanence” is also grasped.</p>	<p>Even if the notion “What is permanent is in something impermanent” is in error, How can this notion be in error since “what is impermanent” does not exist in emptiness? Even if the notion “what is</p>	<p>To cling to permanence in impermanence Is called perverted perception. There is no permanence in emptiness, So where can the perverted perception of permanence exist?</p>

	<p>अनित्यम् इत्य् अपि ग्राहः शून्ये किं न विपर्ययः । १४ । येन गृह्णाति यो ग्राहो ग्रहीता यच्च च गृह्यते उपशान्तानि सर्वाणि तस्माद् ग्राहो न विद्यते । १५ विद्यमाने ग्राहे च मिथ्या वा सम्यग् एव वा भवेद् विपर्ययः कस्य भवेत् कस्याविपर्ययः । १६</p>		<p>What is without error in what is open? What is grasped by the grasper and whoever is grasped by means of grasping Are all calmed. Therefore grasping does not occur. And where grasping is present, either rightly or wrongly, Whose error would it be, whose nonerror would it be?</p>	<p>permanent is in something impermanent” is in error, Is not then the notion concerning emptiness, i.e., that it is impermanent, in error? That by which a notion is formed, the notion, those who have notions, and that which is grasped [in the notion]: All have ceased, therefore, the notion does not exist. If a notion is not existing as either false or true, Whose is the error? Whose is the non-error?</p>	<p>If clinging to impermanence Within impermanence is not a perverted view, Since there is no impermanence in emptiness, Why is this not a perverted view? That which is clung to, the clinger, and the clinging And also the dharma which clinging employs; All these have the characteristic of calm quiescence. How can clinging possibly exist? If there is no dharma of clinging Incorrectly speaking, these are perverted views. Correctly speaking, they are not perverted views, For who is there to have these things?</p>
2323-25	<p>एवं निरुध्यते विद्या विपर्ययनिरोधनात् अविद्यायं निरुद्धायां संस्काराद्यं निरुध्यते । २३ यदि भूताः स्वभावेन क्लेशाः के चिद् धि कस्य चित् कथं नाम प्रहीयेरन् कः स्वभावं प्रहास्यति । २४ यद्य् अभूताः स्वभावेन क्लेशाः के चिद् धि कस्य चित् कथं नाम प्रहीयेरन् को सद्भावं प्रहास्यति । २५</p>		<p>Thus from the cessation of errors, ignorance is stopped. Where ignorance has ceased, disposition, etc., is stopped. If any beings are defiled by their own nature, whose [defilements] are they? How would they be called abandoned? Who will abandon self-nature? If not any beings are defiled by their own nature, whose [defilements] are they? How would they be called abandoned? Who will abandon what does not really exist?</p>	<p>From the cessation of error ignorance ceases; When ignorance has ceased, conditioning forces and everything else cease. If any kind of self-existent impurities belong to somebody, How in all the world would they be eliminated? Who can eliminate that which is self-existent? If any kind of self-existent impurities do not belong to somebody, How in all the world would they be eliminated? Who can eliminate that which is non-self-existent?</p>	<p>When perverted views cease in this way Ignorance also ceases. By the cessation of ignorance Predispositions and so forth cease. If the defilements have a real nature And there is someone to whom they belong, How can they be cut off And who can cut off that nature? If the afflictions are false deceptions With no nature, and belonging to no-one. How can they be cut off? For who can cut off a non-nature?</p>
24:7-27	<p>अत्र ब्रूमः शून्यतायां न त्वं वेत्सि प्रयोजनम्</p>		<p>We reply that here you have not experienced the purpose in openness, And thus the use of openness is</p>	<p>We reply that you do not comprehend the point of emptiness; You eliminate both “emptiness”</p>	<p>You really cannot understand Emptiness, or the reasons for emptiness Or understand the meaning of</p>

<p>शून्यतां शून्यतार्थं च तत एवम् विहन्यसे । ७ द्वे सत्ये समुपाश्रित्य बुद्धानां धर्मदेशना लोकसंवृतिसत्यम् च सत्यम् च परमार्थतः । ८ ये नयोर् न विजानन्ति विभागं सतयोर् द्वयोः ते तत्त्वं न विजानन्ति गम्भीरं बुद्धशासने । ९ व्यवहारम् अनाश्रित्य परमार्थो न देश्यते परमार्थम् अनागम्य निर्वाणं नाधिगम्यते । १० विनाशयति दुर्दृष्टा शून्यता मन्दमेधसं सर्पो यथा दुर्गृहीतो विद्या वा दुष्प्रसाधिता । ११ अतश् च प्रत्युदावृतं चित्तं देशयितुं मुनेः धर्मं मत्वास्य धर्मस्य मन्दैर् दुरवगाहताम् । १२ 'अन्दैर्-देशयितुम् । शून्यतायाम् अधिलयं यं पुनः कुरुते भवान् दोशप्रसण्णो नास्माकं स शून्ये नोपपद्यते । १३ सर्वं च युज्यते तस्य शून्यता यस्य युज्यते सर्वं न युज्यते तस्य शून्यं यस्य न युज्यते । १४ स त्वं दोषान् आत्मनीयान् अस्मासु परिपातयन् अश्वम् एवाभिरूढः सन्न अश्वम् एवासि विस्मृतः । १५ स्वभावाद् यदि भावानां सद्भावम् अनुपश्यसि</p>		<p>severed from openness by you. The instruction of the teachings of the buddhas are based on two truths: The truth of common sense conventions about the world and truth in the higher sense of the word. Those who do not understand the distinction between the two truths Do not understand the profound reality in the teaching of the Buddha. Higher truth is not taught independently of common practice. Liberation is not accomplished by the unattainable higher truth. Openness wrongly conceived destroys the dimly witted. It is like a snake grasped by the head or a garbled incantation. And hence the Sage's thought was turned against causing the Truth to be taught. The purpose of the Teaching is difficult to fathom for the lazy. But what objection to openness is made by the twelvefold causal chain of becoming? The condemnation is not ours. It does not apply in what is open. Because open works, therefore everything works. If openness does not work, then everything does not work. You have projected your errors on us. You are like one who mounts a horse forgetting the saddle. If you consider that the existence of beings is from self-nature, You see beings existing without cause or conditions. You deny effect, cause, agent, action, and activity</p>	<p>itself and its purpose from it. The teaching by the Buddhas of the dharma has recourse to two truths: The world-ensconced truth and the truth which is the highest sense. Those who do not know the distribution (vibhagam) of the two kinds of truth Do not know the profound "point" (tattva) in the teaching of the Buddha. The highest sense [of the truth] is not taught apart from practical behavior, And without having understood the highest sense one cannot understand nirvana. Emptiness, having been dimly perceived, utterly destroys the slow-witted. It is like a snake wrongly grasped or [magical] knowledge incorrectly applied. Therefore the mind of the ascetic [Guatama] was diverted from teaching the dharma, Having thought about the incomprehensibility of the dharma by the stupid. Time and again you have made a condemnation of emptiness, But that refutation does not apply to our emptiness. When emptiness "works," then everything in existence "works." If emptiness does <i>not</i> "work," then all existence does <i>not</i> "work." You, while projecting your own faults on us, Are like a person who, having mounted his horse, forgot the</p>	<p>emptiness. Therefore you create difficulties for yourself. All Buddhas rely on two types of truth In order to teach the Dharma to living beings. One is conventional worldly truth, The other is the truth of the ultimate meaning. If a person is unable to perceive The distinction between the two truths Then he will not know the real meaning Of the profound Buddha-Dharma. Unless you rely on the conventional truth You will not attain the ultimate meaning. Unless you attain the ultimate meaning You will not attain nirvana. If he is unable to perceive emptiness correctly, A dull-witted man will injure himself. It is like a spell unskillfully-invoked Or a poisonous snake unskillfully grasped... The World-Honoured One knew this Dharma, Extremely profound and subtle in character. Could not be approached by the dull-witted. This is why he was unwilling to teach. You say that we are attached to emptiness And you produce and attribute errors to us. But the errors which you are expounding Do not exist in emptiness. By virtue of the principle of</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>अहेतुप्रत्ययान् भावांस् त्वम् एवं सति पश्यसि । १६</p> <p>कार्यं च कारणं चैव कर्तारं करणम् क्रियां</p> <p>उत्पादं च निरोधं च फलं च प्रतिभाधसे । १७</p> <p>यः प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादः शून्यतां तां प्रचक्ष्महे</p> <p>सा प्रज्ञप्तिरुपादाय प्रतिपत् सैव मध्यमा । १८</p> <p>अप्रतीत्य समुत्पन्नो धर्मः कश्चिन् न विद्यते</p> <p>यस्मात् तस्माद् अशून्यो हि धर्मः कश्चिन् न</p> <p>विद्यते । १९</p> <p>यद् यशून्यम् इदम् सर्वम् उदयो नास्ति न व्ययः</p> <p>चतूर्णाम् आर्यसत्यानां अभावस्ते प्रसज्यते । २०</p> <p>अप्रतीत्य समुत्पन्नं कुतो दुःखं भविष्यति</p> <p>अनित्यम् उक्तं दुःखं हि तत् स्वाभाव्ये न विद्यते ।</p> <p>२१</p> <p>स्वभावतो विद्यमानं किं पुनः समुद्देष्यते</p> <p>तस्मात् समुदयो नास्ति शून्यतां प्रतिबाधतः । २२</p> <p>न निरोधः स्वभावेन सतो दुःखस्य विद्यते</p> <p>स्वभावपर्यवस्थानान् निरोधं प्रतिबाधसे । २३</p> <p>स्वाभाव्ये सति मार्गस्य भावना नोपपद्यते</p> <p>अथासौ भाव्यते मार्गः स्वाभाव्यं ते न विद्यते । २४</p> <p>यदा दुःखं समुदयो निरोधश्च न विद्यते</p>		<p>As well as arising, cessation, and the fruit of action.</p> <p>What is interdependent origination, that is called openness by us.</p> <p>It [openness] makes use of convention and is the practice of the middle way.</p> <p>Not any event not interdependently originated occurs.</p> <p>Indeed, not any event that is not open occurs.</p> <p>If all this is not open, arising and dissolution do not exist.</p> <p>For you, the nonexistence of the four noble truths follows.</p> <p>How will there be suffering that is not interdependently originated?</p> <p>Suffering is said to be impermanent.</p> <p>Indeed, it does not occur in what is imagined to have self-nature.</p> <p>Again, why will what is presently existing as a consequence of self-nature rise again?</p> <p>Therefore, form the denial of openness, there is the nonexistence of arising.</p> <p>The cessation of suffering existing by means of self-nature does not occur.</p> <p>Cessation by contradictions in self-nature is denied by you.</p> <p>In what is conceived to be existing by self-nature, practice of the path does not take place.</p> <p>But were this path caused to exist by you, what is imagined to be self-nature does not occur.</p> <p>If suffering, arising, and cessation does not occur,</p> <p>Which path will result in the cessation of suffering?</p> <p>There is no thesis by means of self-nature. How is there a thesis</p>	<p>horse!</p> <p>If you recognize real existence on account of the self-existence of things,</p> <p>You perceive that there are uncaused and unconditioned things.</p> <p>If you deny “what is to be produced,” cause, the producer, the instrument of production, and the producing action,</p> <p>And the origination, destruction, and “fruit.”</p> <p>The “originating dependently” we call “emptiness”;</p> <p>This apprehension, i.e., taking into account [all other things], is the understanding of the middle way.</p> <p>Since there is no dharma whatever originating independently,</p> <p>No dharma whatever exists which is not empty.</p> <p>If all existence is not empty, there is neither origination nor destruction.</p> <p>You must wrongly conclude then that the four holy truths do not exist.</p> <p>Having originated without being conditioned, how will sorrow come into existence?</p> <p>It is said that sorrow is not eternal; therefore, certainly it does not exist by its own nature.</p> <p>How can that which is existing by its own nature originate again?</p> <p>For him who denies emptiness there is no production.</p>	<p>emptiness</p> <p>All dharmas are established.</p> <p>If there were no principle of emptiness</p> <p>Nothing would be established.</p> <p>You yourself are in error</p> <p>Yet you turn these errors against us.</p> <p>Like a man riding a horse</p> <p>Who forgets what he himself is mounted on.</p> <p>If you perceive all dharmas</p> <p>As having fixed, existent natures,</p> <p>Then you will see all dharmas</p> <p>As without causes and without conditions.</p> <p>This constitutes a negation of cause and effect,</p> <p>Of doing, doer and thing done.</p> <p>And moreover it denies</p> <p>The arising, and ceasing of all the myriad things.</p> <p>Dharmas produced by causes and conditions</p> <p>We say are non-existent.</p> <p>And constitute conventional names.</p> <p>And this is the meaning of the middle path.</p> <p>There has never existed a single dharma</p> <p>Which did not arise from causes and conditions.</p> <p>Therefore no dharma exists</p> <p>Which is not empty.</p> <p>If everything were not empty</p> <p>There would be no arising or ceasing</p> <p>And thus there would not be</p> <p>The dharma of the four holy truths.</p> <p>If suffering did not arise from conditions</p> <p>Then how could there possibly be suffering?</p> <p>The meaning of suffering is impermanence</p> <p>A fixed nature is not</p>
--	--	--	--	---

	<p>मार्गो दुःखनिरोधत्वात् कतमः प्रापयिष्यति । २५</p> <p>स्वभावेनापरिज्ञानं यदि तस्य पुनः कथं</p> <p>परिज्ञानं ननु किल स्वभावः समवस्थितः । २६</p> <p>प्रहाणसाक्षात् करणे भावना चैवम् एव ते</p> <p>परिज्ञावन् न युज्यन्ते चत्वार्यु अपि फलानि च ।</p> <p>२७</p>		<p>Or proposition about it if self-nature is never assuredly established?</p> <p>Practice in the intuitive perception of letting go and thus</p> <p>Possession of a thesis and also the four noble fruits do not occur for you.</p>	<p>There is no destruction of sorrow if it exists by its own nature.</p> <p>By trying to establish “self-existence” you deny destruction.</p> <p>If the path [of release] is self-existent, then there is no way of bringing it into existence;</p> <p>If that path is brought into existence, then ‘self-existence,’ which you claim, does not exist.</p>	<p>impermanenet.</p> <p>IF suffering had a fixed nature How could it arise from accumulation?</p> <p>Therefore there is no accumulation Through the denial of the principle of emptiness.</p> <p>If suffering had a fixed nature There would be no cessation Through your attachment to fixed natures You deny the truth of cessation.</p> <p>IF suffering had a fixed-nature There would be no cultivation of the Way.</p> <p>If the Way can be cultivated Then it does not have a fixed nature.</p> <p>If there were no truth of suffering And no truth of accumulation and cessation, What could be achieved by a Way to extinguish suffering?</p> <p>If suffering had a fixed nature Which was not previously perceived How could it be perceived now Since its nature would not have changed?</p> <p>Just as perception of suffering would not occur, So cutting off accumulation, realizing cessation, Cultivation of the Way, and the four fruits Would also not occur.</p>
24:37-40	<p>न कर्तव्यं भवेत् किं चिद् अनारब्धा भवेत् क्रिया</p> <p>कारकः स्याद् अकुर्वानः शून्यतां प्रतिबाधतः । ३७</p> <p>अजातम् अनिरुद्धं च कूटस्थं च भविष्यति</p> <p>विचित्राभिर् अवस्थाभिः स्वभावे रहितं जगत् । ३८</p>		<p>From the denial of openness, there would be nothing to be done, Activity would not be a bit commenced, and the doer would not be doing.</p> <p>In the self-nature doctrine, the world, void of a state of diversity, Will be unborn, unceasing, and unchanging.</p> <p>If what is open does not occur, there</p>	<p>If you deny emptiness, there would be action which is unactivated.</p> <p>There would be nothing whatever acted upon, and a producing action would be something not begun.</p> <p>According to [the doctrine of] “self-existence” the world is free from different conditions;</p> <p>Then it will exist as unproduced,</p>	<p>If you reject the idea of emptiness Then there will be nothing which is done,</p> <p>There will be doing without doing And a non-doer will be called a doer.</p> <p>If they had fixed, existent natures The various characteristics in the world Would be non-arising and non- ceasing</p>

	<p>असंप्राप्तस्य च प्राप्तिर् दुःखपर्यन्तकर्म च सर्वक्लेशप्रहाणं च यद् अशून्यं न विद्यते । ३९ यः प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादं पश्यतीदं स पश्यति दुःकं समुदयं चैव निरोधं मार्गम् एव च । ४०</p>		<p>is abandonment of all Defilements and that is the end of suffering and attachment of the unattained. He who sees interdependent origination sees this; Suffering, arising and ceasing, and also the path.</p>	<p>undestroyed, and immutable. If non-emptiness does not exist, then something is attained which is not attained; There is cessation of sorrow and actions, and all evil is destroyed. He who perceives dependent co- origination Also understands sorrow, origination, and destruction as well as the path [of release].</p>	<p>Permanently abiding and imperishable. If there is not emptiness One who has not yet attained will never attain Nor will the defilements be cut off, Nor will there be termination of suffering. This is why it is said in the sutras That if you perceive the dharma of causality Then you can perceive the Buddha. And perceive suffering, accumulation, cessation, and the Way.</p>
25:3	<p>अप्रहीणम् असंप्राप्तम् अनुच्चिन्नम् अशाश्वतं अनिरुद्धम् अनुत्पन्नम् एतन् निर्वाणम् उच्यते ।</p>		<p>What is not abandoned and not attained, not interrupted and not permanent, Not destroyed and not produced, this is called nirvana.</p>	<p>Nirvana has been said to be neither eliminated nor attained, neither annihilated nor eternal, Neither disappeared, nor originated.</p>	<p>...is neither attained nor arrived at Neither cut off nor permanent Neither arisen nor ceased This is what is called nirvana</p>
25:10	<p>प्रहाणं चाब्रवीच्च चास्ता भवस्य विभवस्य च तस्मान् न भावो नाभावो निर्वाणम् इति युज्यते ।</p>		<p>The Teacher [Buddha] taught the abandonment of becoming and nonbecoming. Therefore, the assertion “nirvana is neither existent nor nonexistent” is reasonable.</p>	<p>The teacher [Gautama] has taught that a “becoming” and a “non-becoming” (vibhava) are destroyed; Therefore it obtains that: Nirvana is neither an existent thing nor a non-existent thing.</p>	<p>As the Buddha tells us in the sutras; “Cut off from existence, cut off from nonexistence”. Therefore we know that nirvana is neither existent nor nonexistent.</p>
25:17- 18	<p>परं निरोधाद् भगवान् भवतीत्येव नोह्यते न भवत्युभयं चेति नोभयं चेति नोह्यते । १७ तिष्ठमानो पि भगवान् भवतीत्य् एव नोह्यते न भवत्य् उभयं चेति नोभयं चेति नोह्यते । १८</p>		<p>It is not maintained that “the Venerable One exists after death” Nor is it maintained “he does not exist” or “both or neither.” It is not maintained that “the Venerable One exists while remaining in the world” nor is it maintained that “he does not exist or both or neither.”</p>	<p>It is not expressed if the Glorious One [the Buddha] exists after his death, Or does not exist, or both or neither. Also, it is not expressed if the Glorious One exists while remaining [in the world], Or does not exist, or both or neither.</p>	<p>The Thus-Come, after his decease Is neither said to exist, nor not exist Nor said to be both existent and nonexistent Nor nonexistent and not nonexistent. The Thus-Come in the present Is neither said to exist, nor not exist Nor said to be both existent and nonexistent Nor nonexistent and not nonexistent.</p>
25:19- 24	<p>न संसारस्य निर्वाणात् किं चिद् अस्ति विशेषणं न निर्वाणस्य संसारात् किं चिद् अस्ति विशेषणं । १९</p>	<p>There is nothing whatsoever of samsara distinguishing (it) from nirvana. There is nothing whatsoever of nirvana distinguishing it from samsara. (That?) is the limit which is the limit of nirvana and the limit of samsara; Even a very subtle interval is not</p>	<p>There is no distinction whatever between samsara and nirvana. There is no distinction whatever between nirvana and samsara. The limit of nirvana is that of samsara. The subtlest difference is not found between the two. Views, such as permanence, etc.,</p>	<p>There is nothing whatever which differentiates the existence-in- flux (samsara) from nirvana; And there is nothing whatever which differentiates nirvana from existence-in-flux. The extreme limit (koṭi) of nirvana is also the extreme limit of existence-in-flux;</p>	<p>Between nirvana and the world There is not the slightest distinction Between the world and nirvana There is not the slightest distinction. The real limit of nirvana And the limit of this world Between these two limits There is not the least distinction.</p>

	<p>निर्वाणस्य च या कोटिः ।कोटिः । संसरणस्य च न तयोर् अन्तरं किञ्चित् सुसूक्ष्मम् अपि विद्यते । २० परं निरोधाद् अन्ताद्याः शाश्वताद्याश् च दृष्टयः निर्वाणम् अपरान्तं च पूर्वान्तं समाश्रिताः । २१ शून्येषु सर्वधर्मेषु किम् अनन्तं किमन्तवत् किम् अनन्तम् अन्तवच्च च नानन्तं नान्तवच्च किं । २२ किं तद् एव किम् अन्यत् किं शाश्वतं किम् अशाश्वतं अशाश्वतं शाश्वतं च किं वा नोभयम् अप्यतः 5थ । २३ सर्वोपलम्भशमः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवः न क्व चित् कस्यचित् कश्चिद् धर्मो बुद्धेन देशितः । २४</p>	<p>found of (between) them. Views of an end, etc., and permanence, etc., after cessation (death?) Have recourse to a beginning and an end nirvana. When all dharmas are empty, what is endless? What has an end? What is endless <i>and</i> with an end? What is not endless <i>and</i> not with an end? What is “it”? What is “other”? What is permanent? What is impermanent? What is impermanent <i>and</i> permanent? What is neither? [FILL] Auspicious is the pacification of phenomenal metastasis, the pacification of all apprehending; There is no dharma whatsoever taught by the Buddha to whomever whenever, wherever. Or, There is no auspicious dharma whatsoever (which would be) the pacification of phenomenal metastasis, the pacification of all apprehending Taught by the Buddha to whomever, whenever, wherever.</p>	<p>finitude, etc., after death, are associated with a past and future nirvana. Since all events are open, what is infinite? What is finite? What is infinite and finite and what is neither infinite nor finite? What has gone away? What identity? What difference? What is permanent and impermanent or neither and so forth? Liberation is the cessation of all thought, the quieting of phenomena. Not any doctrine anywhere has been taught to anyone by the Buddha.</p>	<p>There is not the slightest bit of difference between these two. The views [regarding] whether that which is beyond death is limited by a beginning or an end or some alternative Depend on a nirvana limited by a beginning (purvanta) and an end (aparanta). Since all dharmas are empty, what is finite? What is infinite? What is both finite and infinite? What is neither finite nor infinite? Is there anything which is this or something else, Which is permanent or impermanent, Which is both permanent and impermanent, or which is neither? The cessation of accepting everything (as real) is a salutary (siva) cessation of phenomenal development (prapanca); No dharma anywhere has been taught by the Buddha of anything.</p>	<p>Whether there is existence or nonexistence after death, etc., The boundaries of existence, etc., and permanence, etc., All such views depend on “nirvana” On “future” and on “past Since all dharmas are empty What is bounded, and what unbounded, Both bounded and not bounded, Or neither bounded nor not bounded? Why regard things as one or different? What is permanent, impermanent, Both permanent and impermanent, Or neither permanent nor impermanent? All dharmas are inconceivable. Extinguish all futile thoughts. There is no person, and no place And there is nothing taught by the Buddha.</p>
26:7-12	उपादाने सति भव उपादतुः प्रवर्तते		Where grasping exists, the being who grasps is set in motion. Indeed, if there would be no grasping,	When the acquisition exists, the acquirer begins to function. If he were someone without	On account of craving there are the four grasping And because of grasping there is

<p>स्याद् धि यद् अनुपादानो मुच्येत न भवेद् भवः । ७ पञ्च स्कन्धाः स च भवः भवाज् जातिः प्रवर्तते जरमरणदुःखादि शोकाः सपरिदेवनाः । ८ दौर्मनस्यम् उपायासा जातेर् एतत् प्रवर्तते केवलस्यैवम् एतस्य दुःखस्कन्धस्य संभवः । ९ संसारमूलान् संस्कारान् अविद्वान् संस्करोत्य् अतः अविद्वान् कारकस् तस्मान् न विद्वांस् तत्त्वदर्शनात् । १० अविद्यायां निरुद्धायां संस्काराणां असम्भवः अविद्याया निरोधस् तु ज्ञानेनास्यैव भावनात् । ११ तस्य तस्य निरोधेन तत् तन् नाभिप्रवर्तते दुःखस्कन्धः केवलो यम् एवं सम्यग् निरुध्यते । १२</p>	<p>he would be released and there would be no being [who grasps]. He, the being, is five skandhas and from being, rebirth is set in motion, Together with lamentations, afflictions, suffering, etc., old age and death. Together with despair, all this is set in motion from birth. Thus is the origin of this entire mass of suffering. Hence the ignorant compose dispositions, the roots of samsara. Therefore, the ignorant create while the wise, seeing reality, do not. Since the destruction of dispositions is the cessation of ignorance, Cessation of ignorance is from practice based on knowledge. With the cessation of [ignorance], which [link on the causal chain] advances to what [next link]? Thus the entire mass of suffering is rightly ceased.</p>	<p>acquisition, that being would be released, and would not exist. That being is the five “groups of universal elements” (skandha). Because of a being, birth begins to function. Growing old, dying, sorrow, etc., grief and regrets, Despair and agitation: all this results from birth; That “produced being” is a single mass of sorrows. Thus the ignorant people construct the conditioned things (samskara); [that is] the source for existence-in-flux. The one who constructs is ignorant; the wise person is not [the one who constructs] because he perceives true reality. When ignorance ceases, the constructed phenomena do not come into existence. A person’s cessation of ignorance proceeds on the basis of “becoming [enlightened] through knowledge. Through cessation of every [component] none functions; That single mass of sorrow is thus completely destroyed.</p>	<p>existence. If the grasper would not grasp There would be liberation, and noexistence. From existence there is birth From birth comes old age and death Because of old age and death there are All the afflictions of sorrow and ill. All such things as these Arise from birth Only through these causes and conditions Does the great suffering of the skandhas accumulate. The basis of birth and death And predispositions just described Is created by the unenlightened man The man of insight does not create it. When these things cease They do not arise This suffering assemblage of the skandhas Thus simply ceases.</p>
<p>27:1</p>		<p>Those [views] relating to the limits of the past reality are: “The world is eternal,” etc., [And “I have existed in the past,” “I have not existed in the past,” etc.] [[Reconstructed from Candrakirti]]</p>	

27:4 Streng 24:5	<p>स एवात्मेति तु भवेद् उपादानं विशिष्यते उपादानविनिर्मुक्त आत्मा ते कतमः पुनः</p>		<p>He is defined as “the self” but would be grasping. Again, how is your self exempt from grasping?</p>	<p>If it were held that: “There is no individual self without the acquisition,” Then the individual self would be [only] the acquisition or it is not an individual self [at all].</p>	<p>Now the self is not separate from receiving Nor is it the receiving Neither non-receiving, nor non-existent; This is its fixed meaning.</p>
27:11	<p>उच्चेदः करणां नाशस् तथान्येन कृतकर्मणां ।कृतम् अन्येन कर्म च । अन्येन परिभोगः स्याद् एवम् आदि प्रसज्यते ।</p>		<p>So, the fruit of actions by one would be enjoyed by another. Thus annihilation and destruction of actions follows.</p>	<p>“Verse 11 is not available in the Sanskrit text, but it is known from the Tibetan translation.”</p>	
27:29-30	<p>अथ वा सर्वभावानां शून्यत्वाच् चाश्वतादयः क्व कस्य कतमाः कस्मात् संभविष्यन्ति दृष्टयः । २९ सर्वदृष्टिप्रहानाय यः सद्धर्मम् अदेशयत् अनुकम्पाम् उपादाय तं नमस्यामि गौतमं । ३०</p>	<p>Because (given that) there is openness of all beings, <i>What</i> views of permanence, etc., belonging to whom, will become where, and why? I will bow to Gautama, the one who, for the undertaking of compassion, Taught the true dharma for the striking-down of all views,</p>	<p>Because of the openness of all beings, why, which, Of what, and where will views about permanence, etc., develop? I bow to him, Gautama, who, from compassion, Taught the true Teaching for the purpose of abandoning all views.</p>	<p>Because of the emptiness of all existing things, How will the views about “eternity,” etc., come into existence, about what, of whom, and of what kind? To him, possessing compassion, who taught the real dharma For the destruction of all views—to him, Gautama, I humbly offer reverence.</p>	<p>Since all dharmas are empty Views about the permanence, etc., of the world – In what place, and at what time, And by whom, would such views be generated? To Gautama, Great Sage and Master, Who from pity and compassion preached this Dharma, Entirely cutting off all views; We know bow our head in reverence.</p>