

## अग्नीन्धनपरीक्षा नाम दशमं प्रकरणं

- B: Investigation of Fire and Firewood (Fire)  
S: An Analysis of Fire and Kindling (fire and fuel)  
G: Examination of Fire and Fuel  
I: Examination of Wood and Fire  
K: Examination of Fire and Fuel

यदिन्धनं स चेदग्निरेकत्वं कर्तृकर्मणोः ।

अन्यश्चेदिन्धनादग्निरिन्धनादप्यृते भवेत् ॥ १

- B: If firewood were fire, actor and act would be one. If fire were other than wood, it would occur even without wood.  
S: If fire is identical to its kindling, then it is both producer and product. And if fire is different from kindling, then surely [fire] exists without kindling (i.e. separate).  
SB: Were the fire its flames, Act and actor would be one. Were flames something else, They could not have lit this fire.  
G: If fuel were fire then agent and action would be one. If fire were different from fuel, then it could arise without fuel.  
I: If wood is the same as fire, then likewise the doer and his deed will be identical. If fire is distinct from wood, then it will exist without wood.  
K: If fire were to be fuel, then there would be identity of agent and action. If fire were to be different from fuel, then it would exist even without the fuel.

.नित्यप्रदीप्त एव स्यादप्रदीपनहेतुकः ।

पुनरारम्भवैयर्थ्यमेवं चाकर्मकः सति ॥ २

- B: [Fire] would burn permanently and would not arise from causes for burning. Starting [a fire] would be meaningless. If it were like that, there would also be no act.  
S: A [fire] which is perpetually burning would exist without a cause, which is kindling, Since another beginning would be pointless; in this case [fire] is without its object [i.e., burning of kindling].  
SB: Independent and alone, Eternal flames would burn forever – Actors with no acts.  
G: It would be forever aflame; flames could be ignited without a cause. Its beginning would be meaningless. In that case, it would be without any action.  
I: If there is no cause for burning, then the fire should burn constantly. And there will be no purpose in fire to start (i.e., to burn) again and it will then be without a function.  
K: A burning without a cause would be eternally aflame. Furthermore, its commencement will be rendered meaningless (useless). When that happens, it will be without a function.

परत्र निरपेक्षत्वादप्रदीपनहेतुकः ।

## पुनरारम्भवैयर्थ्यं नित्यदीप्तः प्रसज्यते ॥ ३

B: Because [fire] does not depend on anything else, it would not arise from causes for burning. If it burned permanently, starting it would be meaningless.

S: [Fire] is without a cause, namely kindling, if it were independent of anything else; in which case another beginning would be pointless, and there is perpetual burning.

SB: Were the fire a fire, Only when it burns – How could you light this fire?

G: Since it would not depend on another ignition would be without a cause. If it were eternally in flames, starting it would be meaningless.

I: Being unrelated to an other, it (i.e., fire) will be something without a cause for burning. Moreover, it will follow that constantly burning fire would have no purpose of starting (i.e, burning) again.

K: A burning without a cause, because it is not contingent on another and, therefore, eternally aflame, would imply the meaninglessness of its commencement..

## तत्रैतस्मादिध्यमानमिन्धनं भवतीति चेत्।

## केनेध्य तामिन्धनं तत्तावन्मात्रमिदं यदा ॥ ४

B: Concerning this, if one thinks that while burning it is firewood, if it is such only at that time, by what could that firewood be ignited?

S: If it is maintained: Kindling is that which is being kindled, by what is kindling kindled, since kindling is only that [kindling]?

G: So, if one thinks that that which is burning is the fuel, if it is just this, how is this fuel being burned?

I: Thus, if it is granted that there is wood in the burning (process) and that only wood is burning, then by what means will it burn?

K: Herein, if it is assumed that fuel is the present burning and, therefore, that (i.e. burning) is merely this (i.e. fuel), by what is fuel being burnt?

## अन्यो न प्राप्स्यते ऽप्राप्तो न धक्ष्यत्यदहन् पुनः।

## न निर्वास्यत्यनिर्वाणः स्थास्यते वा स्वलिङ्गवान् ॥ ५

B: Because [fire] is other, it would not connect; if it did not connect, it would not ignite; if it did not ignite, it would not die; if it did not die, it would also remain in possession of its own characteristic.

S: [Fire], when different and not obtained [through kindling], will not obtain; not burning, it will not burn later; without extinction, it will not be extinguished; if there is no extinction, then it will remain with its own characteristics.

SB: Were your flames something else, They would never touch my fire, Never light it and never die. They would burn and burn and burn.

G: If they are different, and if one not yet connected isn't connected, the not yet burned will not be burned. They will not cease. If they do not cease then it will persist with its own characteristic.

I: A different thing (i.e., fire distinguished from wood) is never effected and a non-effected thing will never burn. And, in turn, a non-burning thing will never extinguish itself while a non-extinguishing thing, having its own characteristics, will continue to endure itself.

K: (Fuel) that is different is not reached; the unreached is not ignited. Furthermore, that which is not ignited does not cease. That which does not cease remains, like one has its own mark.

अन्य एवेन्धनादग्निरिन्धनं प्राप्नुयाद्यदि।

स्त्री संप्राप्नोति पुरुषं पुरुषश्च स्त्रियं यथा ॥ ६

B: Just as a woman connects with a man and a man too with a woman, although fire is other than wood, it is fit to connect with wood.

S: [The opponent claims:] If fire is different from kindling it could obtain the kindling as a woman obtains a husband, and a man [obtains] a wife.

SB: Though they are different, Flames touch fires As a woman touches a man And a man a woman. G: Just as a man and a woman connect to one another as man and woman, so if fire were different from fuel, fire and fuel would have to be fit for connection.

I: If fire which is distinct from wood should unite with wood, it would be like a woman united with a man and, vice versa, a man uniting with a woman.

K: If fire is different from fuel it would reach the fuel, just as a woman would reach for a man and a man for a woman.

अन्य एवेन्धनादग्निरिन्धनं काममाप्नुयात्।

आग्नीन्धने यदि स्यातामन्योन्येन तिरस्कृते ॥ ७

B: If fire and wood eliminated each other, even though fire is something other than wood, it would have to connect with wood.

S: [Nagarjuna answers:] Though fire is different from kindling, it could indeed obtain the kindling, on the condition that both fire and kindling can be reciprocally differentiated [—but, this is impossible].

SB: Flame and fire merge. They unite despite being different.

G: And, if fire and fuel preclude each other, then fire being different from fuel, it must still be asserted that they connect.

I: Fire which is distinct from wood will unite with the latter freely as you contend, if and only if, the two have mutually distinct existences.

K: The fire that is different from fuel may reach the fuel only if fire and fuel were to exist mutually separated.

यदीन्धनमपेक्ष्याग्निरपेक्ष्याग्निं यदीन्धनं।

कतरत्पूर्वनिष्पन्नं यदपेक्ष्याग्निरिन्धनं ॥ ८

B: If fire were dependent on wood and wood were dependent on fire, of what becomes fire and wood dependently, which would be established first?

S: If the fire is dependent on the kindling, and if the kindling is dependent on the fire which is attained first, dependent on which they are fire and kindling?

SB: If flames depend on fires And fires upon flames, What comes first?

G: If fire depends on fuel, and fuel depends on fire, on what are fire and fuel established as dependent? Which one is established first?

I: If fire is dependent on wood and wood on fire, then each one must have had a prior completed state and to which the other depends.

K: If fire is contingent upon fuel and fuel upon fire, which of them is pre-accomplished so that fire could be contingent upon fuel?

**यदीन्धनमपेक्ष्याग्निरग्नेः सिद्धस्य साधनं।**

**एवं सतीन्धनं चापि भविष्यति निरग्निकं ॥ ९**

B: If fire were dependent on wood, [already] established fire would be established [again]. Firewood also would be [such] even without fire.

S: If fire is dependent on kindling, so is the proof of the proved fire. Thus, being kindling it will exist without fire.

SB: Were the fire already there, The flame that lit it would flare again Or that fire would flicker flamelessly.

G: If fire depends on fuel, it would be the establishment of an established fire. And the fuel could be fuel without any fire.

I: If fire is dependent on wood then an already existing fire will again be effectuating itself. If that is so then wood also will exist without fire.

K: If fire were to be contingent upon fuel, there would be proof of fire that is already proved (to exist). When that is the case, even fuel would exist without fire.

**यो ऽपेक्ष्य सिध्यते भावस्तमेवापेक्ष्य सिध्यति।**

**यदि यो ऽपेक्षितव्यः स सिध्यतां कमपेक्ष्य कः ॥ १०**

B: If a thing (A) is established dependently (on B), [but] if what it depends upon (B) is established also in dependence on that very thing (A), what would be established in dependence on what?

S: When a thing (bhava) is proved by being dependent on something else, then it proves the other by being dependent [on it]. If that which is required for dependence must be proved, then what is dependent on what?

SB: If what flames depend on Depend on flames, What depends on what?

I: If an entity depends on another entity in order to manifest itself, the latter will also depend on the former for its manifestation. If what is to be dependent on for manifestation already exists, then (the question is) what depends on what?

G: If that on which an entity depends is established on the basis of the entity depending on it, what is established in dependence on what?

यो ऽपेक्ष्य सिध्यते भावः सो ऽसिद्धोऽपेक्षते कथं।

अथाप्यपेक्षते सिद्धस्त्वपेक्षास्य न युज्यते ॥ ११

B: How can a thing (A) which is established dependently (on B) be dependent (on B) when it (A) is not established? If one asks, “how can establishment be dependent?” It is not reasonable for it (A) to be dependent.

S: If that thing is proved by being dependent, how can that which has not been proved be dependent? So, that which is proved is dependent; but the dependence is not possible.

SB: How can flames-to-be Depend on anything? What would do the depending?

G: What entity is established through dependence? If it is not established, then how could it depend? However, if it is established merely through dependence, that dependence makes no sense.

I: An entity depends on an other for realization (i.e., manifestation) but, in an unrealized (i.e., unmanifested) state, what is the manner of dependence? And again, even though (the entity) is already in a dependently manifested state, the nature of dependence is not possible.

K: Whatever existent that is established through contingency, how can that, if it is not yet established, be contingent? Even so (how can) that which is already established be contingent? For, its contingency is not proper.

अपेक्ष्येन्धनमग्निर्नानापेक्ष्याग्निरिन्धनं।

अपेक्ष्येन्धनमग्निं न नानापेक्ष्याग्निमिन्धनं ॥ १२

B: There is no fire that is dependent on wood; there is also no fire that is not dependent on wood. There is no wood that is dependent on fire; there is also no wood that is not dependent on fire.

S: Fire does not exist in relation to kindling; and fire does not exist unrelated to kindling. Kindling does not exist in relation to fire; and kindling does not exist unrelated to fire.

SB: Flames do not depend on fires Nor are they independent of them. Fires do not depend on flames Nor are they independent of them.

G: Fire is not dependent on fuel. Fire is not independent of fuel. Fuel is not dependent on fire. Fuel is not independent of fire.

I: Fire does not exist by dependence on wood nor does it exist by non-dependence on wood. Likewise, wood does not exist by dependence or non-dependence on fire.

K: Fire is not contingent upon fuel; fire is not non-contingent upon fuel. Fuel is not contingent upon fire; fuel is not non-contingent upon fire.

आगच्चत्यन्यतो नाग्निरिन्धने ऽग्निर्न विद्यते।

अत्रेन्धने शेषमुक्तम् गम्यमानगतागतैः ॥ १३

B: Fire does not come from something else; fire also does not exist in wood. Likewise, the remainder of wood has been shown by gone, not-gone and going.

S: Fire does not come from something else; and fire does not exist in kindling.  
SB: Flames and fires explain everything: The self and what it grasps  
G: Fire does not come from something else, nor is fire in fuel itself. Moreover, fire and the rest are just like the moved, the not-moved, and the goer.  
I: Fire does not come from something else nor does it exist in the wood. With respect to wood the remaining issues have been taken up in the discussion of present passing away, that which has transpired, and that which has not transpired.  
K: Fire does not come out of something different nor is fire seen to be in the fuel. Herein, with regard to fuel, the rest is stated as in the case of present moving, the moved and the not moved.

इन्धनं पुनरग्निर्न नाग्निरन्यत्र चेन्धनात्।

नाग्निरिन्धनवान्नाग्नाविन्धनानि न तेषु सः ॥ १४

B: Wood itself is not fire; fire is also not something other than wood. Fire does not possess wood; wood does not exist in fire; that (fire) does not exist in it.  
S: Fire is not identical to kindling, but fire is not in anything other than kindling. Fire does not have kindling as its property; also, the kindling is not in fire and vice versa.  
G: Fuel is not fire. Fire does not arise from anything different from fuel. Fire does not possess fuel. Fuel is not in fire, nor vice versa.  
I: Again, fire is not wood nor is it in something else than wood. Fire does not contain wood. There is neither wood in fire nor fire in wood.  
K: Furthermore, fuel is not fire. Apart from fuel, there is no fire. Fire is not possessed of fuel. Fuel is not in the fire, nor is it (i.e. fire) in them.

अग्नीन्धनाभ्यां व्याख्यात आत्मोपादानयोः क्रमः।

सर्वो निरवशेषेण सार्धं घटपटादिभिः ॥ १५

B: Through fire and wood is explained without exception all the stages of self and the grasped and at the same time jugs, cloth and so on.  
S: By [the analysis of] fire and kindling the syllogism of the individual self (atma) and "the acquiring" (upadana) is fully and completely explained, as well as "the jar" and "the cloth" and other [analogies].  
SB: And also jugs and rolls of cloth.  
G: Through discussion of fire and fuel, the self and the aggregates, the pot and cloth all together, without remainder have been explained.  
I: By means of the analysis of fire and wood, the total relationship between atman and upadana, and along with (notions of) earthen jar, cloth, etc., have all been explained without fail.  
K: Through the examples of fire and fuel, together with the examples of pot, cloth, etc., every method of analysis of the self and grasping have been explained without exception.

आत्मनश्च सतत्त्वं ये भावानां च पृथक् पृथक्।

निर्दिशन्ति न तान्मन्ये शासनस्यार्थकोविदान्॥ १६

B: I do not think those who teach the identity or difference of self and things are wise in the meaning of the teaching.

S: Those who specify the nature of the individual self and of existing things (bhava) as radically different — those people I do not regard as ones who know the sense of the teaching.

SB: Identity and difference? Of self? Of things?

G: I do not think those who teach that the self is the same as or different from the entities understand the meaning of the doctrine.

I: Insofar as I am concerned, those who assign them distinct existences cannot be considered truly knowledgeable of the (Buddha's) teachings.

K: Those who posit the substantiality of the self as well as of discrete existents – these I do not consider to be experts in the meaning of the (Buddha's) message.