

18

Sources for the Yogācāra Critiques of the Two Truths

Zhihua Yao

In a recent study, I discuss Yogācāra critiques of the two truths on the basis of the *Yogācārabhūmi* and related sources.ⁱ As a by-product of this study, the current paper presents the Sanskrit, Chinese and Tibetan editions and my English translation of some main passages that I discussed in my earlier study. I will supply some annotations, which reveal the subtlety and difficulty of reading and understanding classical Buddhist philosophical texts.

1) *Yogācārabhūmi* (The *Tattvārthapaṭala* section of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*)

Sanskrit edition from Takahashi 2005ⁱⁱ

5.3.4 ato ya ekatyā durvijñeyān sūtrāntānⁱⁱⁱ mahā (N21b1) yānapratisa□yuktā□^{iv} gambhīrā□^v śūnyatāpratisa□yuktān^{vi} ābhiprāyikārthanirūpitā□^{vii} śrutvā^{viii} yathābhūta□ bhā□itasyārtham avijñāyāyoniso^{ix} vikalpayitvāyogavihitenā^x tarkamātrake□aiva□d□□□ayo bhavanty eva□vādina□^{xi} prajñaptimātram eva sarvam⁽¹⁰⁾etac ca^{xii} tattva□ yaś caiva□ paśyati sa samyak paśyatītī^{xiii} te□ā□

ⁱ Zhihua Yao. (Forthcoming). *Yogācāra Critiques of the Two Truths*.

ⁱⁱ Takahashi Koichi 高橋晃一. (2005). *Bosatsuji shinjitsugibon kara sho*□ketchakubun *chu*□ *bosatsuji eno shiso*□ *tenkai: Vastu gainen o chu shin to shite*『菩薩地』「真実義品」から「撰決択分中菩薩地」への思想展開: vastu概念を中心として. To□kyo□: Sankibo□ Busshorin.

ⁱⁱⁱ durvijñeyān sūtrāntān NKR; durvijñeyānā□ sūtrāntānā□ C.

(C=Mss from Cambridge, K=Mss from Kyoto University, R=Mss of R. Sā□k□tyāyana, N=Mss from Nepal, W=Wogihara ed.)

^{iv} -□ C; -n NKR

^v -□ C; -n NKR

^{vi} śū- NKR; cchū- C

^{vii} -□ C; -n NKR

^{viii} śrutvā NKR; cchrutvā C

^{ix} avijñāyā- NKR; anabhijñāyā- C

^x vikalpayitvāyogavihitenā; vikalpayitvā ayogavihitenā NKR; vikalpyāyogavihitenā C

^{xi} eva□vādina□ C; evamvādina□ NK; eva□vādina□ / R

^{xii} etac ca NKR; etat C

^{xiii} // K; / NR; om. C

prajñaptyadhi□□hānasya vastumātrasyābhāvāt saiva prajñapti□¹ sarve□a sarva□² na bhavati//³ kuta□ puna□ prajñaptimātra□⁴ tattva□ bhavi□yati⁵//⁶ tad anena paryāye□a tais (18)tattvam api prajñaptir⁷) api tadubhayam apodita□⁸ bhavati//⁹ prajñaptitattvāpavādāc ca pradhā (C21b1) no nāstiko veditavya□//¹⁰

5.3.5 sa evan¹¹ nāstika□ sann akathyo¹² bhavaty asa□vāsyo bhavati¹³ vijñānā□¹⁴ sabrahmacāri□ām//¹⁵ sa ātmānam api vipādayati¹⁶/¹⁷ (29)lokam api yo 'sya d□□□yanumatam āpadyate¹⁸)//¹⁹ (Takahashi 2005: 99-100)

Chinese translation by Xuanzang, CBETA, T30, no. 1579²⁰

《瑜伽師地論》[4 真實義品]卷36：「如有一類，聞・難解大乘相應空性相應未極顯了密意趣義甚深經典，不能如實解所・義，起不如理・妄分別，由不巧便所引尋思，起如是見，立如是論：一切唯假，是為真實；若作是觀，名為正觀。彼於・假所依處、所實有唯事、撥為非有，是則一切・假皆無，何當得有一切唯假、是為真實？由此道理，彼於真實及以・假、二種・謗都無所有。由謗真實及・假故，當知是名最極無者。」

如是無者一切有智同梵行者，不應共語，不應共住。如是無者，能自敗壞，亦壞世間隨彼見者。」(XBETA, T30, vo.1579 π. 488, β28~χ10)

¹ -□ NKC; -□/ R

² sarva□ KRC; sarvan N

³ //; / R; om. NKC

⁴ -□ RC; -n NK

⁵ -ti NKC; -titi R

⁶ // K; / NR; om. C

⁷ tattvam api prajñaptir NC; tatva□ api prajñaptir K; tattva□ prajñaptir R

⁸ apodita□ NKR; apy āpādita□ C; cf. W: apy apavādita□

⁹ // K; / NR; om. C

¹⁰ // K; / NR; om. C

¹¹ -n NK; -□ RC

¹² akathyo NRC; akatho K

¹³ bhavati NK; bhavati/ R; om. C

¹⁴ -□ NKC; -□/ R

¹⁵ // K; / NR; om. C

¹⁶ vipādayati NKR; visa□pādayati C

¹⁷ / NR; // K; om. C

¹⁸ lokam api yo sya d□□□yanumatam āpadyate NKRC; cf.W: loko 'pi yo 'sya d□□□yanumatam āpadyate.

¹⁹ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

²⁰ All the Chinese texts are my punctuation.

Tibetan translation, Derge 4037; Peking 5538

de bas na gang dag kha cig shes par dka' ba'i mdo sde theg pa chen po dang ldan pa zab mo stong pa nyid dang ldan pa/ dgongs pa'i don bstan pa dag thos na bshad pa'i don yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du ma shes na/ tshul bzhin ma yin pa rnam par brtags te/ rigs pa ma yin pas bskyed pa'i rtog ge²¹ tsam gyis 'di thams cad ni btags pa tsam du zad de/ 'di ni de kho na yin no// su 'di ltar lta ba de ni yang dag par lta ba yin no zhes de ltar lta zhing de skad smra'o/ de dag gi ltar na 'dogs pa'i gzhi'i²² dngos po tsam yang med pas/ 'dogs pa de nyid kyang thams cad kyi thams cad du med par 'gyur na/ btags pa²³ tsam gyi²⁴ de kho na lta yod par ga la 'gyur te/ de bas na rnam grangs des na de dag gis ni de kho na dang²⁵ btags pa de gnyi ga la yang skur ba btab par 'gyur te/ btags pa dang/ de kho na la skur ba btab pas na/ med par lta ba'i gtso bo yin par rig par bya'o//

de ltar med par lta ba de²⁶ ni tshangs pa mtshungs par spyod pa mdzangs pa rnams kyis smos pa'i 'os ma yin pa dang/ 'grogs par mi bya ba yin te/ de ni bdag nyid kyang phung²⁷ bar byed la/ 'jig rten gang de'i lta ba la phyogs pa yang phung²⁸ bar byed do// (D4037: wi26a2-6; P5538: zhi31a1-6)

English translation

Therefore, when some people hear the difficult and profound Mahāyāna sūtras that deal with emptiness and are considered to convey a meaning that needs to be interpreted, they do not discern the correct meaning of that which is spoken [in the sūtras]. They develop false concepts, and with mere logic (*tarka*) that is unreasonably performed, they come to have the following view and make the following statement: "All is nothing but a designation (*prajñapti*) and that is the reality. Whoever sees it this way, sees correctly." For these people there is no real thing itself (*vastumātra*) to serve as the basis of designation. This means that there

²¹ rtog ge D; rtogs pa P

²² gzhi'i D; gzhi P

²³ btags pa D; btags P

²⁴ gyi D; gyis P

²⁵ dang D; dang/ P

²⁶ lta ba de D; om. P

²⁷ phung D; 'phung P

²⁸ phung D; 'phung P

cannot be any designation at all. Moreover, how can reality be nothing but a designation? In this way, they come to deny (*apodita*)²⁹ both designation and reality. Someone who denigrates (*apavāda*) designation and reality should be known as the worst kind of nihilist (*nāstika*).

Since he is a nihilist, those who are wise and practice a religious life should not speak or share living community with him. He causes himself to fall, and people who follow his views to fall as well.

2) *Yogācārabhūmi* (The *Tattvārthapaṭala* section of the *Bodhisattvabhūmi*)

Sanskrit edition from Takahashi 2005

5.4.1 ... yena hi śūnya³⁰ (⁹⁰tadasadbhāvāt³¹) yac ca śūnya³² tatsadbhāvāc³³ chūnyatā³⁴ yujyeta^{35//36} (K31b1) sarvābhāvāc ca kutra³⁷ ki³⁸ kena śūnya³⁹ bhavi⁴⁰yati//³⁸ na ca tena tasyaiva śūnyatā yujyate//³⁹ tasmād eva⁴¹ durg⁴²hītā śūnyatā bhavati//⁴⁰

5.4.2 katha⁴¹ ca puna⁴² sug⁴³hītā śūnyatā⁴⁴ bhavati//⁴⁵ yataś ca yad yatra na⁴⁶ bhavati tat tena śūnyam iti samanupaśyati/⁴⁴ yat punar⁴⁵⁾ atrāvaśi⁴⁶a⁴⁷a⁴⁸

²⁹ The Chinese translation of *bang* 講 and the Tibetan translation of *skur ba btab pa* support the alternative reading of *apavādita* suggested by Wogihara and Dutt editions of the text.

³⁰ -□ C; -n NK; illegible R

³¹ tadasadbhāvād NKC; illegible R

³² -□ C; -n NK; illegible R

³³ -c C; -t NK; illegible R

³⁴ chūnyatā C; śūnyatā NK; illegible R

³⁵ yujyeta N; yujyaita K; yujyete C; illegible R

³⁶ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

³⁷ kutra C; kuta⁴² NK; illegible R

³⁸ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

³⁹ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

⁴⁰ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

⁴¹ -□ C; -ñ NK; illegible R

⁴² śūnyatā C; om. NK; illegible R

⁴³ // K; / N; om. C; illegible R

⁴⁴ / RC

⁴⁵ bhava++++++[+]r N; bhava=====yat punar K; illegible R

⁴⁶ atrāvaśi⁴⁶a⁴⁷a⁴⁸ NC; anyavaśi⁴⁶a⁴⁷K; illegible R

bhavati tat sad ihaśtīti yathābhūta□ prajānāti//⁴⁷ iyam ucyate śūnyatāvakrāntir⁴⁸
yathābhūtā aviparītā//⁴⁹ (Takahashi 2005: 101)

Chinese translation by Xuanzang, CBETA, T30, no. 1579

《瑜伽師地論》[4 真實義品]卷36：「由彼故空，彼實是無；於此而空，此實是有。由此道理，可▪為空。若▪一切都無所有，何處、何者、何故名空？亦不應言由此、於此即▪為空。是故名為惡取空者。」

云何復名善取空者？謂由於此彼無所有、即由彼故正觀為空；復由於此餘實是有、即由餘故如實知有。如是名為悟入空性如實無倒。」(CBETA, T30, no.1579 p. 488, c24~ p. 489, a02)

Tibetan translation, Derge 4037; Peking 5538

gang gis stong pa de med pa dang/ gang stong pa de yod pa'i stong pa nyid ni
rigs pa'i phyir ro// thams cad med na ni gang du ci zhig gang gis stong par
'gyur te/ des na de nyid stong pa nyid du 'gyur du ni mi rung ngo// de bas na
de lta bu ni stong pa nyid la log par zin pa yin no//

ji ltar na stong pa nyid la legs⁵⁰ par zin pa yin zhe na/ gang gi⁵¹ phyir gang la
gang med pa de ni des stong par yang dag par mthong la/ 'di la lhag ma gang
yin pa de ni 'di ni⁵² yang dag par yod do zhes yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du rab
tu shes pa de ni stong pa nyid la yang dag pa ji lta ba bzhin du phyin ci ma log
par zhugs pa zhes bya ste/ (D4037: wi26b4-6; P5538: zhi31b5-8)

English translation

[This (x)] is empty of that (y), because that (y) does not exist. And this (x) is empty, because this (x) does exist.⁵³ In this way, emptiness is justified. If everything does not exist, what is empty? Where is it empty? What is it empty

⁴⁷ // K; / NR; om. C

⁴⁸ -ntir NK; -nti C; illegible R

⁴⁹ // K; / NR; om. C

⁵⁰ log D; legs P

⁵¹ gi D; gis P

⁵² ni D; na P

⁵³ See Willis's (1979: 162) translation: "One thing is empty of another because of that [other's] absence and because of the presence of the void thing itself."

of? And emptiness is not justified to mean this (*x*) itself (*eva*) is empty of this (*x*) [itself]. Hence, this is the bad understanding of emptiness.

What, then, is the good understanding of emptiness?⁵⁴ One rightly observes that if something (*y*) does not exist in whatever place (*x*), this [place] (*x*) is empty of that [thing] (*y*). Moreover, one knows in accordance with reality that whatever remains in this place (*x*) [except for that thing (*y*)] still exists, and it is something that exists in this place (*x*). This is called the unmistaken understanding (*avakrānti*) of emptiness, which is in accordance with reality.⁵⁵

3) *Yogācārabhūmi* (*Viniścayasa*□*grahani* section)

Chinese translation by Xuanzang, CBETA, T30, no. 1579

《瑜伽師地論》卷75：「復次於大乘中，或有一類，惡取空故，作如是言：由世俗故，一切皆有；由勝義故，一切皆無。」

應告彼言：長老！何者世俗？何者勝義？

如是問已，彼若答言：若一切法皆無自性，是名勝義；若於諸法無自性中，自性可得，是名世俗。何以故？無所有中建立世俗、假設、名言而起說故。

應告彼曰：汝何所欲？名言、世俗為從因有，自性可得？為唯名言、世俗說有？若名言、世俗從因有者，名言、世俗從因而生，而非是有，不應道理。若唯名言、世俗說有，名言、世俗無事而有，不應道理。

又應告言：長老！何緣諸可得者，此無自性？

如是問已，彼若答言：顛倒事故。

⁵⁴ The Derge edition of the Tibetan translation reads “*stong pa nyid la log par zin pa*” (=durg□hitā śūnyatā), and should be corrected by the Peking edition, which reads “*stong pa nyid la legs par zin pa*” (=sug□hitā śūnyatā).

⁵⁵ This definition of the good understanding of emptiness is a direct quotation from the *Cū*□*asuññata-sutta, Majjhima-Nikāya* III.104: “*Iti ya*□ *hi kho tattha na hoti, tena ta*□ *suñña*□ *samanupassati, ya*□ *pana tattha avasi*□□*ha*□ *hoti, Ta*□ *santa*□ *ida*□ *atthīti pajānāti.*” The translation by Bhikkhu Nā□amoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi (1995: 966ff) reads: “Thus he regards it as void of what is not there, but as to what remains there he understands that which is present thus: ‘This is present.’”

復應告言：汝何所欲？此顛倒事，為有？為無？若言有者，說一切法、由勝義故、皆無自性，不應道理；若言無者，顛倒事故、諸可得者、此無自性，不應道理。□
(CBETA, T30, no. 1579, p. 713, b2-18)

Tibetan translation, Derge 4038; Peking 5539

theṅ pa chen po pa la la rang gi nyes ba gzung⁵⁶ nas 'di skad ces kun rdzob tu ni
thams cad yod la/⁵⁷ don dam par ni thams cad med do zhes zer ro//

de la 'di skad ces⁵⁸ tshe dang ldan pa don dam pa ni gang yin/ kun rdzob ni
gang yin zhes brjod par bya'o//

de skad ces⁵⁹ dris pa na/ gal te de 'di skad ces chos thams cad kyi ngo bo nyid
med pa⁶⁰ gang yin pa de ni don dam pa yin la/ ngo bo nyid med pa'i chos de dag
la ngo bo nyid du dmigs pa gang yin pa de ni kun rdzob yin no/ /de ci'i phyir
zhe na/ 'di ltar de ni yod pa ma yin pa dag la kun rdzob tu byed pa dang/ 'dogs
pa dang/⁶¹ mn̄gon par brjod pa dang/⁶² tha snyad du byed pa'i phyir ro zhes lan
'debs par gyur na/⁶³ de la 'di skad ces brjod par bya'o//

ci ngo⁶⁴ bo nyid du dmigs pa de mn̄gon par brjod pa dang kun rdzob kyi rgyu las
byung ba yin par 'dod dam/ 'on te mn̄gon par brjod pa dang/ kun rdzob tsam
zhig yin par 'dod/ gal te mn̄gon par brjod pa dang/⁶⁵ kun rdzob kyi rgyu las
byung ba yin na ni des na⁶⁶ mn̄gon par brjod pa dang/⁶⁷ kun rdzob kyi rgyu las

⁵⁶ nye bar bzung D; nyes pa gzung P

⁵⁷ la/ D; la P

⁵⁸ ces D; ces/ P

⁵⁹ skad ces D; skad P

⁶⁰ med pa D; med pa nyid P

⁶¹ dang/ D; dang P

⁶² dang/ D; dang P

⁶³ na/ D; na P

⁶⁴ ci ngo D; ngo P

⁶⁵ dang/ D; dang P

⁶⁶ des na D; de nas P

byung ba yin pas yod pa ma yin pa zhes byar mi rung ngo// gal te mngon par
brjod pa dang/ kun rdzob tsam zhig yin na ni des na gzhi med par mngon par
brjod pa dang/ kun rdzob ces byar mi rung ngo//

de la 'di skad ces tshe dang ldan pa ci'i phyir na gang dmigs pa de med pa yin
zhes kyang brjod par bya'o//

de skad dris pa na/ gal te de⁶⁸ 'di skad ces phyin ci log gi dngos po yin pa'i phyir
ro zhes lan 'debs par gyur na/

de la 'di skad ces brjod par bya ste/ ci phyin ci log de yod par 'dod dam 'on te
med par 'dod/ gal te yod na ni des na chos thams cad kyi ngo bo nyid med pa
nyid ni don dam pa'o zhes byar mi rung ngo// gal te med na ni des na phyin ci
log gi dngos po yin pa'i phyir gang dmigs pa de ngo bo nyid med do zhes byar
mi rung ngo// (D4038: zi42b5-43a4; P5539: 'i46a7-46b7)

English translation

Some nihilists among the Mahāyāna⁶⁹ hold that [seen] from the [standpoint of the] conventional [truth], all things exist; [seen] from the [standpoint of the] ultimate [truth], nothing exists.⁷⁰

Then we should ask them: “The Venerables, what is the conventional [truth]? And what is the ultimate [truth]?”

They would answer: “The fact that all *dharma*s are devoid of intrinsic nature (*svabhāva*) is called the ultimate [truth]. The fact that intrinsic nature can be apprehended within the *dharma*s that are devoid of intrinsic nature is called the

⁶⁷ dang/ D; dang P

⁶⁸ te de D; te P

⁶⁹ Literally, those among the Mahāyāna who understand emptiness badly (*e qu kong* 惡取空, *durg*□*hitā* śūnyatā, *stong pa nyid la log par zin pa*). The Tibetan translation reads differently as “*theg pa chen po pa la la rang gi nyes pa gzung nas*” (Peking) or “*theg pa chen po pa la la rang gi nye bar bzung nas*” (Derge). Both terms suggest a meaning similar to Paramārtha’s rendering of “some Mahāyānists who are attached to [their own] wrong views” (大乘中學有偏執者) in his translation of the same passage in the **Buddhadhātuśāstra* (*Fo xing lun* 佛性論) (See Text 4).

⁷⁰ The interpolation of “truth” is supported by Paramārtha’s renderings of “conventional truth” (*su di* 俗諦) and “ultimate truth” (*zhen di* 真諦) (See Text 4).

conventional [truth].⁷¹ Why? Because conventions (*shisu* 世俗, *kun rdzob*, **sa vti*), designation (*jiashe* 假設, 'dogs pa, **prajñapti*), linguistic expressions (*mingyan* 名言, *mingon par brjod pa*, **abhilāpa*) and verbal conventions (*shuo* 說, *tha snyad*, **vyavahāra*) are imposed on nonexistents.⁷²

We should tell them: "Do you intend to say that linguistic expressions and conventions arise from a causal relation and intrinsic nature can be apprehended therein, or that they are merely linguistic expressions and conventions? If linguistic expressions and conventions arise from a causal relation, then it is unreasonable to regard [such] linguistic expressions and conventions, which arise from a causal relation, to be nonexistents. If they are merely linguistic expressions and conventions, then it is unreasonable that linguistic expressions and conventions exist without a real thing (*vastu*) [as their basis (*gzhi*)]."⁷³

Again we should ask them: "The Venerables, why is it that knowables (*zhu kede zhe* 諸可得者, *gang dmigs pa*) are devoid of intrinsic nature?"⁷⁴

Thus we have asked, they would answer: "Because of the perverted view of real things (*vastu*)."

We should again tell them: "Do you intend to say that this perversion (*phyin ci log*)⁷⁵ is existent, or that it is nonexistent? If the perversion is existent, then it is unreasonable to say that all *dharmas* are devoid of intrinsic nature in the sense of the ultimate [truth]. If the perversion is nonexistent, then it is unreasonable [to say] that because of the perverted view of real things these knowables are devoid of intrinsic nature."

4) *Buddhadhātuśāstra (Fo xing lun 佛性論)

⁷¹ Paramārtha renders "the conventional truth" (*su di* 俗諦) (See Text 4), while the Tibetan translation reads "*kun rdzob*" (conventions).

⁷² To make sense Xuanzang's translation, I have followed the Tibetan translation, which reads: "'di ltar de ni yod pa ma yin pa dag la kun rdzob tu byed pa dang/ 'dogs pa dang/ *mingon par brjod pa dang/ tha snyad du byed pa'i phyir ro.*'"

⁷³ The Tibetan translation reads alternatively: "without [a real thing as] their basis" (*gzhi med par*).

⁷⁴ The Tibetan translation omits "of intrinsic nature."

⁷⁵ Xuanzang's translation reads: "this perverted view of real things." The simpler "this perversion" is supported by the Tibetan translation and Paramārtha's rendering (See Text 4).

Chinese translation by Paramārtha, CBETA, T31, no. 1610

[Quotation of the entire passage from the *Viniścayasaṅgrahani*:

復次為破大乘中學有偏執者應知，若汝・：一切有皆由俗諦，一切無皆由真諦，應作此問：善友，何者是真實？何者是俗諦？

答曰：一切諸法無有自性，是為真實。於無自性法中，・有自性，是名俗諦，以於無中假・有故。

問曰：是執無有自性，為當依世俗言故有？為當唯是語言？若依世俗言有此執者，此執⁷⁶則不可・。何以故？執是無故。若此執唯是語言，則無所詮，世俗語言不成就故。若不成就是世俗者，是義不然。又若汝謂於無自性中，執有自性，是名為俗。若執有者，云何是無？

答曰：為顛倒品類故，故無中・有，乃至於無常樂我等諸法，・言皆有常等諸德⁷⁷，其體實無，但假・有。如此執者，為四倒攝。是故雖執是有，而得是無。

問曰：如此顛倒，為有？為無？若是有者，一切諸法無有自性，是義不然。若是無者，此執顛倒亦不得成。若無性中，執有自性，為俗諦者，是義不然⁷⁸。]

何以故？二諦不可・有，不可・無，非有非無故。真諦不可・有，不可・無者，無人法故，不可・有；顯二空故，不可・無。俗諦亦爾，分別性故，不可・有；依他性故，不可・無。復次真諦不定有無，人法無、不⁷⁹無，二空有、不有。俗諦亦爾，分別性故，非決定無；依他性故，非決定有。(CBETA, T31, no. 1610, p. 793, c8-p. 794, a2)

English translation

[Quotation of the entire passage from the *Viniścayasaṅgrahani* skipped]

Why [does the text give the above criticism of the two truths]? We cannot say that the two truths exist or do not exist, because they are neither existence nor nonexistence. As for the fact that we cannot say that the ultimate truth exists or does not exist: 1) we cannot say that [the ultimate truth] exists, because there is no persons or *dharma*s; [but] 2) we cannot say that [the ultimate truth] does not exist, because of the demonstration of the emptiness of the two [i.e., persons and

⁷⁶ [此執] — [宋] [元] [明] [宮]

⁷⁷ 德=法 [宮]

⁷⁸ 然=成 [宋] [元] [明] [宮]

⁷⁹ 不=— [明]

dharmas]. The same is true of the conventional truth. Because of its imagined nature, we cannot say that [the conventional truth] exists. Because of its dependent nature, we cannot say that it does not exist. Moreover, the ultimate truth is not definitely existent or nonexistent. Persons and *dharmas* do not exist, and yet they are not nonexistents. The emptiness of the two [i.e., persons and *dharmas*] exists, and yet it is nonexistent. The conventional truth is likewise. It is not definitely nonexistent because of its imagined nature. Nor is it definitely existent because of its dependent nature.

5) **Madhyamkānusāra* (*Shun zhong lun* 順中論)

Chinese translation by Bodhiruci, CBETA, T30, no. 1565

《順中論》卷2：「答曰：何法無滅？何法無生？」

問曰：第一義諦。

答曰：若如是者，有二種諦。所謂世諦、第一義諦。若有二諦，汝朋則成。

問曰：若異世諦，有第一義諦，成我朋分，為有何過？如說偈言：

如來說法時 依二諦而說

謂一是一世諦 二第一義諦

若不知此理 二諦兩種實

彼於佛深法 則不知實諦

答曰：汝快善說。我說亦爾，依於二諦如來說法。依二諦說，說法真如，不破不二。若其二者，異第一義法真如，別有世諦法真如。一法真如尚不可得，何處當有二法真如而可得也？若說二諦，此如是說：不異世諦，而更別有第一義諦，以一相故，謂無相故。此如是義，師偈說言：

若人不知此 二諦之義者

彼於佛深法 則不知真實

問曰：此云何諦？

答曰：若此不破。

問曰：此之二諦，何物不破？

答曰：一相，所謂無相、無自體，如本性空，如此則是諦。如有偈中說諦相言：

二種法皆無 戲論不戲論

不分別不異 此義是諦相

若如此偈，云何如來依二諦說？一切如來皆無所依。不依世諦，亦復不依第一義諦。如來說法，心無所依⁸⁰。何用多語？」(CBETA, T30, no. 1565, p. 45, a13-b10)

English translation

Answer (=the proponent): What *dharma* does not cease? What *dharma* does not arise?

Question (=the opponent): The ultimate truth.

Answer: If this is the case, then there are two truths, i.e., the so-called conventional and ultimate truths. If there are two truths, then your thesis will be proven.

Question: If there is ultimate truth distinct from conventional truth, then it proves my thesis. What is wrong with that? As [Nāgārjuna] says in the following verses:

“When the Tathāgata teaches the *dharma*, he relies on the two truths: first, conventional truth; second, ultimate truth. Those who do not know the two kinds of reality (*liang zhong shi* 兩種實) [illustrated] by the two truths cannot understand the real truth (*shi di* 真理) of the Buddha’s profound teaching.”⁸¹

⁸⁰ 依 = 衣【元】

⁸¹ Cf. MMK 24.8-9: *dve satye samupāśritya buddhānā dharmadeśanā/ lokasa v tisatya ca satya ca parmartha// ye 'nayor na vijānanti vibhāga satyayor dvayo/ te tattva na vijānanti gambhīra*

Answer: Your thesis is pleasing; but so is mine; it is based upon the two truths, a doctrine expounded by the Tathāgata. When [the Tathāgata] teaches the thusness of *dharma*s through the two truths, he does not destroy non-duality. If there were two [truths], then the conventional thusness of *dharma*s would be distinguished from the ultimate thusness of *dharma*s. Now, even one thusness of *dharma*s is non-apprehensible; how, then, could one know two thusnesses of *dharma*s? If we are to talk about the two truths, we should say that there is no ultimate truth other than the conventional truth, because there is only one characteristic, which is no characteristic at all. This meaning is implied in Master [Nāgārjuna's] following verse:

"Those who do not know the meaning (*yi* 義) of the two truths cannot understand the true reality (*zhen shi* 真實) of the Buddha's profound teaching."⁸²

Question: What (*yunhe* 云何) is this truth?

Answer: That which is not destroyed (*rou ci bu po* 若此不破).

Question: What is not destroyed by the two truths?

Answer: One characteristic, which is no characteristic and no intrinsic nature, just like the emptiness of own nature. Such is the truth, as the characteristic of the truth is explained in [Nāgārjuna's] following verse:

"These two *dharma*s (=two truths?) are both nonexistent, and are not fabricated by mental fabrication. They are neither imagined nor separated. This meaning is the characteristic of the truth."⁸³

If following this verse, how can the Tathāgata teach on the basis of the two truths? The Tathāgata has nothing at all to rely on, neither the conventional truth

buddhaśāsane//. I have translated these verses literally by closely following the Chinese, which apparently overinterprets them by holding that there are "two kinds of reality" (*liang zhong shi* 兩種實) illustrated by the two truths.

⁸² The proponent refers to MMK 24.9 again with a different translation that does not imply two levels of reality.

⁸³ Cf. MMK 18.9: *aparapratyaya* □ *śānta* □ *prapañcair aprapañcitam/ nirvikalpam anānārtham etat tattvasya lakṣaṇam//*. The beginning part of the verse "these two *dharma*s are both nonexistent" does not agree with the extent Sanskrit version of MMK, and the context of this verse does not support its relation to the two truths either.

Zhihua Yao

nor the ultimate truth. When the Tathāgata teaches, his mind has nothing to rely on. What else can we say?