

**A GUIDE TO THE BODHISATTVA'S WAY OF LIFE
BY SHANTIDEVA, AN 8TH CENTURY INDIAN MASTER**

CHAPTER NINE - WISDOM

THE NEED TO GENERATE THE WISDOM REALISING ULTIMATE REALITY

- (1)
The Sage propounded all these branches [of teachings]
For the sake of wisdom.
Therefore, those who wish to pacify suffering
Should generate wisdom.

ASCERTAINING THE TWO TRUTHS

- (2)
Conventional and Ultimate,
These are accepted as being the two truths.
The Ultimate is not the object of mind;
The mind is spoken of as conventional.
- (3)
The world is seen to be of two types:
Yogis and common people.
The world of common people
Is undermined by the world of the yogis.
- (4)
Through differences in their intelligence,
Yogis too are undermined by the higher ones.
[A thesis is proved] by examples accepted by both.
Unanalysed [practitioners train] for the result.

REFUTING OBJECTIONS FROM THE PROPONENTS

OF INHERENT EXISTENCE

- (5)
The world sees things
And conceives them to be truly existent;
Not like an illusion. In this regard
There is dispute between the yogis and the world.

REFUTING THE REALISTS IN GENERAL

(A) BY REFUTING CONTRADICTION

WITH DIRECT PERCEPTION

- (6)
Even direct perceptions of form and so forth
Only view conventionalities and are not valid cognitions.
[Form and so on] are false, like worldly acceptance of that
What is unclean and so forth as clean and the like.

(B) BY REFUTING CONTRADICTION WITH BUDDHA'S WORDS

(7)

For the sake of letting the world enter [into reality],
The Guardian taught about things.
In the ultimate sense, however, they are not “momentary.”
“But that is also contradictory conventionally.”

(8)

The convention of Yogis [has] no fault.
Otherwise, [their] discernment
Of the uncleanliness of the other
Would be undermined by the world.

(9)

From the illusion-like Victorious Ones,
positive forces [arise],
Just as [for those believing in] true things.
“But, if a sentient being were like an illusion,
Then how could he take rebirth, once having died?”

(10)

So long as conditions are gathered together,
The illusion lasts that long.
And how could a sentient being be truly existent
Merely because his continuum lasts long?

(11)

In murdering and so forth of an illusory person,
There is no negativity, since it has no mind.
But with someone having an illusory mind,
Positive and negative forces accrue.

(12)

Because mantras and so forth lack the ability,
Cannot produce a mind in an illusion.
Even illusory ones that arise from varying conditions
are of varying kinds,
[Since] nowhere is there one condition with the ability
to [produce] all.

(13)

“If ultimately someone is released in nirvana
And conventionally is circling in samsara;
Then Buddha as well would be circling in samsara,
What use would there be for bodhisattva conduct?”

(14)
Even an illusion cannot be turned back
Unless the continuity of its conditions has ceased.
Yet, when the continuity of those conditions ceases,
It does not arise even conventionally.

REFUTING THE CHITTAMATRINS

[PROPONENTS OF THE MIND ONLY SCHOOL]

(15)
“When even the deceptive awareness doesn’t exist,
By what is the illusion perceived?”
For you, if the illusion itself does not exist,
Then what is being perceived?

(16)
“In actuality, it exists as something else:
The aspect of which is the very mind itself.”
When mind itself is like an illusion,
Then what is being seen by what?

(17)
The Guardian of the World in fact said,
“Mind cannot see mind.”
Just as the edge of a sword cannot cut itself,
So [it is with] the mind.

(18)
“But it is just like the way a lamp flame
Perfectly illuminates its own characteristics.”
The flame of a lamp is not being illuminated,
Since darkness does not obscure [darkness].

(19)
“For an intrinsic blue to be blue
It does not depend on something else, as does a crystal.
[We] see some that depend on others
And some that do not.”

(20)
There is no self-created blue,
Which is dependence-void blue.

(21)
If [you] say that “the mind cognizes
The illumination of the lamp flame,”
Based upon whose cognition can the statement be made,
“A mind has an illuminating nature?”

(22)
Since [mind] is never been seen by anyone,

Even if discussed as to whether it is [self]-luminous
Or not, is meaningless;
Like the attractive gestures of a barren woman's daughter.

Rejecting Self-Cognizant Mind

(23)

“But if a self-cognizing mind does not exist,
How can a consciousness be recalled?”
Through a connection with experiencing another,
Recollection happens, like a rat's poison.

(24)

“But it can illuminate itself,
Because, when with other conditions, [one] sees.”
By means of applying magic eye lotion,
A vase is seen while the eye lotion is not.

(25)

Those which are seen, heard, or known
Are not to be negated.
Here, the conception of true existence, which is
the cause of suffering,
Is to be rejected.

(26)

“The illusion is not separate from the mind;
Despite being inseparable, it is still impermanent.”
If it were a thing, how could it not be different?
And if it is not different, it could not be a thing.

(27)

Although the illusion is not truly existent,
it is still an object of view,
So it is for the viewer.
“But samsara must have a thing as its support;
Otherwise, it would be like space.”

(28)

How could a non-thing, supported by
a truly existent thing,
Come to have a function?
The mind you [asserted] would be
Something existing alone, accompanied by nothing.

(29)

And if the mind is free of apprehension,
Then everyone would be a Tathagata.
And if that were the case, what benefit would there be
In analyzing mind-only?

REFUTING THE ASSERTION THAT THE PATH WHICH
UNDERSTANDS EMPTINESS IS OF NO BENEFIT

(30)

“Even upon knowing the illusion-like,
How do afflictions gotten rid of?
Since lust for an illusory woman
Can arise even in the one who conjured her up?”

(31)

Heretofore the conjurer has not rid himself
Of dispositions of afflictions towards phenomena.
And so when he sees her, [lust arises];
His inclination towards emptiness is still weak.

(32)

By habituating with the imprint of emptiness,
The tendencies for things will be removed.
By habituating with “emptiness” of all,
Later, he will be rid of that as well.

(33)

Through not finding the object of investigation,
The non-existence of that thing is claimed.
Thus how can the emptiness
Whose basis is empty, stand in front of the mind?

(34)

When neither the things,
Nor the emptiness of the things stand before the mind,
Having no other aspect,
There is full pacification in devoid of objects.

(35)

Just as a wish-fulfilling gem
And a wish-granting tree fulfill all wishes,
Likewise, through the power of prayers,
The enlightened body of a Victor appears to the disciples.

(36)

For example, [when a *garudika* healer],
Who empowered a healing cairn, has passed away,
[That cairn] can pacify poison and the like
Long after [the healer’s] death.

(37)

Similarly, when a bodhisattva has passed into nirvana,
After setting up the reliquary of a Victor
By conforming to the bodhisattva’s conduct,
He still performs all deeds.

(38)
“How can offerings made to something lacking a mind
Give rise to results?”
Whether alive or has passed into nirvana,
[It] has been proclaimed the same.

(39)
According to scripture, results [accrue] -
Whether truly or conventionally.
Similar to the way
A truly existent Buddha gives results.

**ESTABLISHING THAT THE WISDOM OF EMPTINESS IS ULTIMATELY
THE TRUE PATH EVEN TO WHO SEEK MERE LIBERATION**

(40)
Liberation occurs through seeing the Truth,
What is the use of seeing Emptiness?”
Why? Because in scriptures it is proclaimed
That without this path, there is no Enlightenment.

(41)
“But, Mahayana is not established!”
[Well] how can [your] scriptures be established?
“Because they are established for both parties.”
They were not established as valid at the outset.

(42)
Any criterion that would give confidence in them
Would [apply] equally to the Mahayana.
If acceptance by two different parties make something true,
Then the Vedas and so forth also would become true.

(43)
“But it is because the Mahayana is disputed.”
Since the scripture is disputed by non-Buddhists,
And some other [sections of the] scripture are disputed
by yourselves and others,
They would have to be discarded [too].

(44)
While the Bhikshus are the foundation of the teachings,
It is hard [to posit the] Bhikshus.
For those minds with objects,
It is hard to transcend sorrow.

(45)
“But they are liberated, as they eliminate afflictions.”
That [liberation] must occur immediately.
Despite [their] lacking afflictions,
They have the karmic potential.

- (46)
“But it is definite that they do not have
Craving for obtaining [rebirth].”
Even if this craving is not afflictive,
Why is it not like ignorance?
- (47)
Through the force of feeling, there is craving,
And feelings exist in them as well.
A mind having object
Is what some have.
- (48)
For a mind that is parted from emptiness
What is subsided will arise again,
Like the meditative equipoise of non-discrimination.
Therefore, meditate on emptiness.
- (49)
If you accept as spoken by the Buddha
Any speech that conforms to the sutras,
Then are the Mahayana not [sutras] which, for the most part,
Are equivalent to sutras?
- (50)
If because of one exception,
All would become corrupt;
Then why, because of one equivalence to the sutras,
Would not all have been spoken by the Buddha?
- (51)
And who would consider unacceptable
Some speech, the depth of which
Maha-Kasyapa and the like could not fathom,
Because you cannot understand it?
- (52)
The fruit of emptiness is this:
While being freed from the extremes of attachment and fear,
One is able to remain in samsara
For the sake of those who suffer due to ignorance.
- (53)
As this is the case,
Disputation against emptiness is improper.
Therefore, without indecision,
Please meditate on emptiness.

(54)
Emptiness is the remedy to the darkness
Of afflictive and cognitive obscurations;
How can one wishing to quickly achieve omniscience
Not meditate on it?

(55)
While fear should be with
What gives rise to suffering.
Emptiness pacifies suffering,
Why be fearful about that?

REASONS THAT ESTABLISH THE VIEW OF EMPTINESS

(A) ESTABLISHING THE “SELFLESSNESS OF PERSONS”

(56)
If there were something called a “self”,
There would be something to be afraid.
But as one finds “self” nowhere,
Who is there to experience fear?

(57)
Teeth, hair, and nails are not a “self”.
Nor is “self” the bones or blood.
[“Self” is] neither mucous nor phlegm.
Nor is “self” lymph or pus.

(58)
“Self” is not fat nor sweat.
Neither is “self” the lungs nor liver.
“Self” is not any of the other visceral organs.
Neither is “self” faeces nor urine.

(59)
Flesh and skin are not a “self”;
Nor is “self” heat or wind.
In no way is “self” one of the bodily orifices,
Nor are the six types of consciousness a “self.”

(1) REFUTATION OF THE “SELF” AS POSTULATED BY THE NON-BUDDHISTS TENET HOLDERS

A) REFUTATION OF SAMKYA SCHOOL’S POSITION THAT CONSCIOUSNESS IS “SELF”

(60)
If the mind [perceiving] sound were permanent
The sound would be cognized at all times.
But what is cognized when bereft of an object?
For what reasons could it be called a cognizer?

- (61)
 If [something] could be a cognizer without an object,
 Then absurdly a stick would also be a cognizer.
 Therefore, without being associated with an object,
 It is certain that cognition is non-existent.
- (62)
 “It cognizes a ‘sight’.”
 Why does it also not hear at that time?
 “Because the sound is not nearby,”
 Then it is no longer a cognizer of it.
- (63)
 How can something having the nature of a sound cognizer
 Become the cognizer of sight?
 By imputation a single person is a ‘father’ and a ‘son’
 And not [due to] his ‘true *nature*.’
- (64)
 Likewise courage, particles and darkness
 Are neither a ‘son’ nor a ‘father’.
 And a [cognizer of a sight] has never been seen
 That has a nature associated with a sound cognizer.
- (65)
 “Like a dancer, it is still itself, but is seen in another guise.”
 [Well then] it would be impermanent.
 And suppose, “The other guise is the very same”.
 Its oneness is a oneness that did not exist before.
- (66)
 “But its other modes [of perception] are not true.”
 Then please describe its own nature.
 “It is a cognizer.”
 Absurdly it would follow that all people are one.
- (67)
 What has mind and what lacks mind –
 those two would, in fact, become the same thing
 As their existence is the same.
 And if the individual identities were false,
 Then what could be their shared basis?

B) REFUTATION OF NAIYAYIKA SCHOOL’S POSITION OF “SELF”

- (68)
 Furthermore, something lacking mind cannot be a self
 As it has no mind, like a vase and so forth.
 “It is cognizant because of its conjunction with a mind.”
 It absurdly follows that [this] non-cognizant has perished.

(69)

And if the self were unchanging,
What could a mind do to it?
If [the self] were devoid of mind and activities,
Space could also become a self.

**(2) REJECTION OF ARGUMENTS CONCERNING
“SELFLESSNESS OF PERSON”**

(70)

“But, if a self does not exist,
The connection between actions and their effects
could not be maintained.
Since, actions cease after having been done,
To whom should the action be ascribed?”

(71)

Since it is established for both of us
That action and result have a different basis,
And that the self of action is not there
Is it not pointless to dispute on this?

(72)

Seeing a causal state with a result
Is never feasible.
Through the shared continuum,
The agent and the experiencer are explained.

(73)

The past and the future minds
Are not the self, since they do not exist.
And, if the mind arising were the self,
When it perishes, there would, in fact, be no self!

(74)

For example, when the trunk of a plantain tree
Is split apart, nothing [is found].
Likewise, when sought through investigation,
A self also cannot be true.

(75)

“If sentient beings do not exist,
Towards whom does one generate compassion?”
It is the [one] imputed by ignorance,
Which is accepted for the goal.

(76)

“Whose fruit is it, if there are no sentient beings?”
Fair enough. But this is posited through ignorance.
In order to completely pacify suffering,
For the result, eliminate not ignorance [associated].

(77)
Because the arrogance, which is a source of suffering,
Misconceives the self, [suffering] increases.
“But, that cannot be undermined.”
To meditate on selflessness is the supreme.

(B) SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA
(1) IN RELATION TO CLOSE PLACEMENT OF
MINDFULNESS ON THE BODY

(78)
A body is neither the feet nor the calves.
Nor is a body, the thighs or the hips.
Neither the belly nor the back is the body.
Nor is a body the chest or the arms.

(79)
The sides of the torso and the hands are not a body.
Nor is a body the armpits or the shoulders.
The visceral organs also are not it.
Neither is a body the head nor the throat.
So what then is a body?

(80)
If this body were located
With a portion in all of these [parts];
Then, although the parts are located in its own parts,
Where are [the sub-parts] in turn located?

(81)
And if a body itself, in its entirety,
Were located, in the hands and so forth,
There would be as many bodies
As there were hands and so on.

(82)
As the body does not exist outside or inside,
How could the hands and so forth possess a body?
It does not exist separately from the hands and so on,
How could it possibly be existent?

(83)
Thus, a body is not [truly] existent.
Because of ignorance, the mind perceiving a body
in hands, and so forth, arises.
Like the mind perceiving a man in an effigy,
Because [it] is moulded in the shape [of a man].

(84)

For as long as the conditions are assembled,
The figure is seen as a man.
Likewise, for as long as there are [conceptions]
over the hands and so on,
They are seen as the body.

(85)

Similarly, because of its being a composite of fingers,
Where is the hand?
[Where is] that [finger], as it is composed of joints.
Likewise a joint, when breakdown into its own parts;

(86)

A part, as well, through breaking it down into particles;
Likewise is the particle, for its directional parts;
The directional parts also, because of lacking parts,
Like space, they as well do not exist.

(87)

Therefore, what wise would be attached
To a bodily form that is like a dream?
And since a body does not exist that way,
Then what is a male and what is a female?

(2) "SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA" IN RELATION TO
CLOSE PLACEMENT OF MINDFULNESS ON FEELING

(88)

If suffering exists absolutely,
Why does it not undermine extreme joy?
And if happiness [exist intrinsically],
Why does a good taste and so forth not delight
someone tormented by grief and the like.

(89)

"It is not experienced,
Because it is overridden by something more intense."
How can something not in the nature of an experience
Still be a feeling?

(90)

"Suffering exists in a subtle way."
"Doesn't this [happiness] eliminate [only] the gross?
This [suffering] is but other form of mere happiness."
[There should be no suffering, as] even
the subtle one is [of happiness nature].

(91)

"But with the arising of discordant conditions,

There is no arising of suffering.”
[Well] is it not established that
A feeling is something imputed by a thought?

(92)

Because that [feeling is not intrinsic, one] should
Meditate on this analysis as remedy.
[The insight] that grows from the field of analysis
And the meditation are the foods of yogis.

Rejecting intrinsic causes

(93)

If there is a gap between a source and its object,
Where would they meet?
And if there is no gap, would be just one.
So the meeting would be of what with what?

(94)

A particle cannot conflate with [another] particle:
[As] there is no instance of [space] and they are uniform.
When there is no conflation, there is no co-mingling;
And when there is no co-mingling, there is no meeting.

(95)

Moreover, for something that is partless,
A meeting is not tenable.?
If a meeting and being partless can be observed,
Then show it, please!

(96)

For a consciousness, which is immaterial,
A meeting is untenable;
A collection as well does not truly exist.
The earlier analysis is also [applicable here].

(97)

Thus when contact does not exist,
From what does a feeling arise?
For what reason, is all this painful efforts made?
For whom and from what can harm occur?

(98)

And when there is no one who feels,
The feeling, as well, does not exist,
Then seeing this situation,
Why is craving not eliminated?

(99)
Those seen or touched
Have the nature of a dream or an illusion.
Having arisen simultaneously with the mind,
The feeling is not perceived by that [mind].

(100)
[Those] produced before or after
Can be remembered and not experienced.
One cannot experience oneself,
Nor be experienced by others.

(101)
There is no one that feels,
Feeling cannot truly exist.
How can these induce harm
To this collection that lacks a self?

**(3) "SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA" IN RELATION TO
CLOSE PLACEMENT OF MINDFULNESS ON MIND**

(102)
A mind does not exist in sources,
Nor in forms and so forth, nor in between.
A mind is not inside, nor outside,
Nor can it be found anywhere else.

(103)
That which is not the body nor others,
Neither co-mingled, nor separate in any way,
Is not a thing at all. As such
Sentient beings are released in natural nirvana.

(104)
If the cognition exists prior to the object,
Then on what does it focus to arise?
And if a cognition and the object are simultaneous,
On what does it focus to arise?

(105)
Yet, if it occurs after the object,
Then from what does the cognition arise?

**(4) "SELFLESSNESS OF PHENOMENA" IN RELATION TO
CLOSE PLACEMENT OF MINDFULNESS OF PHENOMENA**

This way arising of any phenomenon
Cannot be determined.

REJECTING THE OBJECTION THAT
THE TWO TRUTHS ARE UNTENABLE

(106)

“If conventional truth does not exist,
How can there be two truths?
If conventionalities are [posited by] others,
How can sentient beings transcend sorrow?

(107)

This [existence is through] other thoughts,
This is not our mode of conventionality.
If this is ascertained afterwards, it exists;
If not, the conventionality does not exist.

(108)

Both the thought and the to be thought
Are mutually dependent.
And by dependence on acceptance,
All objects of analysis are expressed.

(109)

“If the analytical intelligence is that which
Examines [the intrinsic nature,]
The intelligence is also [subject to] examination,
This leads to an infinite regress.

(110)

When the object of analysis is being examined,
The analysis has no basis.
Being devoid of a basis, it does not arise;
That is called [natural] nirvana.

(111)

For them, the two are true.
But it is extremely hard to maintain.
If an object is established by the power of a cognition,
What is the basis for the existence of cognition?

(112)

And if a cognition is established through the object,
Then what is the basis for existence of the object?
Their existence is by the power of mutual [dependence],
Which entails that both would be not [truly] existent.

(113)

If [a man] without a child is not a father,
Where does the child come from?
In the absence of a child, there can be no father.
Again, the two are not [truly] existent.

(114)
“A sprout grows from a seed,
And just as the seed is indicated by the [sprout],
By the arising of a cognition from the object,
Why cannot its [true] existence be realised?”

(115)
If the seed is realised by a cognition
Different from the sprout
By what is the existence of the cognition
Realized which cognizes the object ?

LOGIC THAT ESTABLISHES “EMPTINESS”

(A) REASONING FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF CAUSE

(1) REJECTING CAUSELESS PRODUCTION

(116)
By direct perception of the conventional world,
All causes are seen.
The multiple parts like a lotus – stalks and so forth -
Grow by means of multiple causes.

(117)
“What has produced [those] multiple causes?”
The previous multiple causes.
“Why does a cause have the ability to bring an effect?”
[Well] due to the power of previous causes.

(2) REJECTING PRODUCTION FROM PERMANENT CAUSES

(118)
If Ishvara were the cause of the world,
Tell me, what is Ishvara in fact?
If you say, “The elements,” then so be it,
But why [all] the fuss over a mere name?

(119)
However, earth and the rest have multiple parts,
Are impermanent, inanimate and not divine;
Trod on and unclean.
So these cannot be Ishvara.

(120)
Ishvara cannot be space, as it does not waver.
He cannot be the self, since it is refuted earlier.
“He is the creator which is inconceivable.”
What is the point of discussing the inconceivable?

(121)
And what could it be that he wished to create? The self?

Well, are not [the self], the earth and the rest,
And Ishvara supposed to be eternal by nature?
Cognition arises from the object of cognition.

(122)

Happiness and suffering have arisen since
beginninglessly from karma.
So tell me, what has been created [by Ishvara]?
And if there is no beginning to the cause,
How can there be a beginning to the effect?

(123)

Why does he not create continually
Since he does not depend on anything else?
If nothing exists that was not created by him,
On what does he depend [in order to create]?

(124)

If [the creation] depends [on others],
the collection [of the conditions] would be the cause,
And not Ishvara.
When [the conditions] are gathered,
no power can impede the creation.
And in their absence, [it] has no power to create.

(125)

If Ishvara must create despite lacking a wish,
He is then under the force of something else.
If [he creates] when he wants, then he is
under the power of “want.”
How is he “Ishvara” when creations are done that way?

(126)

Those who assert particles as permanent [creator]
As well have been disproved earlier.
Samkhyas assert Permanent Primal Substance
As the cause of the world.

(3) REJECTING PRODUCTION FROM

“PERMANENT PRIMAL SUBSTANCE”

(127)

[For Samkhyas] the universal constituents,
Courage, particles, and darkness,
When abiding in balance is called Primal Substance;
[Their] imbalance is said to be the migrators

(128)

Illogical is it for a unity to have a threefold nature;
Therefore, it does not exist.
Likewise, the qualities cannot be existent,

Because each of them also has three aspects.

(129)

And in the absence of the qualities,
The existence of sound and so forth becomes far-fetched.
Moreover, it is impossible for pleasure and so on
To exist in non-sentient clothing and the like.

(130)

For things having the nature of their causes.
Have not functional things already been analyzed?
The causes for you are the very pleasure and so forth:
Cotton clothing and the like do not arise from those.

(131)

Pleasure and so on arise from cotton clothing and the like,
Since these do not exist, pleasure and so on do not exist.
Moreover, even the permanence of pleasure and so on
Has never been seen.

(132)

If manifest pleasure and so on are existent,
Why is [their] experience not felt?
“The [experience] turns into a subtle [state]”,
How can it be [both] gross and subtle?

(133)

If it becomes subtle after leaving the gross state,
These gross and subtle states are impermanent.
So why not accept
All things as impermanent?

(134)

If the grossness is no different from pleasure,
Then the manifest pleasure is impermanent.
“But something totally nonexistent
Could not be produced, because of being non-existent.”

(135)

Even if you do not accept the production
of an evident phenomenon,
Still this is actually the case.
And if an effect exists in its causes,
Then consuming food would be eating excrement!

(136)

[Why not buy] and wear cotton seed [cheaper than]
the price of cotton clothing?
“Common people do not see [it], because of ignorance,
That is the precise position of the Knower of Reality.”

(137)
[Well] cognition of that must [also] exist
In common people, so why do [they] not see it?
“[Because] common people are not valid cognizers.”
What they see as manifest [also] is not true.

(138)
A valid cognizer is not a valid cognizer.
Wouldn't what was cognized by it [also] become false,
Therefore, in actuality, meditation on emptiness
Becomes untenable?”

(139)
Without getting the object of analysis,
The absence of that object cannot be apprehended.
Therefore, the lack of any false object,
Is clearly a falsity.

(140)
Thus, upon the death of a child in a dream,
The thought, 'He does not exist'
Is a hindrance to [thinking of] his existence.
And yet that ['the child does not exist'] is false.

SUMMARY

(141)
Therefore, when analysed in that way,
Nothing exists causelessly.
[Things] do not exist in their conditions,
Whether individually or collectively.

(142)
[A thing] does not emerge from something else;
Does not abide nor does it go.
Any thing viewed as truly existent by ignorance,
How is it different from an illusion?

(B) REASONING OF DEPENDENT ORIGINATION TO ESTABLISH THE VIEW OF “SELFLESSNESS”

(143)
[For] any thing emanated by a magician,
Or any thing emanated by causes:
Examine where it comes from.
And also where it goes to,

(144)

How can there be true existence
In contrived objects like a reflection,
Which is seen in conjunction with something
And which does not exist when that is absent?

**(C) REASONING TO ESTABLISH “EMPTINESS”
FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF EFFECT**

(145)

For a thing that is existent,
What need is there for a cause?
Then again, if that is not existent,
What need is there for a cause?

(146)

There is no transformation of a non-existent thing,
Even by means of a hundred million causes!
How can it in that state become a thing?
But what else could be transformed into a thing?

(147)

Since things cannot be possible at the time
of the absence of [it].
When will they come to exist as things?
Without production of a thing,
[It] cannot be freed from a non-thing.

(148)

Without being freed from non-things,
No occasion will there be for a thing to exist.
And a thing cannot change to a state of non-functionality,
It would absurdly follow that it had two true natures.

(149)

In that way, as cessation does not exist,
[The arising] of things does not exist either,
All sentient beings at all times
Never are arising nor ceasing.

SAMENESS OF SAMSAARA AND NIRVANA

ON THE ULTIMATE LEVEL

(150)

Sentient beings resemble dreams.
Upon analysis, they are like plantain trees.
Whether they are released or not released from sorrow
Ultimately, there is no difference.

ADVICE ON THE NEED TO STRIVE TO REALISE EMPTINESS

(A) WHAT IS THE REALITY?

(151)
With all phenomena empty in that way,
What is there to gain?
What is there to lose?
Who is there to respect or scorn?

(152)
From where does pleasure or pain arise?
What is there to dislike or like?
When investigated at the ultimate level
What is craved by which?

(153)
Upon analysis, [what] world of living beings exist
that will die here?
Who will come into existence?
Who has existed?
Who is a relative and a friend?

(154)
Those of my kind, please understand
That everything is like space.

(B) DRAWBACKS OF SAMBARA

But those wishing for happiness for a “self”
Get agitated and excited

(155)
Through causes [such as] fights and festivities;
From the distress, exertion,
And disputes, they cut and stab each other.
Living in great difficulties due to negativities.

(156)
[Despite] coming to the favourable births
over and over again,
So often experiencing manifold pleasures,
After death, they fall to the unbearable sufferings
Of the bad rebirth for a very long time.

(157)
In samsara, cliffs are aplenty;
And there, one remains deprived of [knowing] the reality
But since [samsara and nirvana] mutually contradict one another,
[one unceasingly cycles in Samsara]
In samsara, nothing [compares with] the realisation
of the reality.

(158)

There, too, are incomparable and unbearable
Oceans of suffering beyond any end;
In [samsara], there is little strength;
The life span is too short.

(159)

There, as well, with activities for longevity and health,
With hunger and exhaustion,
With sleep and harms, and likewise
With fruitlessly keeping company with childish people,

(160)

Life passes quickly and in vain.
Yet, analytical wisdom is so difficult to gain!
Furthermore, where is there [in samsara] a means
To eliminate the habituated distractions?

(161)

Again, the demon is striving there
To bring about a fall to the most awful rebirth.
There are too many distorted paths,
It is difficult to transcend “doubt.”

(162)

It is difficult to obtain a good rebirth again;
The appearance of a Buddha is extremely rare;
And the currents of afflictions are difficult to abandon.
Alas, suffering will go on unceasingly.

(163)

They fail to see their own suffering,
Although they are infested with extreme suffering.
Oh dear, this really is the cause to lament
For those who are caught in the rapids of suffering

(164)

For example, some people often perform ablutions;
Then they jump into fire again and again;
Even though in terrible states of suffering,
They assume themselves to be happy.

(165)

Likewise, there are those who frolic about,
As if there were no old age and death.
First, they will lose their lives,
Then fall to an unbearable lower rebirth.

THE MODE OF APPREHENSION OF
THE GREAT COMPASSION

(166)

Oh! When shall I come to bring peace
To those tormented by the fires of suffering like these
With a rain of happiness from my collection,
Pouring forth from the clouds of my merit?

(167)

Oh! When shall [I] respectfully accumulate merit
Non-referentially,
And teach emptiness to those
Who have been ruined by objectification.