

CHAPTER 33

Aids to Gaining the Fruits of Śīla

XXXIII.CHAPTER 33: AIDS TO GAINING THE FRUITS OF ŚĪLA

A. ON THE PURIFICATION OF ŚĪLA, MORAL VIRTUE

In order to pursue extensive learning and then practice in accord with the way it was taught after understanding the meaning of that extensive learning, a bodhisattva such as this becomes able to purify his practice of *śīla*. Thus one should cultivate the dharmas used to purify one's practice of *śīla* (moral virtue).

1. FOUR DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

Question: Which dharmas are able to purify one's practice of *śīla*?

Response:

Guard the actions of body, speech, and mind
while also not apprehending any dharma by which one guards it.
Never permit any admixture of the view of a self
or any of the other views.
Dedicate the merit from this to the attainment of all-knowledge.
These four methods purify one's practice of *śīla*.

If the practitioner cultivates these four dharmas, his observance of *śīla* will naturally become pure. "Guarding the actions of body, speech, and mind" refers to always using right mindfulness in one's physical, verbal, and mental actions even to the point that one does not allow oneself to err through committing even the most minor transgressions, acting in this like the tortoise who always takes such care in guarding his head and feet.

Because this practitioner deeply delights in emptiness, in his comprehension of the supreme meaning, he does not even apprehend [the existence of] any dharma by which one guards the three types of actions. There are others who, although they do indeed perceive the emptiness of dharmas, they are still of the opinion that the knower of emptiness remains [as an existent entity]. It is for this reason that [the verse] says, "Never permit any admixture of the view imputing a self," the view of a being, the view of a person, the view of a soul, the view of a life,⁵⁹¹ or the view of a knower.

"Dedicating [merit to the realization of] all-knowledge" means one does not dedicate the merit arising from upholding the moral precepts to any other sort of fortunate result, but rather only dedicates it to the

liberation of all beings through one's quest to attain buddhahood. These are the four [dharmas that enable the purification of moral virtue].

2. FOUR MORE DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

There are yet another four dharmas by which one is able to bring about the purification of one's practice of *śīla*, namely:

If one has no conceptions of a self or anything belonging to a self,
if one also has no annihilationist or eternalist views,
and if one penetrates the dharma explaining multiple conditions,
one will then be able to purify one's practice of *śīla*.

"Freedom from conceptions of a self or anything belonging to a self" refers to not being attached to thoughts imputing the existence of a self or anything belonging to a self. One need only realize that these ideas are empty, false, and inverted and hence there is no dharma of [the existence of] a self.

One "has no annihilationist or eternalist views" because annihilationist and eternalist views are possessed of numerous faults.

As for "penetrating the dharma that explains multiple conditions," by knowing that all dharmas are products of many conditions and hence are devoid of any fixed nature of their own, one practices the Middle Way.

[By availing oneself of] four such dharmas such as these, one is able to purify one's practice of *śīla*.

3. FOUR MORE DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

There are four additional dharmas through which one is able to purify one's practice of *śīla*, namely:

One practices the four lineage bases of the Āryas,
adopts the twelve *dhūta* austerities,
also does not delight in the noise of crowds,
and bears in mind why one left home [to become a monastic].

"The four lineage bases of the Āryas" refers to being satisfied with whatever robes one has already obtained, to being satisfied with whatever food and drink one has already obtained, to being satisfied with whatever dwelling place⁵⁹² one has already obtained, and to practice that delights in severance and delights in cultivation.

"The twelve *dhūta* austerities" are:

Adopting the dharma of dwelling in a forest hermitage;
Obtaining one's food through the alms round;
Wearing robes made of cast-off rags;
[Taking one's daily meal in but] a single sitting;

Always sitting [to sleep, never lying down];
 Having taken the meal, not accepting food or drink at the wrong times;
 Possessing only a single three-part set of robes;
 Wearing only an animal-hair robe;
 Laying out one's sitting mat wherever one happens to be;
 Dwelling at the foot of a tree;
 Dwelling out in the open (lit. "on empty ground");
 Dwelling in a charnel field.

"Not delighting in the noise of crowds" refers to avoiding meeting together with either laypeople or monastics. There are those who, although they have taken up the dharma of dwelling in a forest hermitage, because they have many acquaintances and friends, often have many people coming and going. Therefore, it refers here to "not delighting in the noise of crowds," whether through not going off to other places or through being disinclined to gather together with others.

As for "bearing in mind why one left home [to become a monastic]," one who is focused on *śīla* practice reflects thus: "Why did I leave the home life to become a monastic?" Having pondered this, because one accords with the endeavors appropriate to the monastic's life and wishes to succeed in these, he practices in a manner that accords with the way [monastic cultivation] was taught. These are the four.

4. FOUR MORE DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

There are another four dharmas by which one can purify one's practice of *śīla*, namely:

[One sees that] the five aggregates have no arising or destruction, [sees] the six elements⁵⁹³ as like the nature of dharmas, sees that the six sense faculties are empty [of inherent existence], and does not become attached to worldly expressions.
 [Practice] that accords with these four dharmas also enables one to purify one's practice of *śīla*.

As for "[seeing that] the five aggregates have no arising or destruction," this means that, by contemplating the five aggregates from root to branch, one perceives their absence of arising and destruction.

As for "[seeing that] the six elements" consisting of earth and so forth "are like the nature of dharmas,"⁵⁹⁴ this means that, just as the nature of dharmas cannot be apprehended, so too, the six elements cannot be apprehended, either.

One realizes that, although the six sense faculties involve pain, pleasure, and such, they do so through causes and conditions linked

to the mind and mental dharmas. Thus, by resorting to investigative applications of right wisdom, one realizes that they are empty [of any inherent existence].

One then utterly comprehends the nature of all three of these associated categories, realizing that in every case they are entirely empty [of inherent existence].

There are practitioners who develop an attachment to emptiness that then also hinders cultivation of the path. Hence it states here that one must not develop an attachment to emptiness that simply conforms to worldly uses of the word "emptiness."

Dharmas such as these enable one to purify one's practice of *śīla*.

Question: If this is truly so, why do you speak here of the dharmas of the five aggregates?

Response: It is because they are empty. All dharmas of the five aggregates are empty. As for the very last part where it states that one must not become attached to emptiness, this means that even "emptiness" should be relinquished. If one accords with this, then there will be no dharma of erroneous doubtfulness impeding one's practice of *śīla*.

Question: Because the dharmas of the five aggregates are possessed of characteristic marks and that which can be marked, they do therefore definitely exist. Take for instance the [canonical] declarations that "the form aggregate is characterized by being assailed by what is painful"⁵⁹⁵ and "awareness of pain and pleasure is the characteristic of the feeling aggregate." Given that they obviously possess such characteristics, how can one claim that [the aggregates] are neither empty nor non-empty?

Response:

Affliction and destruction are marks of the form aggregate.

What all goes into making this form?

If affliction is indeed a characteristic mark of form,

apart from its marks, there is nothing amenable to being marked.

And where then do these characteristic marks abide?

There is no mark nor anything that can be marked.

The entire world is finally nonexistent.

There is neither any mark nor anything that can be marked.

Characteristic marks and that which can be marked
are neither conjoined nor not conjoined.

In their coming forth, they have no place from which they come.

In going away, they also have no place to which they go.

If one posits either a conjoining or a non-conjoining
through which one establishes either marks or what is markable,

then to proceed in this way is mistaken
with regard to both marks and what is markable.

This would be to use marks to establish what is markable.
[However], marks themselves are not self established.
Since even marks themselves cannot be established,
how then could they [be used to] establish what is markable?

The beings of the world are so extremely pitiable,
for they distinguish marks and what is markable,
become deluded in pursuing all manner of deviant paths,
and are cheated and deceived by deviant teachers.

Marks and what is markable then are just
devoid of marks and devoid of anything that can be marked.
Given such a visibly apparent situation as this,
how could one fail to realize [what is so obvious]?

Pursuant to imputations of the existence of marks and the markable,
there exist such [merely] conceptual elaborations as these.
And whenever such conceptual elaborations as these arise,
one then falls into a position associated with afflictions.⁵⁹⁶

Moreover, the practitioner employs the gateway of [understanding that
all phenomena] neither come into existence nor pass away to facilitate
the contemplation of the aggregates, sense realms, and sense bases as
empty [of inherent existence]. This is as described here:

The dharmas of birth, aging, sickness, and death,
when arising, have no place from which they come.
The dharmas of birth, aging, sickness, and death,
when extinguished, have no place to which they go.

It is the nature of the aggregates, sense realms, and sense bases that,
when arising, they have no place from which they come,
and, when extinguished, they have no place to which they go.
Just so is the meaning of the Buddha's Dharma.

So too with fire, which is not in the human effort used to make it,
is also not present in the friction drill or wood,
and is not in their coming together, either,
even as it still does exist due to their all having come together.

If the fuel is entirely consumed, the fire will then die out.
Yet, when it does die out, there is no place to which it goes.
It exists due to the coming together of conditions,
yet, if those conditions scatter, it becomes entirely nonexistent.

So too is this the case with the eye consciousness
that does not abide in the eye,

also does not abide in visual forms,
 also does not abide between them,
 also does not abide in their combination,
 also is not found apart from them,
 also does not come thither from elsewhere,
 yet does exist due to such a combination,
 and which, when the combining scatters, then becomes non-existent.
 So too it also is with all dharmas.

When arising, there is no place from which they come,
 and when extinguished, there is no place to which they go.

This is analogous to a dragon's mental powers
 through which the dark clouds appear.
 They do not emerge from the body of the dragon,
 nor do they arrive from some other place,
 and yet the rain from these great dark clouds
 pours down throughout the entire world,
 after which it then evaporates,
 yet has no place to which it goes.

Just as such clouds neither come nor go,
 so too it is with all dharmas.
 When they arise, there is no place from which they come,
 and, when destroyed, there is no place to which they go.

They are also like a man who has been painted on a wall
 that does not reside in any or all of the colors,
 also does not reside in their combination,
 and also does not abide in the wall.

It does not abide in the painter,
 nor does it abide in the paintbrush.
 It does not come forth from elsewhere,
 yet it exists because of all of these coming together.

When that combination scatters, it then no longer exists.
 So too it is with all dharmas.
 When they exist, there is no place from which they come.
 When they cease to exist, there is no place to which they go.

The lamp flame does not abide in its oil,
 also does not emerge from its wick,
 and also does not arrive from some other place,
 and yet, because of the oil and the wick, it exists.

If its causes and conditions end, it is extinguished.
 When it is extinguished, there is no place to which it goes.

All dharmas' characteristics of coming forth and departing are in every case also just like this.

5. FOUR MORE DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

There are another four dharmas by which one can purify one's practice of *śīla*, namely:

One is able to contemplate the nature of one's own body and refrains from elevating oneself or diminishing others.

Since these two cannot be apprehended, one abides in mental pliancy, free of any conceit.

One contemplates all dharmas as uniformly equal.

These four serve to purify one's *śīla*.

As for being "able to contemplate the nature of one's own body," the practitioner has this thought: "This body of mine is characterized by impurity, impermanence, and mortality. What true worth⁵⁹⁷ does it possess?"

Having reflected in this manner, one does not elevate oneself and look down on others.

Because one has a resolute belief that both self and others are devoid of "I" and "mine," one realizes that they cannot be apprehended at all.

As for "mental pliancy," having acquired these dharmas, one's mind then abides in lightness, suppleness, and the capacity to endure and acquiesce in dharmas. It is due to this mental pliancy and delight that one does not elevate himself above others.

As for "contemplating all dharmas as uniformly equal," this means that, because [one realizes] they are empty, one contemplates all conditioned and unconditioned dharmas as equal and devoid of any distinctions as to those which are superior, those which are middling, and those which are inferior. This is as described here:

If one would posit that, because of the inferior, there thereby exist the middling and the superior, since the inferior does not itself create the middling or the superior, how then could they exist because of the inferior?
And for the inferior itself to have become "inferior," middling and superior would definitely have existed beforehand.

If one would posit that, because of the middling, there thereby exist the inferior and the superior, since the middling does not itself create the inferior or the superior, how could they exist because of the middling?
And for the middling itself to have become "middling," inferior and the superior would definitely have existed beforehand.

If one would posit that, because of the superior,
there thereby exist the middling and the inferior,
since the superior does not itself create the middling or the inferior,
how could they exist because of the superior?

And for the superior itself to have become "superior,"
middling and inferior would definitely have existed beforehand.

It cannot be that, due to the inferior, [middling and superior exist].
Nor can it be that it is *not* because of it [that they exist].

If [the middling and superior] already existed previously,
they could not exist because of the inferior.

And if [the middling and superior] were previously non-existent,
how could they succeed in becoming the middling and superior?

It cannot be that, due to the middling, [inferior and superior exist].
Nor can it be that it is *not* because of it [that they exist].

If [the inferior and the superior] already existed previously,
they could not exist because of the middling.

And if [the inferior and the superior] were previously non-existent,
how could they succeed in becoming the inferior and the superior?

It cannot be that, due to the superior, [inferior and middling exist].
Nor can it be that it is *not* because of it [that they exist].

If [the middling and the inferior] definitely already existed,
they could not exist because of the superior.

And if [middling and inferior] were certainly previously non-existent,
how could they succeed in becoming middling and inferior?

Additionally, because their emptiness is of a singular character, one
contemplates all dharmas as uniformly equal. So too it is with beings.
This is as described here:

In the midst of what is empty, the wise
do not speak of any distinguishable characteristic signs.
In the singularity of emptiness, there are no differentiations.
If one is able to perceive emptiness in this manner
this then is to see the Buddha,
for the Buddha is no different from emptiness.

It is said that all buddhas are one,
all beings are one,
all dharmas are but a single dharma,
and no distinctions exist between superior, middling, or inferior.

All of the Buddhas, the Bhagavats,
transcend both inherently existent and externally created nature.
So too do all beings
transcend both inherently existent and externally created nature.

All dharmas are also just so
in transcending inherently existent and externally created natures.
It is because of just such causes and conditions
that they are said to be of a singular character.

If one claims that buddhas exist, this is wrong.
If one claims no buddhas exist, this is also wrong.
If one claims that beings exist, this is wrong.
If one claims that no beings exist, this is also wrong.

If one claims dharmas exist, that is wrong.
If one claims that no dharmas exist, that is also wrong.
It is because they transcend both “existence” and “non-existence”
that they are said to be uniformly equal.

All the Buddhas, the Bhagavats,
all beings, and also all dharmas
are in every case ungraspable.
This is what is meant by the uniform equality of all dharmas.

All buddhas, beings,
and dharmas have no differences.
Because one cannot make any distinctions among them,
they are said to be of a single uniform equality.

All buddhas, all beings,
and all dharmas,
even as they enter into arising, enduring, and destruction,
abide in quiescent cessation and do not exist at all.

Nor do they have any place from which they have come,
nor do they have any place to which they go.
It is because of their neither coming nor going
that they are said to be of a single uniform equality.

All buddhas, all beings,
and all dharmas
are, in every case, entirely non-existent
and utterly beyond all of the paths of existence.

These three are not equal,
are not unequal,
are not both equal and unequal,
and are neither equal nor unequal.
It is in this way that one explains all dharmas
as being in every case equal and devoid of distinctions.

6. FOUR MORE DHARMAS ENABLING PURIFICATION OF MORAL VIRTUE

There are another four dharmas by which one can purify one's practice of *śīla*. They are as described below:

Being well able to maintain a resolute belief in emptiness,
not being frightened by the dharma of signlessness,
maintaining the great compassion toward beings,
and being able to acquiesce in the nonexistence of self—
It is through four dharmas such as these
that one is also able to purify one's practice of *śīla*.

It is because of a practitioner's complete comprehension of all dharmas as devoid of any self-existent nature or any externally-created nature that he is referred to as having "a resolute belief in emptiness." This is as described here:

All dharmas whatsoever
never arise on the basis of any inherently existent nature.
If they arise from multiple conditions,
they should then exist through that which is other.

Given they do not arise through any inherently existent nature,
how then could they arise through that which is other?
If an inherently existent nature is not established,
then any nature existing through some "other" is also nonexistent.

If they transcend any arising from an inherently existent nature,
then they are devoid of any inherently existent nature.
If they have transcended any inherently existent nature,
then they are [also] devoid of any mark of inherent existence.

An inherently existent nature and marks of inherent existence
do not exist on the basis of conjoining
and do not become non-existent through separation.
Hence they are both devoid of any fixed existence.

Dharmas cannot be produced from that which is other,
nor can they be produced from themselves,
nor can they be produced by both self and other,
and yet, apart from those two, they cannot be produced, either.

If no inherent existence can be established for itself,
how then could it possibly be produced from what is other?
If one departs from dharmas that are mere worldly conventions,
then "self" and "other" are entirely nonexistent.

If that which is other were produced from that which is other,
then that "other" would have no substance of its own.
If it had no substance, then it could not even exist.
From what thing then can there be the arising of what is other?

Because it has no substance of its own,
 production from some other is also a nonexistent [possibility].
 Since all four [tetralemma ideas] are empty [of inherent existence],
 no dharma whatsoever has any fixed arising or destruction.

As for “not being frightened by signlessness,” it is because of one’s resolute belief [in signlessness] and one’s utter transcendence of all signs that one is not frightened. This is as described here:⁵⁹⁸

If everything is signless,
 then everything is identical with whatever possesses signs.
 Quiescent cessation is signless
 and is identical with whatever is an existent dharma.⁵⁹⁹

If one contemplates the dharma of signlessness,
 whatever is signless is [seen as] the same as what possesses signs.
 If one says that one is cultivating signlessness,
 that is just a non-cultivation of signlessness.

Were one to relinquish all strategizing and attachments⁶⁰⁰
 and designate that as constituting signlessness,
 such seizing on this sign of having relinquished attachments
 then becomes the very absence of liberation.

In general, it is because of the existence of grasping,
 that then, because of that grasping, there then is relinquishing.
 It is the abandonment of grasping and whatever thing is grasped⁶⁰¹—
 It is on this basis that one then refers to “relinquishing.”

As for the one who grasps, the grasping to which he resorts,
 as well as that dharma that is subject to being grasped,
 whether as conjoined or separate, they are all entirely nonexistent,⁶⁰²
 for these are all synonymous with quiescent cessation.

If any dharma’s signs are established on the basis of causes,
 this is just something devoid of any [inherently existent] nature.
 Whatever is devoid of any [inherently existent] nature—
 this is just something that is devoid of any [inherently existent] signs.

If a dharma has no [inherently existent] nature—
 this is just something that is signless.
 How can one assert that it has no [inherently existent] nature?
 It is precisely because it is synonymous with signlessness.⁶⁰³

If one uses [such terms as] “existence” and “nonexistence,”
 “both” and “neither” should be permissible as well,⁶⁰⁴ for,
 although one may speak thus, so long as one’s mind is not attached,
 one thereby remains free of any fault in doing so.

Where has there ever first existed some dharma
 that, afterward, was not destroyed?
 Wherever there was first some fire
 that, afterward, was then extinguished,
 the quiescent cessation of these existent signs
 is identical to the quiescent cessation of whatsoever is signless.

Therefore, as for these words about quiescent cessation
 as well as the one who speaks about quiescent cessation,
 from the beginning onward, they have not been quiescent⁶⁰⁵
 nor have they been non-quiescent,
 nor have they been both quiescent and non-quiescent,
 nor have they been neither quiescent nor non-quiescent.

Regarding “maintaining compassion toward beings,” because beings are countless and boundless, one’s mind of compassion is also expansive in that very same way. Also, the Dharma of all buddhas is measureless, boundless, and endless, like empty space. The mind of compassion is the very foundation of the Dharma of all buddhas. It is because it is able to bring about the realization of the great Dharma that it is referred to as the “great” compassion. Among all beings, the one who is the greatest is the Buddha. It is because it is practiced by the Buddha that it is referred to as the “great” compassion.

As for “acquiescence in the dharma of non-self,” one accomplishes this because one has a resolute faith in the true Dharma. It is because it is the one path to nirvāṇa taken by all buddhas that it is known as “the Dharma of non-self.”

If one enters into this dharma and one’s mind is unable to endure it, this is like putting a small plant into a fire, whereupon it is entirely burned up. However, if one puts real gold into a fire, it is able to endure it and it remains entirely undiminished.

In the same way, if a common person, one who has not cultivated roots of goodness, attempts to enter [the dharma of] non-self, he will be unable to bear it and will immediately bring forth erroneous doubts about it. This bodhisattva, however, has cultivated roots of goodness for countless lifetimes. His wisdom has become fiercely sharp and he is sustained by the protective mindfulness of all buddhas. Although he may not yet have cut off the fetters, when he enters into the dharma of non-self, his mind is able to endure and accept it.

“The dharma of non-self” is a reference to all such dharmas as the aggregates, the sense realms, the sense bases, and the twelve-fold chain of causation. The causes and conditions through which one demolishes [the view of] self are as discussed earlier.

Therefore, if one wishes to purify one's practice of śīla, one should practice these four dharmas.

Furthermore:

7. FOUR KINDS OF MONKS WHO BREAK THE MORAL PRECEPTS

There are four individuals who destroy śīla even when seeming to uphold śīla.

The practitioner should be vigorous in exerting self-control and taking care not to act [as they do].

In the “Kāśyapa” chapter of *The Jeweled Summit Sutra*, the Buddha told Kāśyapa:⁶⁰⁶

There are four kinds of bhikshus who break the moral precepts while seeming as if they are bhikshus who uphold the moral precepts. What are those four? Kāśyapa, there are bhikshus who are completely able to perfectly practice the moral precepts of the scriptures and yet claim that a self exists. Kāśyapa, this is what is meant by breaking the moral precepts while seeming as if one is upholding the moral precepts.

Then again, Kāśyapa, there are bhikshus who recite and retain the moral precept scriptures and guard their practice of the moral precepts, but who do not move from and never abandon their view of a real self in association with the body. This is what is meant by breaking the moral precepts while seeming as if one is upholding the moral precepts.

Yet again, Kāśyapa, there are bhikshus who are perfect in their practice of the twelve *dhūta* austerities while nonetheless maintaining the view that dharmas have a fixed existence. This is what is meant by breaking the moral precepts while seeming as if one is upholding the moral precepts.

Then again, Kāśyapa, there are bhikshus who focus on beings as the objective condition in their cultivation of the mind of kindness but who, on hearing that all conditioned things⁶⁰⁷ are characterized by non-production, their minds are filled with terror. This is what is meant by breaking the moral precepts while seeming as if one is upholding the moral precepts.

Kāśyapa, these are the four kinds of persons who break the moral precepts even while seeming as if they are upholding the moral precepts.

Furthermore:

8. FOUR KINDS OF MONKS OF WHICH ONE SHOULD BECOME THE FOURTH

According to what the Bhagavat has taught, there are four types of *śramaṇas*

of which one should become the fourth while distancing oneself from the first three kinds.⁶⁰⁸

As for these four kinds of bhikshus referred to here that are found in the "Kāśyapa" chapter, one should learn to become the fourth kind of *śramaṇa* while avoiding becoming any of the other three kinds. What then are those four? The Buddha told Kāśyapa:

There are four kinds of *śramaṇas*, namely:

First, those who, merely in form and appearance, seem to be *śramaṇas*;

Second, those *śramaṇas* who merely feign extraordinary deportment;

Third, those who are *śramaṇas* simply because they covet fame and self-benefit;

Fourth, *śramaṇas* who genuinely carry on right practice.

a. HE WHO IS A MONK ONLY IN FORM AND APPEARANCE

What is meant by one who is a *śramaṇa* merely in form and appearance? He adopts the form of the *śramaṇa* and adopts the appearance of a *śramaṇa*, doing so specifically through wearing a *saṃghāṭī* robe, shaving off his hair and beard, and carrying a blackened bowl, while nonetheless still engaging in impure physical actions, impure verbal actions, and impure mental actions. He does not seek to reach *nirvāṇa* and does not seek to become good. He is miserly and indolent and practices evil dharmas. He breaks the moral precepts and does not delight in cultivation of the path. This is what is meant by one who is a *śramaṇa* merely in form and appearance.

b. HE WHO MERELY FEIGNS EXTRAORDINARY DEPORTMENT

What is meant by the *śramaṇa* who merely feigns extraordinary deportment? He is perfect in the four kinds of deportment. He investigates the truths, is comfortable and serene in getting by on whatever robes and food he has already acquired, is devoted to the practice of the [four] lineage bases of the Āryas, avoids gathering together with either laypeople or monastics, and speaks but little, but he does all these things in order to seize the attentions of others with a mind that is not pure.

Deportment of this sort is not done for the sake of goodness, is not done for the sake of reaching *nirvāṇa*, and is done with an implicit view that seizes on all dharmas as having a fixed and definite existence. [Such a practitioner] fears the dharmas of emptiness and non-existence in just the same way as one might fear falling into a pit. Whenever he sees anyone who speaks of emptiness, he thinks of him as an enemy. This is what is meant by the *śramaṇa* who merely feigns extraordinary deportment.

c. HE WHO IS A MONK ONLY FOR FAME AND SELF-BENEFIT

What is meant by one who is a *śramaṇa* simply because he covets fame and self-benefit? There are those *śramaṇas* who, although they are able to force themselves to uphold the moral precepts, [as they do so, they think], “How can I cause other people to know me as one who upholds the moral precepts?”

Although they are able to force themselves to strive after extensive learning, [as they do so, they think], “How can I cause other people to know me as someone possessed of extensive learning?”

Although they are able to force themselves to take up the dharma of abiding in a forest hermitage, [as they do so, they think], “How can I cause other people to know that I am a forest hermitage dweller?”

Although they are able to force themselves to have but few wants, to be easily satisfied, and to practice the dharmas of one who dwells in solitude, as they do so, they think, “How can I cause other people to know that I have but few wants, am easily satisfied, and practice the dharmas of one who dwells in solitude?”

They do not do these things in order to develop a mind of renunciation, do not do them in order to destroy the afflictions, do not do them in order to strive in the eight-fold right path of the Āryas, do not do them in order to reach nirvāṇa, and do not do them in order to bring about the liberation of all beings. This is what is meant by the *śramaṇa* who covets fame and self-benefit.

d. THE MONK WHO GENUINELY CARRIES ON RIGHT PRACTICE

What is meant by the *śramaṇa* who genuinely carries on right practice? There is a type of *śramaṇa* who does not retain any selfish cherishing even of his own body, how much the less might he cherish fame or self-benefit? On being taught that all dharmas are empty and that nothing whatsoever exists, his mind is filled with great joy and he proceeds to practice in accordance with that teaching.

He does not have any selfish cherishing even of nirvāṇa as he carries on his practice of *brahmacarya*, how much the less might he have any selfish cherishing of [any station of rebirth within] the three realms?

He is not even attached to the view that sees the emptiness [of all dharmas], how much the less might he become attached to the existence of a self, a person, a being, a soul, a life, a knower, or a seer?

He seeks liberation even in the midst of the afflictions and does not seek it anywhere outside. He contemplates all dharmas as fundamentally pure and undefiled. This person relies only on himself and does not rely on anyone else. Through [his direct knowing of] the true character of all dharmas, he does not even covet the Dharma body, how much the less the form body. He sees dharmas as transcending

marks and as inexpressible in words. He does not even make any discriminating distinctions among those in the community of Āryas who course in the unconditioned, how much the less might he do so among those in the common multitude of people? He does not for the sake of severance or for the sake of cultivation abhor *saṃsāra* on the one hand and delight in *nirvāṇa* on the other. For him, there is neither bondage nor liberation. He realizes that the Dharma of the Buddhas has no fixed aspects and, having realized this, he neither comes and goes in *saṃsāra*, nor opts to enter *nirvāṇa*, either.

Kāśyapa, this is what is meant by the *śramaṇa* who accords with genuine practice. Kāśyapa, you should all be diligent in the practice of the genuine-practice *śramaṇa*. Do not allow yourselves to be harmed for the sake of a reputation.

9. WRONG MOTIVATIONS FOR UPHOLDING THE PRACTICE OF MORAL VIRTUE

Moreover:

Do not uphold the practice of *śīla*
merely for the sake of kingship or other such things.
Also, do not uphold the practice of *śīla*
to obtain a particular rebirth or other such aims.

The practitioner who wishes to purify his practice of *śīla* should not practice it for the sake of such things as kingship. With regard to such things as becoming a king, when speaking for the benefit of the stalwart, Pure Virtue, the Buddha said, "Son of Good Family, as for the bodhisattva who practices *śīla*:

He will never break a moral precept even at the cost of his own life;
He does not uphold the moral precepts hoping to become a king;
He does not uphold the moral precepts hoping to achieve celestial rebirth;
He does not uphold the moral precepts hoping to become Śakra, ruler of the devas, hoping to become the Brahma Heaven King, or hoping to gain wealth, happiness, or unconstrained and independent power;
He does not uphold the moral precepts for the sake of fame or praise, for the sake of offerings, for the sake of a long lifespan, or for the sake of drink, food, robes, bedding, medicines, or other life-sustaining things;
He does not uphold the moral precepts in reliance on dharmas concerned with rebirths and such. Hence he does not do so for the sake of being reborn among devas or humans;
He does not uphold the moral precepts because of concerns having to do with himself;

- He does not uphold the moral precepts because of concerns having to do with others;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts because of present-life concerns;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts because of future-life concerns;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts out of concerns associated with his physical form, out of concerns associated with feelings, perceptions, formative factors, or consciousnesses, out of concerns associated with the eyes, out of concerns associated with the sense bases, or out of concerns associated with the ears, nose, tongue, body, or mind faculty;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts out of concerns associated with the desire realm, form realm, or formless realm;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts to be liberated from the wretched destinies of the hell realm, the animal realm, the hungry ghost realm, or the *asura* realm;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts out of fear of being poverty-stricken when reborn among the devas;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts out of fear of being poverty-stricken when reborn among humans;
- He does not uphold the moral precepts out of fear of being poverty-stricken when reborn among the *yakṣas*.

10. RIGHT MOTIVATIONS FOR UPHOLDING THE PRACTICE OF MORAL VIRTUE

Question: If [this bodhisattva] does not [uphold the moral precepts] out of concern for these sorts of things, then for the sake of which sorts of things does he uphold the moral precepts?

Response:

- It is because he wishes to cause the Three Jewels to abide for a long time that he upholds the moral precepts.
- It is because he wishes to obtain the many different sorts of benefits that he upholds the moral precepts.

As for “causing the Three Jewels to abide for a long time”:

- It is in order to prevent the cutting off of the lineage of the Buddhas that he upholds the moral precepts;
- It is in order to turn the wheel of Dharma that he upholds the moral precepts;
- It is in order to attract a community of *āryas* that he upholds the moral precepts;
- It is in order to gain liberation from birth, aging, sickness, death, lamentation, grief, pain, and melancholy that he upholds the moral precepts;

- It is in order to facilitate the liberation of all beings that he upholds the moral precepts;
 It is in order to cause all beings to gain peace and happiness that he upholds the moral precepts;
 It is in order to cause beings to reach a peaceful and secure⁶⁰⁹ place that he upholds the moral precepts;
 It is in order to cultivate the *dhyāna* absorptions that he upholds the moral precepts;
 It is in order to gain wisdom, liberation, and the knowledge and vision of liberation that he upholds the moral precepts.

These matters are just as extensively discussed in *The Pure Virtue Sutra*.

11. THE BENEFITS OF PERFECTING THE PRACTICE OF MORAL VIRTUE

The bodhisattva who is able in this fashion to perfect the practice of *śīla* will not lose the ten benefits or the many other different types of benefits.

Additionally, he will not fall down into erroneous paths associated with the four difficulties. He will not encounter the four dharmas associated with loss and he will not encounter the four dharmas associated with destruction, He will also gain the four dharmas by which one does not deceive the Buddhas or others. He is able to pass beyond susceptibility to falling into the hells and the rest of the ten terror-inducing circumstances.

“Will not lose the ten benefits” refers to:

- Not losing the ability to always become a wheel-turning king;
 Not losing the non-neglectful mind when acting in that capacity;
 Not losing the ability to always become Śakra, ruler of the devas;
 Not losing the non-neglectful mind when acting in that capacity;
 Never losing one's quest to seek the path of all buddhas;
 Never losing those things that all bodhisattvas are taught;
 Never losing the unimpeded knowledge of eloquence;
 Never losing [the pursuit of] the planting of roots of goodness and merit and the fulfillment of whatsoever one has vowed to accomplish;
 Never losing that due to which one is praised by all buddhas, bodhisattvas, worthies and *āryas*;
 Never losing the ability to swiftly perfect the attainment of all-knowledge.

These are the ten [benefits of perfecting the practice of *śīla*].

“The many other different types of benefits” refers to never retreating from or losing one’s many different sorts of meritorious qualities. This is as described in the sutras:

The bodhisattva who skillfully guards his ability to uphold the moral precepts:

Is always praised by the devas;
 Is well protected by the dragon kings;
 Is the beneficiary of people’s offerings;
 Is always borne in mind by all buddhas;
 Always serves as a great teacher of those in the world;
 And is sympathetically mindful of beings.

As for “not falling down into erroneous paths associated with the four difficulties,” the bodhisattva who is able to perfect the practice of *śīla* in this manner will not fall into places [of rebirth] beset with the four difficulties, namely:

First, he will not be born into a place in which the Buddha is not present;

Second, he will not be born into a household in which wrong views hold sway;

Third, he will not take rebirth among the long-lived devas;

Fourth, he will not be reborn into any of the wretched destinies.

“The four dharmas associated with loss” are:

First, he never loses the resolve to attain bodhi;

Second, he never loses his mindfulness of the Buddha;

Third, he never loses his constant quest for extensive learning;

Fourth, he never loses his ability to call to mind the events experienced across the course of countless lifetimes.

Regarding “not encountering the four dharmas associated with destruction” this refers to:

First, never encountering the destruction of the Dharma;

Second, never encountering weapons or war;

Third, never encountering noxious poisons;

Fourth, never encountering hunger.

As for “gaining the four dharmas of non-deception,” they are:

First, one does not deceive the Buddhas of the ten directions;

Second, one does not deceive devas, spirits, or other such beings;

Third, one does not deceive beings;

Fourth, one does not deceive oneself.

Also, regarding “passing beyond the ten terror-inducing circumstances,” the bodhisattva who purifies the moral precepts in this way thereby becomes able to pass beyond any vulnerability to falling down into the hells or into any of the other situations contained in the ten terror-inducing circumstances. What then are those ten? They are:

- First, one is able to pass beyond the fear of falling into the hell realms;
- Second, one is able to pass beyond the fear of falling into the animal realms;
- Third, one is able to pass beyond the fear of falling into the hungry ghost realms;
- Fourth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of becoming poverty-stricken;
- Fifth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of slander, rebuke, and bad reputation;
- Sixth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of being overcome by the various sorts of afflictions;
- Seventh, one is able to pass beyond the fear of reaching the [irreversible] “right and definite position” (*samyaktva niyāma*) [in the paths] of the *śrāvaka* disciples and the *pratyekabuddhas*;
- Eighth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of [falling into the destinies of] devas, men, dragons, spirits, *yakṣas*, *gandharvas*, *asuras*, *garuḍas*, *kinnaras*, *mahoragas*, and others;
- Ninth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of weapons or war, noxious poisons, water, fire, lions, tigers, wolves, and injury by other men;
- Tenth, one is able to pass beyond the fear of adopting wrong views.

If the bodhisattva is able in this manner to purify his observance of the moral precepts, then he will be able to abide within the Dharma of all Buddhas, namely the forty exclusive dharmas, and he will also be able to become a Dharma vessel.