



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

B = Stephen Batchelor? (according to internet site)

S = Frederick J. Streng, EMPTINESS: A STUDY IN RELIGIOUS MEANING (New York: Abingdon Press, 1967), Appendix A & B; pp. 183-227

G = Jay L. Garfield, THE FUNDAMENTAL WISDOM OF THE MIDDLE WAY: NAGARAJUNA'S MULAMDHYAMAKAKARIKA (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)

SG = rJe Tsong khapa, Translated by Geshe Ngawang Samten and Jay L. Garfield, OCEAN OF REASONING: A Great Commentary on Nagarjuna's Mulamadhyamakarikā (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)

I = Kenneth K. Inada, NAGARJUNA: A TRANSLATION OF HIS MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1970)

K= David J. Kalupahana, MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA OF NAGARJUNA: THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE MIDDLE WAY (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1986)

मूलमध्यमककारिका

आर्यसत्यपरीक्षा नाम चतुर्विंशतितमं प्रकरणं

B: Investigation of Nirvana (Nirvana)

S: An Analysis of Nirvana (nirvana)

G: Examination of Nirvana

SG: Examination of Nirvana

I: Examination of Nirvana

K: Examination of Freedom



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

यदि शून्यमिदं सर्वमुदयो नास्ति न व्ययः।

प्रहाणाद्वा निरोधाद्वा कस्य निर्वाणमिष्यते ॥ १

yadi śūnyamidaṁ sarvamudayo nāsti na vyayaḥ |
prahāṇādvā nirodhādvā kasya nirvāṇamiṣyate || 1

B: If everything were empty, there would be no arising and perishing. From the letting go of and ceasing of what could one assert nirvana(-ing)?

S: If all existence is empty, there is no origination nor destruction. Then whose nirvana through elimination [of suffering] and destruction [of illusion] would be postulated?

G: If all this is empty,
Then there is no arising or passing away
By the relinquishing or ceasing of what
Does one wish nirvana to arise?

SG: If all this is empty.
Then there is neither arising nor passing away.
Through the abandonment or cessation of what
Does one aspire to nirvana?

I: (The opponent contends)
If all is *sunya* and there is neither production nor destruction, then from whose abandonment (of defilements) or from whose extinction (of suffering) can *nirvana* be attained?

K: If all this is empty, there exists neither arising nor ceasing. [As such,] through the relinquishing and ceasing of what does one expect freedom?

यद्यशून्यमिदं सर्वमुदयो नास्ति न व्ययः।

प्रहाणाद्वा निरोधाद्वा कस्य निर्वाणमियते ॥ २

yadyaśūnyamidaṁ sarvamudayo nāsti na vyayaḥ |
prahāṇādvā nirodhādvā kasya nirvāṇamiyate || 2



B: If everything were not empty, there would be no arising and perishing. From the letting go of and ceasing of what could one assert nirvana(-ing)?

S: If all existence is non-empty, there is no origination nor destruction. Then whose nirvana through elimination [of suffering] and destruction [of illusion] would be postulated?

G: If all this is nonempty,
Then there is no arising or passing away.
By the relinquishing or ceasing of what
Does one wish nirvana to arise?

SG: If all this is nonempty,
Then there is neither arising nor passing away.
Through the abandonment or cessation of what
Does one aspire to nirvana?

I: (Nagarjuna asserts)
If all is *asunya* and there is neither production nor destruction, then from whose abandonment (of defilements) or from whose extinction (of suffering) can *nirvana* be attributed?

K: If all this is non-empty, there exists neither arising nor ceasing, [As such,] through relinquishing and ceasing of what does one expect freedom?

अप्रहीणमसंप्राप्तमनुच्चिन्नमशाश्वतं।

अनिरुद्धमनुत्पन्नमेतन्निर्वामुच्यते ॥ ३

aprahīṇamasamprāptamanuccinnamaśāśvataṃ |
aniruddhamanutpannametannirvamucyate || 3

B: No letting go, no attainment, no annihilation, no permanence, no cessation, no birth: that is spoken of as nirvana.

S: Nirvana has been said to be neither eliminated nor attained, neither annihilated nor eternal,
Neither disappeared nor originated.

G: Unrelinquished, unattained,



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

Unannihilated, not permanent,
Unarisen, unceased:
This is how nirvana is described.

SG: Unrelinquished, unattained,
Unannihilated, impermanent,
Unarisen, unceased:
This is how nirvana is described.

I: What is never cast off, seized, interrupted, constant, extinguished, and produced... this is called *nirvana*.

K: Unrelinquished, not reached, unanihilated, non-eternal, non-ceased and non-arisen – this is called freedom.

भावस्तावन्न निर्वाणं जरामरणलक्षणं ।

प्रसज्येतास्ति भावो हि न जरामरणं विना ॥ ४

bhāvastāvanna nirvāṇaṃ jarāmaṇalakṣaṇaṃ ।
prasajyetāsti bhāvo hi na jarāmaṇaṃ vinā । । 4

B: Nirvana is not a thing. Then it would follow that it would have the characteristics of aging and death. There does not exist any thing that is without aging and death.

S: Nirvana is certainly not an existing thing, for then it would be characterized by old age and death.

In consequence it would involve the error that an existing thing would not become old and be without death.

G: Nirvana is not existent.

It would then have the characteristics of age and death.

There is no existent entity

Without age and death.

SG: Nirvana is not a thing.

It would then have the characteristics of aging and death.

No thing exists

Without aging and death.



I: Indeed, *nirvana* is not strictly in the nature of ordinary existence for, if it were, there would wrongly follow the characteristics of old age-death. For, such existence cannot be without those characteristics.

K: Freedom, as a matter of fact, is not existence, for if it were, it would follow that it has the characteristics of decay and death. Indeed, there is no existence without decay and death.

भावश्च यदि निर्वाणं निर्वाणं संस्कृतं भवेत्।

नासंस्कृतो हि विद्यते भावः क्व चन कश्चन ॥ ५

bhāvaśca yadi nirvāṇam nirvāṇam saṃskṛtaṃ bhavet |
nāsaṃskṛto hi vidyate bhāvaḥ kva cana kaścana || 5

B: If nirvana were a thing, nirvana would be a conditioned phenomenon. There does not exist any thing anywhere that is not a conditioned phenomenon.

S: And if nirvana is an existing thing, nirvana would be a constructed product (samskrta),
Since never ever has an existing thing been found to be a non-constructed-product (asamskrta).

G: If nirvana were existent,
Nirvana would be compounded.
A non-compounded existent
Does not exist anywhere.

SG: If nirvana were a thing,
Nirvana would be compounded.
A non-compounded thing
Does not exist anywhere.

I: If *nirvana* is strictly in the nature of ordinary existence, it will be of the created realm. For, no ordinary existence of the uncreated realm ever exists anywhere at all.

K: Moreover, if freedom were to be existence, then freedom would be considered conditioned. Yet, an existence that is unconditioned is not evident anywhere.



भावश्च यदि निर्वाणमनुपादाय तत्कथं।

निर्वाणं नानुपादाय कश्चिद्भावो हि विद्यते ॥ ६

bhāvaśca yadi nirvāṇamanupādāya tatkatham |
nirvāṇam nānupādāya kaścidbhāvo hi vidyate || 6

B: If nirvana were a thing, how would nirvana not be dependent? There does not exist any thing at all that is not dependent.

S: But if nirvana is an existing thing, how could [nirvana] exist without dependence [on something else]?
Certainly nirvana does not exist as something without dependence.

G: If nirvana were existent,
How could nirvana be nondependent?
A nondependent existent
Does not exist anywhere.

SG: If nirvana were a thing,
How could nirvana be nondependent?
A nondependent thing
Does not exist anywhere.

I: If *nirvana* is strictly in the nature of ordinary existence, why is it non-appropriating? For, no ordinary existence that is non-appropriating ever exists.

K: Furthermore, if freedom were to be existence, how can that freedom be independent, for an independent existence is certainly not evident?

यदि भावो न निर्वाणमभावः किं भविष्यति।

निर्वाणं यत्र भावो न नाभावस्तत्र विद्यते ॥ ७

yadi bhāvo na nirvāṇamabhāvaḥ kiṃ bhaviṣyati |
nirvāṇam yatra bhāvo na nābhāvastatra vidyate || 7



B: If nirvana were not a thing, how could it possibly be nothing? The one for whom nirvana is not a thing, for him it is not nothing.

S: If nirvana is not an existing thing, will nirvana become a non-existing thing? Wherever there is no existing thing, neither is there a non-existing thing.

G: If nirvana were not existent,
How could it be appropriate for it to be nonexistent?
Where nirvana is not existent,
It cannot be a nonexistent.

SG: If nirvana were a non-thing,
How could it make sense for it not to be a thing?
Where nirvana is not a thing,
It cannot be a non-thing.

I: If *nirvana* is not strictly in the nature of ordinary existence, how could what is in the nature of non-existence be *nirvana*? Where there is no existence, equally so, there can be no non-existence.

K: If freedom is not existence, will freedom be non-existence? Wherein there is no existence, therein non-existence is not evident.

यद्यभावश्च निर्वाणमनुपादाय तत्कथं।

निर्वाणं न ह्यभावो ऽस्ति यो ऽनुपादाय विद्यते ॥ ८

yadyabhāvaśca nirvāṇamanupādāya tatkatham |
nirvāṇam na hyabhāvo 'sti yo 'nupādāya vidyate || 8

B: If nirvana were nothing, how could nirvana possibly be not dependent? There does not exist any nothing which is not dependent.

S: But if nirvana is a non-existing thing, how could [nirvana] exist without dependence [on something else]?
Certainly nirvana is not a non-existing thing which exists without dependence.

G: If nirvana were not existent,
How could nirvana be nondependent?



Whatever is nondependent
Is not nonexistent.

SG: If nirvana were a non-thing,
How could nirvana be nondependent?
Whatever is nondependent
Is not a non-thing.

I: If *nirvana* is in the nature of non-existence, why is it non-appropriating? For, indeed, a non-appropriating on-existence does not prevail.

K: If freedom is non-existence, how can freedom be independent? For there exists no non-existence which evidently is independent.

य आजवंजवीभाव उपादाय प्रतीत्य वा ।

सो ऽप्रतीत्यानुपादाय निर्वाणमुपदिश्यते ॥ ९

ya ājavamjavībhāva upādāya pratītya vā ।
so 'pratītyānupādāya nirvāṇamupadiśyate ॥ 9

B: Whatever things come and go are dependent or caused. Not being dependent and not being caused is taught to be Nirvana.

S: That state which is the rushing in and out [of existence] when dependent or conditioned
This [state], when not dependent or not conditioned, is seen to be nirvana.

G: That which comes and goes
Is dependent and changing.
That, when it is not dependent and changing,
Is taught to be nirvana.

SG: A thing which comes and goes
Is dependent and produced by causes.
That which is not dependent and not produced by causes
Is taught to be nirvana.

I: The status of the birth-death cycle is due to existential grasping (of the *skandhas*) and relational condition (of the being). That which is non-grasping and non-relational is taught as *nirvana*.



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

K: Whatever is of the nature of coming and going that occurs contingently or dependently. Freedom is, therefore, indicated as being non-contingent and independent.

प्रहाणं चाब्रवीच्चास्ता भवस्य विभवस्य च।

तस्मान्न भावो नाभावो निर्वाणमिति युज्यते ॥ १०

prahāṇam cābravīccāstā bhavasya vibhavasya ca ।
tasmānna bhāvo nābhāvo nirvāṇamiti yujyate ।। 10

B: The teacher taught [it] to be the letting go of arising and perishing. Therefore, it is correct that nirvana is not a thing or nothing.

S: 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.

G: The teacher has spoken of relinquishing
Becoming and dissolution.
Therefore, it makes sense that
Nirvana is neither existent nor non-existent.

SG: The teacher has spoken of relinquishing
Becoming and passing away.
Therefore it makes sense that
Nirvana is neither a thing nor a non-thing.

I: The teacher (Buddha) has taught the abandonment of the concepts of being and non-being. Therefore, *nirvana* is properly neither (in the realm of) existence nor non-existence.

K: The teacher has spoken of relinquishing both becoming and other-becoming. Therefore, it is proper to assume that freedom is neither existence nor non-existence.

भवेदभावो भावश्च निर्वाणमुभयं यदि।

भवेदभावो भावश्च मोक्षस्तच्च न युज्यते ॥ ११



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

bhavedabhāvo bhāvaśca nirvāṇamubhayam yadi |
bhavedabhāvo bhāvaśca mokṣastacca na yujyate || 11

B: If nirvana were both a thing and nothing, it would follow that it would be a thing and nothing. That is incorrect.

S: If nirvana were both an existent and a non-existent thing,
Final release (moksa) would be [both] an existent and a non-existent thing; but that is not possible.

G: If nirvana were both
Existent and non-existent,
Passing beyond would, impossibly,
Be both existent and non-existent

SG: If nirvana were both
A thing and a non-thing,
Then things and non-things would both be nirvana.
But that makes no sense.

I: If *nirvana* is (in the realm of) both existence and non-existence, then *moksa* (liberation) will also be both. But that is not proper.

K: If freedom were to be both existence and non-existence, then release would also be both existence and non-existence. This too is non-proper.

भवेद्भावो भावश्च निर्वाणमुभयं यदि।

नानुपादाय निर्वाणमुपादायोभयं हि तत् ॥ १२

bhavedabhāvo bhāvaśca nirvāṇamubhayam yadi |
nānupādāya nirvāṇamupādāyobhayam hi tat || 12

B: If nirvana were both a thing and nothing, nirvana would not be not-dependent, because it would depend on those two.

S: If nirvana were both an existent and a non-existent thing,
There would be no nirvana without conditions, for these both [operate with] conditions.

G: If nirvana were both
Existent and non-existent,



Nirvana would not be nondependent
Since it would depend on both of these.

SG: If nirvana were both
A thing and non-thing
Nirvana would not be independent
Because those two are dependent.

I: If *nirvana* is (in the realm of) both existence and non-existence, it will not be non-appropriating. For, both realms are (always in the process of) appropriating.

K: If freedom were to be both existence and non-existence, freedom could not be independent, for existence and non-existence are, indeed, dependent upon one another.

भवेदभावो भावश्च निर्वाणमुभयं कथं।

असंस्कृतं च निर्वाणं भावाभावौ च संस्कृतौ ॥ १३

bhavedabhāvo bhāvaśca nirvāṇamubhayaṁ kathaṁ |
asaṁskṛtaṁ ca nirvāṇaṁ bhāvābhāvau ca saṁskṛtau | | 13

B: How could nirvana be both a thing and nothing? Nirvana is unconditioned; things and nothings are conditioned.

S: How can nirvana exist as both an existent thing and a non-existent thing, For nirvana is a non-composite-product (asamskrta), while both an existent thing and a non-existent thing are composite products (samskrta).

G: How could nirvana
Be both existent and nonexistent?
Nirvana is uncompounded.
Both existents and nonexistents are compounded.

SG: How could nirvana
Be both a thing and a non-thing?
Nirvana is uncompounded.
Both things and non-things are compounded.



I: How could *nirvana* be (in the realm of) both existence and non-existence? *Nirvana* is of the uncreated realm while existence and non-existence are of the created realm.

K: How could freedom be both existence and non-existence, for freedom is unconditioned while existence and non-existence are conditioned?

भवेद्भावो भावश्च निर्वाण उभयं कथं।

न तयोरेकत्रास्तित्वमालोकतमसोर्यथा ॥ १४

bhavedabhāvo bhāvaśca nirvāṇa ubhayaṁ katham |
na tayorekatrāstitvamālokatamasoryathā | | 14

B: How could nirvana exist as both a thing and nothing? Those two do not exist as one. They are like light and dark.

S: How can nirvana exist as both an existent and a non-existent thing? There is no existence of both at one and the same place, as in the case of both darkness and light.

G: How could nirvana
Be both existent and nonexistent?
These two cannot be in the same place.
Like light and darkness.

SG: How could nirvana
Be both a thing and a non-thing?
These two cannot be in the same place.
Like light and darkness.

I: How could *nirvana* be (in the realm of) both existene and non-existence? Both cannot be together in one place just as the situation is with light and darkness.

K: How could freedom be both existence and non-existence, for their simultaneous existence in one place is not possible, as in the case of light and darkness?



DIAMOND MOUNTAIN UNIVERSITY

नैवाभावो नैव भावो निर्वाणमिति या ऽञ्जना।

अभावे चैव भावे च सा सिद्धे सति सिध्यति ॥ १५

naivābhāvo naiva bhāvo nirvāṇamiti yā 'ñjanā |
abhāve caiva bhāve ca sā siddhe sati sidhyati | | 15

B: The presentation of neither a thing nor nothing as nirvana will be established [only] if things and nothings are established.

S: The assertion: "Nirvana is neither an existent thing nor a non-existent thing" is proved if [the assertion]: "It is an existent thing and a non-existent thing" were proved.

G: Nirvana is said to be
Neither existent or nonexistent.
If the existent and the nonexistent were established,
This would be established.

SG: Nirvana is said to be
Neither a thing nor a non-thing.
If things or non-things could exist,
It would exist.

I: The proposition that *nirvana* is neither existence nor non-existence could only be valid if and when the realms of existence and non-existence are established.

K: The proposition that freedom is neither existence nor non-existence could be established if and when both existence and non-existence are established.

नैवाभावो नैव भावो निर्वाणं यदि विद्यते।

नैवाभावो नैव भाव इति केन तदज्यते ॥ १६

naivābhāvo naiva bhāvo nirvāṇam yadi vidyate |
naivābhāvo naiva bhāva iti kena tadajyate | | 16



B: If nirvana is neither a thing nor nothing, by who could neither a thing nor nothing be perceived?

S: If nirvana is neither an existent thing nor a non-existent thing, Who can really arrive at [the assertion]: "neither an existent thing nor a non-existent thing"?

G: If nirvana is
Neither existent nor nonexistent,
Then by whom is it expounded
"Neither existent nor nonexistent"?

SG: If nirvana is
Neither a thing nor a non-thing
Then by whom is it expounded as
"Neither a thing nor a non-thing"?

I: If indeed *nirvana* is asserted to be neither existence nor non-existence, then by what means are the assertion to be known?

K: If freedom as neither existence nor non-existence is evident, by means of what is it made known as neither existence nor non-existence?

परं निरोधाभगवान् भवतीत्येव नोह्यते।

न भवत्युभयं चेति नोभयं चेति नोह्यते ॥ १७

param nirodhābhagavān bhavatītyeva nohyate |
na bhavatyubhayaṁ ceti nobhayaṁ ceti nohyate | | 17

B: After the Bhagavan has entered nirvana, one cannot perceive [him? it?] as 'existing,' likewise as not existing, nor can one perceive [him? it?] as both or 'neither'.

S: It is not expressed if the Glorious One [the Buddha] exists (1) after his death, Or does not exist (2), or both (3) or neither (4).

G: Having passed into nirvana the Victorious Conqueror
Is neither said to be existent
Nor said to be nonexistent.
Neither both nor neither are said.



SG: Having passed into nirvana, the Transcendent Lord
Is neither perceived to be existent
Nor perceived to be nonexistent.
He is neither perceived to be both nor to be neither.

I: It cannot be said that the Blessed One exists after *nirodha* (i.e., release from worldly desires). Nor can it be said that He does not exist after *nirodha*, or both, or neither.

K: It is not assumed that the Blessed One exists after death. Neither is it assumed that he does not exist, or both, or neither.

तिष्ठमानो ऽपि भगवान् भवतीत्येव नोह्यते ।

न भवत्युभयं चेति नोभयं चेति नोह्यते ॥ १८

tiṣṭhamāno 'pi bhagavān bhavatītyeva nohyate |
na bhavatyubhayaṁ ceti nobhayaṁ ceti nohyate || 18

B: Even when the Bhagavan is alive, one cannot perceive [him? it?] as `existing,` likewise as `not existing,` nor can one perceive [him? it?] as `both` or `neither`.

S: Also, it is not expressed if the Glorious One exists (1) while remaining [in the world],
Or does not exist (2), or both (3) or neither (4).

G: So, when the Victorious One abides, he
Is neither said to be existent
Nor said to be nonexistent.
Neither both nor neither are said.

SG: So, when the Transcendent Lord was alive, he
Was neither perceived to be existent
Nor perceived to be nonexistent.
He was neither perceived to be both nor to be neither.

I: It cannot be said that the Blessed One even exists in the present living process. Nor can it be said that He does not exist in the present living process, or both, or neither.



K: It is not assumed that even a living Blessed One exists. Neither is it assumed that he does not exist, or both or neither.

न संसारस्य निर्वाणात्किं चिदस्ति विशेषणं।

न निर्वाणस्य संसारात्किं चिदस्ति विशेषणं ॥ १९

na saṃsārasya nirvāṇātkiṃ cidasti viśeṣaṇaṃ |
na nirvāṇasya saṃsārātkiṃ cidasti viśeṣaṇaṃ || 19

B: Samsara does not have the slightest distinction from Nirvana. Nirvana does not have the slightest distinction from Samsara.

S: 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.

G: There is not the slightest difference
Between cyclic existence and nirvana.
There is not the slightest difference
Between nirvana and cyclic existence.

SG: Cyclic existence is not the slightest bit
Different from nirvana
Nirvana is not the slightest bit
Different from cyclic existence.

I: *Samsara* (i.e., the empirical life-death cycle) is nothing essentially different from *nirvana*. *Nirvana* is nothing essentially different from *samsara*.

K: The life-process has no thing that distinguishes it from freedom. Freedom has no thing that distinguishes it from the life-process.

निर्वाणस्य च या कोटिः कोटिः संसरणस्य च।

न तयोरन्तरं किं चित्सुसूक्ष्ममपि विद्यते ॥ २०

nirvāṇasya ca yā koṭiḥ koṭiḥ saṃsaraṇasya ca |
na tayorantaraṃ kiṃ citsusūkṣmamapi vidyate || 20



B: Whatever is the end of Nirvana, that is the end of Samsara. There is not even a very subtle slight distinction between the two.

S: The extreme limit (koti) of nirvana is also the extreme limit of existence-in-flux; There is not the slightest bit of difference between these two.

G: Whatever is the limit of nirvana,
That is the limit of cyclic existence.
There is not even the slightest difference between them,
Or even the subtlest thing.

SG: Whatever is the limit of nirvana,
That is the limit of cyclic existence.
There is not even the slightest difference between them,
Or even the subtlest thing.

I: The limits (i.e., realm) of *nirvana* are the limits of *samsara*. Between the two, also, there is not the slightest difference whatsoever.

K: Whatever is the extremity of freedom and the extremity of the life-process, between them not even a subtle something is evident.

परं निरोधादन्ताद्याः शाश्वताद्याश्च दृष्टयः ।

निर्वाणमपरान्तं च पूर्वान्तं च समाश्रिताः ॥ २१

paraṃ nirodhādantādyāḥ śāśvatādyāśca dr̥ṣṭayaḥ ।
nirvāṇamaparāntaṃ ca pūrvāntaṃ ca samāśritāḥ ॥ 21

B: Views about who passes beyond, ends etc. and permanence etc. are contingent upon nirvana and later ends and former ends.

S: The views [regarding] whether that which is beyond death is limited by a beginning or an end or some other alternative
Depend on a nirvana limited by a beginning (purvanta) and an end (aparanta),

G: Views that after cessation there is a limit, etc.,
And that it is permanent, etc.,



Depend upon nirvana, the final limit
And the prior limit.

SG: Views regarding his status after his passing; extremes, etc.,
And views regarding the permanent, etc.,
Are grounded upon nirvana, the final limit,
And the prior limit.

I: The various views concerning the status of life after *nirodha*, the limits of the world, the concept of permanence, etc., are all based on (the concepts of) *nirvana*, posterior and anterior states (of existence).

K: Metaphysical views relating to the finite, etc., to the eternal, etc., after death are associated with [the problems of] freedom as well as the posterior and prior extremities.

शून्येषु सर्वधर्मेषु किमनन्तं किमन्तवत्।

किमनन्तमन्तवच्च नानन्तं नान्तवच्च किम् ॥ २२

śūnyeṣu sarvadharmeṣu kīmanantaṁ kīmantavat |
kīmanantamantavacca nānantaṁ nāntavacca kim || 22

B: In the emptiness of all things what ends are there? What non-ends are there?
What ends and non-ends are there? What of neither are there?

S: Since all dharmas are empty, what is finite? What is infinite?
What is both finite and infinite? What is neither finite nor infinite?

G: Since all existents are empty,
What is finite or infinite?
What is finite and infinite?
What is neither finite or infinite?

SG: Since all existents are empty,
What is finite or infinite?
What is finite and infinite?
What is neither finite or infinite?

I: Since all factors of existence are in the nature of *sunya*, why (assert) the finite,
the infinite, both finite and infinite, and neither finite nor infinite?



K: (no translation)

किं तदेव किमन्यत्किं शाश्वतं किमशाश्वतं।

अशाश्वतं शाश्वतं च किं वा नोभयमप्यतः ॥ २३

kiṁ tadeva kimanyatkiṁ śāśvataṁ kimaśāśvataṁ ।
aśāśvataṁ śāśvataṁ ca kiṁ vā nobhayamapyataḥ ॥ 23

B: Is there this? Is there the other? Is there permanence? Is there impermanence? Is there both permanence and impermanence? Is there neither?

S: Is there anything which is this or something else, which is permanent or impermanent,
Which is both permanent and impermanent, or which is neither?

G: What is identical and what is different?
What is permanent and what is impermanent?
What is both permanent and impermanent?
What is neither?

SG: What is identical and what is different?
What is permanent and what is impermanent?
What is both permanent and impermanent?
What is neither?

I: Why (assert) the identity, difference, permanence, impermanence, both

सर्वोपलम्भोपशमः प्रपञ्चोपशमः शिवः ।

न क्व चित्कस्य चित्कश्चिद्धर्मो बुद्धेन देशितः ॥ २४

sarvopalambhopaśamaḥ prapañcopaśamaḥ śivaḥ ।
na kva citkasya citkaściddharmo buddhena deśitaḥ ॥ 24

K: When all things are empty, why [speculate on] the finite, the infinite, both the finite and the infinite and neither finite nor the infinite? Why [speculate on] the identical, the different, the eternal, the non-eternal, both or neither?



B: Totally pacifying all referents and totally pacifying fixations is peace. The Buddha nowhere taught any dharma to anyone.

S: 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.

G: The pacification of all objectification
And the pacification of all illusion:
No Dharma was taught by the Buddha
At any time, in any place, to any person

SG: The pacification of all objectification
And the pacification of all fabrication is peace.
No Dharma was taught by the Buddha
At any time, in any place, to any person

I: All acquisitions (i.e., grasping) as well as play of concepts (i.e., symbolic representation) are basically in the nature of cessation and quiescence. Any factor of experience with regards to anyone at any place was never taught by the Buddha.

K: The Buddha did not teach the appeasement of all objects, the appeasement of obsession, and the auspicious as some thing to some one at some place.