

	Essler (Sanskrit)	Tsultrim	Chunzin & Roach (Tibet)	Krause (Tibet)
1	<p><i>So hab' ich es gehört: Zu einer Zeit weilte der Bhagavan bei Srāvastī im Sieger-Hain, dort im Kloster Anāthapiṇḍada's. Mit ihm hielt sich dort damals auch ein großer Kreis von Bhikṣus auf, bestehend 1.250 Bhikṣus, [unter ihnen] auch viele Bodhisattvas, [somit] Mahāsattvas.</i></p> <p><i>[An einem dieser Tage] bekleidete sich der Bhagavan früh am Morgen, warf sich den Mantel über, nahm seine [Almosen-] Schale, begab sich nach Srāvastī, [und betrat] diese Großstadt, um hier Almosen zu sammeln. Nachdem er dann [das dabei an Essensresten des Vortags Erhaltene] verspeist hatte, kehrte er von diesem Rundgang [durch Srāvastī] zurück [ins Kloster].</i></p> <p><i>Dort legte er den Mantel und die Schale ab, wusch sich die Füße, und setzte sich mit gekreuzten Beinen auf eine für ihn vorbereitete Sitzmatte. Seinen Körper hielt er dabei aufrecht; und achtsam festigte er seine Aufmerksamkeit nach vorne hin.</i></p> <p><i>Daraufhin begaben sich viele Bhikṣus hin zu dem [Platz], an dem der Bhagavan da weilte, begrüßten seine Füße mit ihren Häuptern, umrundeten ihn dreimal, ihm dabei ihre rechte Seite zukehrend, und setzten sich sodann ihm zur Seite nieder.</i></p>	<p><i>Thus did I hear at one time. The Bhagavān was dwelling at Shravasti, in the grove of Prince Jeta, in the garden of Anāthapiṇḍada, 3 together with a great Sangha of bhikṣus of 1,250 bhikṣus and a great many bodhisattva mahāsattvas.</i></p> <p><i>Then, in the morning, having put on the lower and upper Dharma robes and carried the begging bowl, the Bhagavan entered the great city of Shravasti to request alms. Then, having gone to the great city of Shravasti to request alms, the Bhagavān afterwards enjoyed the alms food, and having performed the activity of food, since he had given up alms of later food, put away the begging bowl and upper robe. He washed his feet, sat upon the prepared cushion, and having assumed the cross-legged posture, straightened the body upright and placed mindfulness in front. Then, many bhikṣus approached to the place where the Bhagavān was and, having reached there, bowing their heads to the Bhagavan's feet, circumambulated three times and sat to one side.</i></p>	<p><i>These words once I heard. The Conqueror was residing at Shravasti, in the park of Anāpindada in the gardens of Prince Jeta. In convocation with him was a great gathering of 1.250 monks who were listeners, as well as an immense number of bodhisattvas who were great beings.</i></p> <p><i>In the morning then the Conqueror donned his monk's robes and outer shawl, took up his sage's bowl, and entered the great city of Shravasti for requesting his meal. After collecting the food, he returned from the city and partook of it. When he had finished eating, he put away his bowl and shawl, for he was a person who had given up eating in the latter part of the day. Lord Buddha then washed his feet and seated himself on a cushion that had been set forth for him. He crossed his legs in the full lotus position, straightened his back, and placed his thoughts into a state of contemplation.</i></p> <p><i>Then a great number of monks advanced towards the Conqueror and, when they had reached his side, bowed and touched their heads to his feet. They circled him in respect three times, and seated themselves to one side.</i></p>	<p><i>Folgendes habe ich einst vernommen: Der Erhabene hielt sich mit einer großen Sangha von Ordinierten - 1250 Mönchen - sowie zahlreichen Großen Bodhisattvas im Gartengelände von Anāthapiṇḍada im Park des Prinzen Jeta in Srāvastī auf.</i></p> <p><i>Am Morgen legte der Erhabene dann den Mönchsrock und Umhang an, nahm die Almosen-schale und begab sich auf Almosengang hinaus in die große Stadt Srāvastī. Nach dem Almosengang in die große Stadt Srāvastī nahm er die Speisen zu sich. Nachdem er die Speisen zu sich genommen hatte, legte er den Umhang und die Almosenschale beiseite, denn er hatte es aufgegeben, später am Tage zu essen. Er wusch seine Füße, ließ sich in Vajrahaltung auf einem für ihn bereiteten Kissen nieder, richtete sich gerade auf und versetzte [den Geist] in klare Vergegenwärtigung.</i></p> <p><i>Viele Mönche näherten sich dann dem Ort, wo sich der Erhabene befand, und als sie ihn erreichten, verbeugten sie sich mit dem Kopf zu seinen Füßen, umrundeten den Erhabenen drei Mal und ließen sich dann auf einer Seite nieder.</i></p>
2-1	<p><i>[Bald danach] begab sich [auch] der Ehrwürdige Subhūti zu dieser Versammlung; und er setzte sich [neben die anderen Bhikṣus] hin. ..., erhob er sich von seinem Sitzplatz, warf seinen Mantel über die eine Schulter, kniete sich mit dem rechten Knie auf den Boden, faltete seine Hände, und richtete sie zum Bhagavan hin aus.</i></p>	<p><i>Also at that time, the venerable Subhūti, joining that very assembly, sat down. Then, the venerable Subhūti rose from the seat, placed the upper robe over one shoulder, set his right knee on the ground, bowed, joining the palms, toward the Bhagavān, and said this to the Bhagavān:</i></p>	<p><i>At this point the junior monk Subhuti was with this same group of disciples, and he took his seat with them. Then the junior monk Subhuti rose from his cushion, dropped the corner of his upper robe from one shoulder in a gesture of respect, and knelt with his right knee to the ground. He faced the Conqueror, joined his palms at his heart, and bowed. Then he beseeched the Conqueror, in the following words:</i></p>	<p><i>Zu dieser Zeit setzte sich auch der Sthavira Subhūti, der zu eben diesem Gefolge gehörte. Der ehrbare Subhūti erhob sich dann von seinem Sitz, hängte das Umschlagtuch seiner Robe über eine Schulter, kniete mit dem rechten Knie auf der Erde nieder und verneigte sich mit zusammengelegten Händen vor dem Erhabenen. Dann ersuchte er den Erhabenen mit folgenden Worten:</i></p>
2-2	<p><i>"Wunderbar ist es, o Bhagavan, ja, ganz außerordentlich wunderbar es, o Sugata, wie durch den Tathāgata – den Arhat, den Samyaksaṃbuddha – [all] den Bodhisattvas – [diesen] Mahāsattvas – mit großer Unterstützung geholfen worden ist, wie sie durch ihn mit großem Beistand gefördert worden sind!</i></p> <p><i>[Mich betreffend wie auch Andere, die sich nach einer solchen Unterstützung und nach einer solchen Förderung sehnen, bitt' ich nun:] Wie sollte [daher – um ebenfalls einen solchen hohen Zustand zu erreichen –] ein Sohn oder eine Tochter von guter Herkunft, der oder die in den Bodhisattvayāna eingetreten sind, sich verhalten, wie sollten er</i></p>	<p><i>"Bhagavān, the extent to which the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Enlightened Buddha has benefited the bodhisattva mahāsattvas with highest benefit, the extent to which the Tathāgata has entrusted the bodhisattva mahāsattvas with highest entrustment– Bhagavān, it is astonishing; Sugata, it is astonishing. Bhagavān, how should one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle abide, how practice, how control the mind?"</i></p>	<p><i>"O Conqueror, the Buddha, the One Gone Thus, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Totally Enlightened One, has given much beneficial instruction to the bodhisattvas who are great beings. All the instruction he has ever given has been of benefit. And the One Gone Thus, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Totally Enlightened One, has as well instructed these bodhisattvas who are great beings by granting them clear direction. All the clear direction he has ever granted, o Conqueror, has been a wondrous thing. It is, o Conqueror, a wondrous thing. And now, o Conquering One, what of those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva? How shall they live? How shall they practice? How should they keep their</i></p>	<p><i>"Erhabener, es ist erstaunlich, in welchem Ausmaß der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha den Großen Bodhisattvas den höchsten zu erbringenden Nutzen hat zukommen lassen, in welchem Maße der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha den Großen Bodhisattvas die höchste zu erweisende Gunst erwiesen hat – es ist erstaunlich, o Sugata. Erhabener, wie sollte jemand, der wirklich ins Fahrzeug der Bodhisattvas eingetreten ist, darin verbleiben, wie es verwirklichen, wie den Geist am besten lenken?"</i></p>

	oder sie [dabei] vorangehen, wie sollten er oder sie [dabei] seine oder ihre Geisteszustände in den Griff bekommen?"		thoughts?"	
2-3	"Ja, so ist es, wie du es sagst, Subhūti: Der Tathāgata hat den Bodhisattvas – [diesen] Mahāsattvas – so geholfen und sie so gefördert. Darum, Subhūti, höre nun gut und aufmerksam zu! [Denn] ich werde dir [nun in der jetzt gebotenen Kürze] darlegen, wie solche, die den Weg der Bodhisattvas angetreten sind, sich verhalten sollen, wie sie vorangehen sollen, wie sie [dabei und dadurch] ihre Geisteszustände in den Griff bekommen [können]!"	"Subhūti, well said, well said. Subhūti, it is so; it is so. The Tathāgata has benefited the bodhisattva mahāsattvas with the highest benefit. The Tathāgata has entrusted the bodhisattva mahāsattvas with the highest entrustment. Subhūti, therefore, listen and properly retain it in mind, and I will explain to you how one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle should abide, how practice, how control the mind."	"O Subhuti, it is good, it is good. O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus it is: the One Thus Gone has indeed done benefit to the bodhisattvas who are great beings, by granting them beneficial instruction. The One Thus Gone has indeed given clear direction to the bodhisattvas who are great beings, by granting them the clearest of instruction. O Subhuti, it is good, it is good. O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus it is: the One Thus Gone has indeed done benefit to the bodhisattvas who are great beings, by granting them beneficial instruction. The One Thus Gone has indeed given clear direction to the bodhisattvas who are great beings, by granting them the clearest of instruction."	"Gut, gut, Subhūti. Ganz recht, Subhūti, so ist es. Der Tathāgata hat den Großen Bodhisattvas höchsten Nutzen zukommen lassen; der Tathāgata hat den Großen Bodhisattvas umfassende Gunst erwiesen. Also höre, Subhūti, und behalte es gut im Sinn. Wie jemand, der wirklich ins Fahrzeug der Bodhisattvas eingetreten ist, darin verbleiben, es verwirklichen, den Geist am besten lenken soll: Ich will es dir sagen."
2-4	"So werd' ich [zuhören], o Bhagavan!"	"Bhagavān, so be it"	"Thus shall I do."	"So sei es, Erhabener"
3	<p>"Subhūti! Jemand, der in den Bodhisattvayāna eingetreten ist, sollt' in seinem Geist diese [Grundhaltung] hervorbringen: 'So viele Lebewesen, wie im Bereich der Lebewesen in [den verschiedenen Arten des] Geborenwerdens – bezeichnet dann mit 'Lebewesen' – gibt, sei's mit Gestalt oder sei's ohne Gestalt, sei's mit Unterscheidung[sfähigkeit] oder sei's ohne Unterscheidung[sfähigkeit] oder sei's weder mit noch ohne Unterscheidung[sfähigkeit], soweit irgendeine erfassbare Gestalt von Lebewesen erfasst wird: Sie alle muss ich zum Nirvana führen, zu diesem Bereich des Nirvana, das nichts zurückbehält. Aber wiewohl unüberschaubar viele Lebewesen danach auf solche Weise zum Nirvana geleitet worden sind, ist [–ganz genau genommen–] überhaupt kein Lebewesen zum Nirvana geführt worden!'"</p> <p>Warum ist dies so? Einer, der [mit entsprechenden Begriffen, die in ihm verankert sind] – wie: 'Selbst' und 'Lebewesen' wie auch: 'Lebenskraft' und 'Individuum' – Unterscheidungen fällt, der darf nicht als ein Bodhisattva erachtet werden."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, here, one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle should generate the mind [of enlightenment] thinking this: 'As many as are included in the category of sentient being – born from egg, born from the womb, born from heat and moisture, born miraculously; with form, without form, with discrimination, with- out discrimination, without discrimination but not without [subtle] discrimination – the realm of sentient beings, as many as are designated by imputation as sentient beings, all those I shall cause to pass completely beyond sorrow into the realm of nirvana without remainder of the aggregates. Although limitless sentient beings have thus been caused to pass completely beyond sorrow, no sentient being whatsoever has been caused to pass completely beyond sorrow."</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because if a bodhisattva engages in discriminating a sentient being, he is not to be called a 'bodhisattva'."</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, if anyone engages in discriminating a sentient being, or engages in discriminating a living being, or engages in discriminating a person, they are not to be called a 'bodhisattva'."</p>	<p>"Subhuti, this is how those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva must think to themselves as they feel the Wish to achieve enlightenment: I will bring to nirvana the total amount of living beings, every single one numbered among the ranks of living kind: those who were born from eggs, those who were born from a womb, those who were born through warmth and moisture, those who were born miraculously, those who have a physical form, those with none, those with conceptions, those with none, and those with neither conceptions nor no conceptions. However many living beings there are, in whatever realms there may be, anyone at all labelled with the name of 'living being,' all these will I bring to total nirvana, to the sphere beyond all grief, where none of the parts of the suffering person are left at all. Yet even if I do manage to bring this limitless number of living beings to total nirvana, there will be no living being at all who was brought to their total nirvana."</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, Subhuti, if a bodhisattva were to slip into conceiving of someone as a living being, then we could never call them a 'bodhisattva'."</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, if anyone were to slip into conceiving of someone as a living being, or as something that lives, or as a person, then we could never call them a 'bodhisattva'."</p>	<p>"Dazu, Subhūti, sollte jemand, der wirklich ins Fahrzeug der Bodhisattvas eingetreten ist, das Bewusstsein entwickeln, indem er denkt: Wie viele es unter den Arten der Lebewesen auch gibt – seien es aus dem Ei Hervorgegangene, aus einem Leib Geborene, aus Wärme und Feuchtigkeit oder durch Wunder Entstandene, ob mit Form oder ohne Form, ob mit Unterscheidung, ob ohne, oder ob sie unterscheidungslos und doch nicht ohne Unterscheidung sind – so vielen auch in den Bereichen der Lebewesen die Bezeichnung Lebewesen zukommt, sie alle werde ich dazu bringen, über alles Leid hinauszu gelangen in den Bereich des Nirvāna ohne Überreste von Skandhas. Doch obwohl so unermesslich viele Lebewesen über alles Leid hinausge langt sein werden, so wird doch gar kein Lebewesen über alles Leid hinausge langt sein."</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, wenn ein Bodhisattva sich auf die Unterscheidung von Lebewesen einlässt, ist er nicht Bodhisattva zu nennen."</p> <p>Warum? Weil niemand, der sich auf Unterscheidung von Lebewesen, Unterscheidung von Lebendigem, Unterscheidung von Personen einlässt, Bodhisattva zu nennen ist."</p>
4-1	"Subhūti! [Mit der so erfolgreichen Geisteshaltung] sollte [daher] ein Bodhisattva, der eine Gabe spendet, sich dabei nicht	"Further, Subhūti, a bodhisattva gives a gift without abiding in a thing; gives a gift without abiding in any phenomenon	"And I say, o Subhuti, that a bodhisattva performs the act of giving without staying in things. They perform the act of	"Subhūti. Ein Bodhisattva sollte auch Gaben geben, ohne bei Dingen zu verweilen, Subhūti. Er sollte Gaben geben, ohne

	<p>auf Dinge [oder auf deren Eigenschaften] oder auf sonst was [stützen]: nicht auf [Seh-Gegenstände als] Gesehenes, nicht auf [Hör-Gegenstände als] Gehörtes, nicht auf [Riech-Gegenstände als] Geruchenes, nicht auf [Schmeck-Gegenstände als] Geschmecktes, nicht auf [Tast-Gegenstände als] Getastetes, nicht auf [Denk-Gegenstände als] Gedachtes.</p> <p>Denn, Subhūti, der Bodhisattva –[als ein] Mahāsattva– sollte Gaben auf eine Art spenden, dass er sich dabei nicht auf ein –wie auch immer geartetes– Unterscheiden stützt. Er sollte dies deswegen nicht machen, weil dann, indem er solcherart ungestützt spendet, die Anhäufung seines Verdienstes nicht leicht zu ermessen ist.</p> <p>Was meinst du, Subhūti: Ist die Ausdehnung des Raums nach Osten, nach Süden, nach Westen, nach Norden, nach unten, nach oben, nach den Zwischenrichtungen, [kurz gesagt:] nach allen zehn Himmelsrichtungen rundherum messbar?"</p>	<p>whatsoever. A gift should be given not abiding in visual form; a gift should be given not abiding in sound, smell, taste, tactility, or phenomenon either. Subhūti, without abiding in discriminating anything whatsoever as any sign, thus does a bodhisattva give a gift.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because the heap of merit of that bodhisattva who gives a gift without abiding, Subhūti, is not easy to take the measure of.</p> <p>Subhūti, what do you think about this? Do you think it is easy to take the measure of space in the east?"</p>	<p>giving without staying in any object at all. They perform the act of giving without staying in things that you see. They perform the act of giving without staying in sounds, and without staying in smells, or tastes, or things that you touch, or in objects of the thought.</p> <p>O Subhuti, bodhisattvas perform the act of giving without conceiving of anything in any way as a sign. That is how they give.</p> <p>Why is it so? Think, o Subhuti, of the mountains of merit collected by any bodhisattva who performs the act of giving without staying. This merit, o Subhuti, is not something that you could easily ever measure.</p> <p>O Subhuti, what do you think? Would it be easy to measure the space to the east of us?"</p>	<p>bei irgendetwas zu verweilen. Er sollte auch geben, ohne bei Formen zu verweilen, und desgleichen sollte er geben, ohne bei Tönen, Gerüchen, Geschmäckern, Tastbarem und Phänomenen zu verweilen.</p> <p>Subhūti, ohne bei der Unterscheidung von überhaupt irgendetwas als Merkmal zu verweilen - so gibt ein Bodhisattva Gaben.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, das Ausmaß der Anhäufung von positivem Potenzial eines Bodhisattvas, der gibt, ohne bei irgendetwas zu verweilen, ist nicht leicht zu erfassen.</p> <p>Was meinst du, Subhūti: Ist es leicht, das Ausmaß des östlichen Himmelsraums zu erfassen?"</p>
4-2		"Bhagavān, it is not so."	"O Conqueror, it would not."	"Erhabener, das ist es nicht."
4-3		"Subhūti, similarly, do you think it is easy to take the measure of space in the south, west, north, above, below, the intermediate directions, and the ten directions?"	"And just so, would it be easy to measure the space in any of the main directions to the south of us, or to the west of us, or to the north of us, or above us, or below us, or in any of the other directions from us? Would it be easy to measure the space to any of the ten directions from where we now stand?"	"Und ebenso – Subhūti, was meinst du, ist es leicht, das Ausmaß des südlichen, westlichen, nördlichen Himmelsraumes, des Raumes über uns, unter uns, eines der Himmelsrichtungen dazwischen oder des Raumes aller zehn Richtungen zu erfassen?"
4-4	"In keiner Weise!"	"Bhagavān, it is not so."	"Conqueror, it would not."	"Erhabener, das ist es nicht."
4-5	"In vergleichbarer Weise ist auch die Anhäufung des Verdienstes eines Bodhisattvas, der ungestützt [auf ein angebliches Sein des Erscheinenden] eine Gabe spendet, nicht leicht zu ermessen. Und deswegen, Subhūti, sollten solche, die in den Bodhisattvayāna eingetreten sind, Gaben spenden, ohne sich dabei auf ein begrifflich erfolgtes Unterscheiden [als angeblich begriffsunabhängig bestehende Unterschiede] zu stützen."	"Subhūti, similarly, the heap of merit of that bodhisattva who gives a gift without abiding is also not easy to take the measure of."	"And just so, Subhuti, it would be no easy thing to measure the mountains of merit collected by any bodhisattva who performs the act of giving without staying."	"Eben deshalb, Subhūti - genauso ist auch das Ausmaß von positivem Potenzial eines Bodhisattvas, der Gaben gibt, ohne bei etwas zu verweilen, nicht leicht zu erfassen, Subhūti."
5-1	"Was meinst du, Subhūti: Kann der Tathāgāta durch ihm zukommende Merkmale gesehen werden?"	"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Is one viewed as the Tathāgāta due to the perfect marks?"	"Now Subhuti, what do you think? Should we consider someone to be One Thus Gone, just because they possess the totally exquisite marks that we find on a Buddha's body?"	"Was meinst du, Subhūti, ist jemand anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgāta zu betrachten?"
5-2	"Nein, o Bhagavan! Denn –so hat dies der Tathāgāta gelehrt– was da [–im Sinn des üblichen Sprachgebrauchs–] ein Besitzen von Merkmalen ist, das ist im eigentlichen Sinn ein Nicht-Besitzen von Merkmalen!"	"Bhagavān, it is not so; one is not viewed as the Tathāgāta due to the perfect marks. Why is that? Because, that itself which the Tathāgāta called perfect marks are not perfect marks."	"O Conquering One, we should not. We should not consider anyone One Thus Gone just because they possess the totally exquisite marks that we find on a Buddha's body. And why not? Because when the One Thus Gone himself described the totally exquisite marks on a Buddha's body, he stated at the same time that they were impossible."	"Erhabener, so ist es nicht; jemand ist nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgāta zu betrachten. Warum? Weil eben die vollkommenen Merkmale, die der Tathāgāta nannte, nicht vollkommene Merkmale sind."
5-3	"Was da [im üblichen Sinn] ein Besitzen	"Subhūti, to the degree there are perfect	"O Subhuti, what do you think? The	"Insofern es vollkommene Merkmale

	<p>von Merkmalen ist, das ist Täuschung; was da [hingegen im eigentlichen Sinn] ein Nicht-Besitzen von Merkmalen –und, mehr noch: was Nicht-Merkmale!– sind, das ist keine Täuschung. Daher ist der Tathāgata als einer zu erachten, dessen Merkmal [eben diese] Merkmalslosigkeit ist."</p>	<p>marks, to that degree there is deception. To the degree there are no perfect marks, to that degree there is no deception. Thus, view the Tathāgata as marks and no marks."</p>	<p>totally exquisite marks on a Buddha's body are, as such, are deceptive. The totally exquisite marks on a Buddha's body are also not deceptive, but only insofar as they do not exist. And so you should see the One Thus Gone as having no marks, no marks [to indicate his nature] at all."</p>	<p>gibt, Subhūti, insofern sind sie falsch. Soweit es vollkommene Merkmale nicht gibt, so weit sind sie nicht falsch. In dieser Weise sollte man den Tathāgata als Merkmal und merkmalslos ansehen."</p>
6-1	<p><i>Essler: "Meiner Sicht nach ist der Abschnitt [6] ein –wohl von Schülern Nāgārjuna's erfolgter– Einschub, jedenfalls einer, der ein halbes Jahrtausend nach dem Tod Buddha Sākyamuni's vorgenommen worden ist. Daher lass' ich ihn gänzlich weg."</i></p>	<p>"Bhagavān, in the future period, at the end of the five hundred, when the holy Dharma will totally perish, will any sentient beings produce correct discrimination upon the words of Sūtras such as this being explained?"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, what will happen in the future, in the days of the last five hundred, when the holy Dharma is approaching its final destruction? How could anyone of those times ever see accurately the meaning of the explanations given in sūtras such as this one?"</p>	<p>"Erhabener, wie kann es geschehen, dass in der Zukunft am Ende der letzten 500 [Jahre der Lehre], wenn der heilige Dharma völlig vernichtet sein wird, irgendwelche Wesen korrekte Unterscheidung in Bezug auf solche Erklärungen der Sūtra-Worte hervorbringen?"</p>
6-2		<p>"Subhūti, do not say what you have said, '...in the future period, at the end of the five hundred, when the holy Dharma will totally perish, will any sentient beings produce correct discrimination upon the words of Sūtras such as this being explained...'. Moreover, Subhūti, in the future period, at the end of the five hundred, when the holy Dharma will totally perish, there will be bodhisattva mahāsattvas, endowed with morality, endowed with qualities, endowed with wisdom.</p> <p>Subhūti, those bodhisattva mahāsattvas moreover will not have made homage to just a single Buddha; they will not have produced roots of virtue to just a single Buddha. Subhūti, there will be bodhisattva mahāsattvas who have made homage to many hundred thousands of Buddhas and produced roots of virtue to many hundred thousands of Buddhas.</p> <p>Subhūti, those who will acquire merely a single mind of faith upon the words of such Sūtras as this being explained, Subhūti, the Tathāgata knows. Subhūti, they are seen by the Tathāgata; Subhūti, all those sentient beings will produce and perfectly collect an unfathomable heap of merit.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because those bodhisattva mahāsattvas will not engage in discriminating a self and will not discriminate a sentient being, will not discriminate a living being, will not engage in discriminating a person.</p> <p>Subhūti, those bodhisattva mahāsattvas will not engage in discriminating phenomena nor discriminating non-phenomena; nor will they engage in discrimination or non-discrimination.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because if those bodhisattva mahāsattvas engage in discriminating phenomena, that itself would</p>	<p>"Subhuti, you should never ask the question you have just asked: 'What will happen in the future, in the days of the last five hundred, when the Dharma is approaching its final destruction? How could anyone of those times ever see accurately the meaning of the explanations given in sūtras such as this one? I say to you, o Subhuti, that in the future, in the days of the last five hundred, when the holy Dharma is approaching its final destruction, there will come bodhisattvas who are great beings, who possess morality, who possess the fine quality, and who possess wisdom.</p> <p>And these bodhisattvas who are great beings, o Subhuti, will not be ones who have rendered honor to but a single Buddha, or who have collected stores of virtue with a single Buddha. Instead, o Subhuti, they will be ones who have rendered honor to many hundreds of thousands of Buddhas, and who have collected stores of virtue with many hundreds of thousands of Buddhas. Such are the bodhisattvas, the great beings, who then will come. Suppose, o Subhuti, that a person reaches even just a single feeling of faith for the words of a sūtra such as this one. The One Thus Gone, Subhuti, knows any such person. The One Thus Gone, Subhuti, sees any such person. Such a person, o Subhuti, has produced, and gathered safely into themselves, a mountain of merit beyond any calculation.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, Subhuti, these bodhisattvas who are great beings never slip into any conception of something as a self, nor do they slip into any conception of something as a living being, nor any conception of something as being alive, nor any conception of something as a person. Subhuti, these bodhisattvas who are great beings neither slip into any</p>	<p>"Subhūti, sprich nicht so - wie es geschehen kann, dass in der Zukunft am Ende der letzten 500 Jahre, wenn der Dharma völlig zugrunde gerichtet sein wird, irgendwelche Wesen korrekte Unterscheidung in Bezug auf solche Erklärungen der Sūtra-Worte hervorbringen. Subhūti, auch in der Zukunft, am Ende der letzten 500 Jahre, wenn der heilige Dharma völlig zugrunde gegangen sein wird, wird es Große Bodhisattvas geben, die Ethik besitzen, Qualitäten besitzen und Weisheit besitzen.</p> <p>Auch haben jene Großen Bodhisattvas nicht [nur] einem Buddha Ehre erwiesen, nicht [nur] vor einem Buddha Wurzeln von Heilsamem hervorgebracht, Subhūti, sondern es werden Große Bodhisattvas auftauchen, die vielen hunderttausend Buddhas Ehre erwiesen, vor vielen hunderttausend Buddhas Wurzeln von Heilsamem hervorgebracht haben. Der Tathāgata kennt sie, der Tathāgata sieht sie, die auch nur einen einzigen Bewusstseinszustand von Vertrauen in solche Erklärungen der Sūtra-Worte erlangt haben, Subhūti. All diese Wesen, Subhūti, werden unermessliche Anhäufungen positiven Potenzials hervorbringen und ansammeln.</p> <p>Warum ist das so? Weil jene Großen Bodhisattvas, Subhūti, sich nicht auf die Unterscheidung eines Selbst einlassen, auf Unterscheidung von Lebewesen, auf Unterscheidung von Lebendigem, auf Unterscheidung von Personen einlassen werden. Jene Großen Bodhisattvas werden sich weder auf die Unterscheidung [von etwas] als 'Phänomen' noch als 'Nicht-Phänomen' einlassen; sie werden sich weder auf Unterscheidung noch auf Unterscheidungslosigkeit einlassen, Subhūti.</p> <p>Warum? Wenn die Großen Bodhisattvas</p>

		<p>be of them grasping a self and grasping a sentient being, grasping a living being, grasping a person. Because even if they engage in discriminating phenomena as non-existent, that would be of them grasping a self and grasping a sentient being, grasping a living being, grasping a person.</p> <p>Why is that? Further, Subhūti, because a bodhisattva should not wrongly grasp phenomena, nor grasp non-phenomena. Therefore, thinking of that, the Tathāgata said, 'If, by those who know this Dharma treatise as like a boat, even dharmas should be given up, what need is there to mention non-dharmas?'"</p>	<p>conception of things as things, nor do they slip into any conception of things as not being things. They neither slip into any conception of a thought as a conception, nor do they slip into any conception of a thought as not being a conception.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because if, Subhuti, these bodhisattvas who are great beings were to slip into any conception of things as things, then they would grasp these same things as being a 'self'; they would grasp them as being a living being; they would grasp them as being something that lives; they would grasp them as a person. And even if they were to slip into thinking of them as not being things, that too they would grasp as being a 'self'; and as being a living being; and as being something that lives; and as being a person.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, Subhuti, the bodhisattvas never hold the Dharma in the wrong way either. Nor do they hold what is not the Dharma. This then is what the One Thus Gone meant when he said: 'Those who understand that this presentation of the Dharma is like a ship leave even these teachings of Dharma behind. What need is there to mention then what they do with that which is not the Dharma?'"</p>	<p>sich auf Unterscheidung von Phänomenen einlassen würden, so wäre eben dies auch ein Auffassen von jenen als Selbst, Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Lebendiges, Auffassen als Person. Und wenn sie sich auf Unterscheidung von Phänomenen als 'selbstlos' einlassen würden, so wäre auch dies ein Auffassen von jenen als Selbst, Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Lebendiges, Auffassen als Person.</p> <p>Warum? Bodhisattvas sollten Phänomene weder verkehrt auffassen noch Nicht-Phänomene erfassen, Subhūti. Wenn diejenigen, die wissen, dass diese Aufstellung des Dharma wie ein Boot ist, sogar Dharmas aufgeben sollen - was braucht man da Nicht-Dharmas noch zu erwähnen?"</p>
7-1	<p>"Subhūti! Gibt es irgendeine Gegebenheit, die der Tathāgāta als die unübertreffliche vollständig-vollendete Erwachung des richtig vollendet Erwachten vollständig [kennt und] weiß? Gibt es eine [solche] Gegebenheit, die der Tathāgāta [als bestehend] nachgewiesen hat?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, exist whatsoever? Has any Dharma been taught by the Tathāgata?"</p>	<p>"Subhuti, what do you think? Is there any such thing as an enlightenment where Those Gone Thus reach some incomparable, perfect, and total Buddhahood? And does the One Thus Gone ever teach any Dharma at all?"</p>	<p>"Was meinst du, Subhūti: gibt es den Dharma der Buddhaschaft, welcher vom Tathāgata in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung vollkommen verwirklicht wurde, überhaupt? Meinst du, dass der Tathāgata solch einen Dharma überhaupt lehrte?"</p>
7-2	<p>"So, Bhagavan, wie ich das vom Bhagavan Gesagte verstanden habe, gibt es keine Gegebenheit, die der Tathāgāta als die unübertreffliche vollständig-vollendete Erwachung des richtig vollendet Erwachten vollständig [kennt und] weiß. Denn diese Gegebenheit, die der Tathāgāta vollständig weiß oder [jedenfalls] nachgewiesen hat, kann nicht erfasst werden, [sie kann nicht ergriffen werden, sie kann nicht begriffen werden], über sie kann nicht gesprochen werden; sie ist [daher eigentlich] weder eine Gegebenheit noch eine Nicht-Gegebenheit. Denn das Nicht-mehr-zu-Beschreibende überhöht den Edel-Menschen!"</p>	<p>"Bhagavān, as I understand this meaning that was taught by the Bhagavān, that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever. That dharma that was taught by the Tathāgata does not exist whatsoever.</p> <p>Why is that? Because any dharma manifestly and completely realized or taught by the Tathāgata is not to be grasped, not to be expressed; it is not dharma nor is it non-dharma.</p> <p>Why is that? Because Arya beings are differentiated by the uncompounded."</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, as far as I can catch the thrust of what the Conqueror has spoken thus far, then I would have to say that it is impossible for there to be any such thing as an enlightenment where Those Gone Thus could ever reach some incomparable, perfect, and total enlightenment. And it is impossible as well for there to be any such thing as a Dharma that the One Thus Gone could ever teach.</p> <p>And why is this the case? Because it is impossible for there to be any such thing as an enlightenment which the One Thus Gone has reached, or a Dharma which he has taught, which could ever be held. It is impossible for there to be any such thing that could ever be described. And this is because it is neither true that these things exist, nor that it is impossible for them to exist.</p> <p>And why is that? Because these persons who are realized beings distinguish all these</p>	<p>"Erhabener, wie ich die Bedeutung dessen verstehe, was der Erhabene lehrte, so gibt es überhaupt keinen Dharma der Buddhaschaft, den der Tathāgata in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung vollkommen verwirklichte. Der Dharma, den der Tathāgata lehrte, existiert überhaupt nicht.</p> <p>Warum? Weil der Dharma, den der Tathāgata in vollkommener Buddhaschaft verwirklichte oder zeigte, nicht zu erfassen ist, nicht auszudrücken ist; er ist weder Dharma noch Nicht-Dharma.</p> <p>Warum? Weil die Edlen Wesen sich durch Nicht-Zusammengesetztes auszeichnen."</p>

			things, perfectly, through that which is unproduced."	
8-1	<p><i>Essler: "In diesem Absatz [8] wird versucht, den Absatz [4] zu übertrumpfen, dies jedoch nicht durch bessere Argumente, sondern durch größere Anzahlen; inhaltlich hingegen fällt er gegenüber [4] merklich ab. Daher seh' ich ihn als einen später erfolgten Einschub an.</i></p>	<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? If some son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage, completely filling this billionfold world system with the seven types of precious things, were to give gifts, do you think that son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage would produce an immense heap of merit on that basis?"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Suppose some son or daughter of noble family were to take all the planets of this great world system, a system with a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets, and cover them with the seven kinds of precious substances, and offer them to someone. Would that son or daughter of noble family create many great mountains of merit from such a deed?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du: Wenn irgendein Sohn oder eine Tochter edler Art dieses große Weltensystem von tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und als Gabe darbrächte, würde jener Sohn oder jene Tochter edler Art auf dieser Grundlage eine immense Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervorbringen?"</p>
8-2	<p><i>Wichtig ist es noch, den Abschluß-Satz von [8] im Auge zu behalten, in D: 'Der Tathāgāta hat gelehrt, dass die besonderen Gegebenheiten der Buddhas nicht besondere Gegebenheiten der Buddhas sind, weswegen sie 'besondere Gegebenheiten der Buddhas' genannt werden'. Dunkle Aussagen dieser Art zeigen an, dass hier mit dem halbverstandenen Unterschied von Konventionell-Bestehendem und Letztlich-Bestehendem eine besondere Tiefe der Einsicht vorzutäuschen man sich bemüht hat. Wo im Folgenden irgendwelche Aussagen dieser Art den Kern eines Absatzes bilden, darf man getrost davon ausgehen, dass es sich bei ihnen um spätere Hinzufügungen handelt."</i></p>	<p>"Bhagavān, immense. Sugata, immense. That son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage would produce an immense heap of merit on that basis.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because that very heap of merit is not a heap; therefore, the Tathāgata says, 'Heap of merit, heap of merit.'"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, many would it be. O You who have Gone to Bliss, it would be many. This son or daughter of noble family would indeed create many great mountains of merit from such a deed.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, these same great mountains of merit are great mountains of merit that could never exist. And for this very reason do the Ones Gone Thus speak of 'great mountains of merit, great mountains of merit.'"</p>	<p>"Immens, Erhabener, immens, Sugata. Der Sohn oder die Tochter edler Art brächte auf dieser Grundlage immense Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervor.</p> <p>Warum? Weil eben diese Anhäufung positiven Potenzials keine existente Anhäufung ist; also lehrte der Tathāgata so [genannte] 'Anhäufung positiven Potenzials, Anhäufung positiven Potenzials'."</p>
8-3		<p>"Subhūti, compared to any son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage who, completely filling this billionfold world system with the seven types of precious things, were to give gifts, if someone, having taken even as little as one stanza of four lines from this discourse of Dharma, also were to explain and correctly and thoroughly teach it to others, on that basis, the heap of merit produced would be much greater, incalculable, unfathomable.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because the unsurpassed perfectly completed enlightenment of the Tathāgata Arhat perfectly completed Buddhas arises from it; the Buddha Bhagavāns also are produced from it.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because the Buddha dharma called 'Buddha dharma,' are those Buddha dharma taught by the Tathāgata as non-existent; therefore, they are called 'Buddha dharma.'"</p>	<p>"Suppose, o Subhuti, that some son or daughter of noble family were to take all the planets of this great world system, a system with a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets, and cover them all with the seven kinds of precious substances, and offer them to someone. Suppose on the other hand that anyone held but a single verse of four lines from this particular presentation of the Dharma, and explained it to others, and taught it correctly. By doing the latter, a person would create many more great mountains of merit than with the former: the mountains of their merit would be countless, and beyond all calculation.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, Subhuti, this is where the matchless and totally perfect enlightenment of the Ones Thus Gone, the Destroyers of the Foe, the Totally Enlightened Buddhas, comes from. It is from this as well that the Buddhas, the Conquerors, are born.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, these qualities of an Enlightened Being—what we call the 'qualities of an Enlightened Being'—are qualities of an Enlightened Being which Those Gone Thus have said could never even exist. And that is in fact why we can call them the 'qualities of an Enlightened Being.'"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, verglichen mit einem Sohn oder einer Tochter edler Art, der oder die dieses große Weltensystem von tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und als Gabe darbrächte, bringt jemand, wenn er auch nur einen vierzeiligen Vers dieser Aufstellung des Dharma erfasst hat, anderen völlig richtig erklärt und völlig korrekt lehrt, auf dieser Grundlage eine Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervor, die noch viel größer, zahllos und unermesslich ist.</p> <p>Warum? Weil daraus die unübertreffliche, vollständige Erleuchtung der Tathāgatas, Arhats, vollkommenen Buddhas entstanden ist, Subhūti; auch die erhabenen Buddhas sind daraus entstanden.</p> <p>Warum? Die Buddha-Dharmas, die Buddha-Dharmas genannt werden, jene Buddha-Dharmas lehrte der Tathāgata als nicht existent, Subhūti, deshalb sind sie 'Buddha-Dharmas' zu nennen.</p>
9-1	<p>"Was meinst du Subhūti: Denkt ein Inden-Strom-Eingetretener: 'Ich bin ein Inden-Strom-Eingetretener!'?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the stream-enterer think, 'I have attained the result of stream-enterer'?"</p>	<p>"Now Subhuti, what do you think? Do those who have entered the stream ever think to themselves, 'Now I have attained</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du - denkt jemand, der in den Strom eingetreten ist: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis des Stromeintritts</p>

			the goal of entering the stream'?"	erreicht'?"
9-2	"Wirklich nicht, Herr! Denn er hat sich [ja doch] keine Gegebenheit angeeignet; und eben deswegen, [nämlich: in seinem Wissen darum, dass 'In-den-Strom-Eingetretener' ein leeres Wort ist], wird er 'In-den-Strom-Eingetretener' genannt: Keinen Gegenstand des Sehens, des Hörens, des Riechens, des Schmeckens, des Tastens, des Denkens hat er mit dieser Bezeichnung ermittelt; und eben deswegen wird er 'In-den-Strom-Eingetretener' genannt. Würde [ihm] der Gedanke: 'Ich bin ein In-den-Strom-Eingetretener!' denken, so wäre damit ein Ergreifen eines Selbst, eines Seins verbunden."	<p>"Bhagavān, it is not so.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because one does not enter into anything whatsoever; therefore, one is called 'stream-enterer.' One has not entered into form, nor entered into sound, nor into smell, nor into taste, nor into tactility, nor entered into a phenomenon; therefore, one is called 'stream-enterer.' Bhagavān, if that stream-enterer were to think 'I have attained the result of stream-enterer,' that itself would be a grasping of that as a self, grasping as a sentient being, grasping as a living being, grasping as a person."</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, they do not.</p> <p>And why is it so? It is, o Conqueror, because it would be impossible for them to enter anything at all. And this is precisely why we can call them a 'stream enterer.' They neither enter into things that you can see, nor into words, nor into smells, nor into tastes, nor into things you can touch, nor into objects of the thought. And this again is precisely why we can say they have 'entered the stream.'</p> <p>And if it happened, o Conqueror, that a stream-enterer were to think to themselves, 'I have attained the goal of entering the stream,' then they would begin to grasp to some self in it. And they would begin to grasp to a living being, and to something that lives, and to a person."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so.</p> <p>Warum? Weil er überhaupt nirgends eingetreten ist, Erhabener; deshalb wird er 'jemand, der in den Strom eingetreten ist' genannt. Er ist weder in Formen eingetreten noch in Töne, Gerüche, Geschmäcker und Tastbares, noch ist er in Phänomene eingetreten; daher wird er 'jemand, der in den Strom eingetreten ist' genannt.</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, wenn der in den Strom Eingetretene dächte: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis des Stromeintritts erreicht', so würde eben dies zum Auffassen dessen als Selbst, zum Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Lebendiges, Auffassen als Person führen."</p>
9-3	<i>Essler: "In gleicher Weise befragte der Bhagevan den Subhūti bezüglich des Einmal-Wiederkehrers, sodann des Nicht-Wiederkehrers, und schließlich des Arhat, und in gleicher Weise antwortete dieser jedesmal darauf, und fügte bezüglich des Arhats hinzu:"</i>	"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the once-returned think, 'I have attained the result of once-returned'?"	"What, o Subhuti, do you think? Do those who are to return but once ever think to themselves, 'Now I have achieved the goal of returning but once'?"	"Was meinst du, Subhūti - denkt derjenige, der [nur noch] einmal wiederkehrt: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis des Einmal-Wiederkehrens erreicht'?"
9-4		<p>"Bhagavān, it is not so.</p> <p>Why is that? Because the phenomenon of entry into the state of the once-returned does not exist whatsoever. Therefore, one says, 'once-returned.'"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, they do not.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because it is impossible for there ever to be any such state, of having reached the point of needing to return but once. And this is precisely why we can call them 'someone who needs to return but once.'"</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so.</p> <p>Warum? Weil überhaupt kein Phänomen des Eingetretenseins in eben dieses Einmal-Wiederkehren existiert - deshalb wird es '[nur noch] Einmal-Wiederkehren' genannt.</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, wenn der Einmal-Wiederkehrer dächte: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis des Einmal-Wiederkehrens erreicht', so würde eben dies zum Auffassen dessen als Selbst, zum Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Lebendiges, Auffassen als Person führen."</p>
9-5		"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the non-returned think, 'I have attained the result of non-returned'?"	"Subhuti, what do you think? Do those who need never return at all ever think to themselves, 'Now I have achieved the goal of never having to return at all'?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du - denkt derjenige, der nicht mehr wiederkehrt: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis des Nicht-mehr-Wiederkehrens erreicht'?"
9-6		<p>"Bhagavān, it is not so.</p> <p>Why is that? Because the phenomenon of entry into the state of the non-returned does not exist whatsoever. Therefore, one says, 'non-returned.'"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, they do not.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because it is impossible for there ever to be any such state, of having reached the point of never needing to return at all. And this is precisely why we can call them 'someone who need never return at all.'"</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so.</p> <p>Warum? Weil überhaupt kein Phänomen des Eingetretenseins in eben dieses Nicht-mehr-Wiederkehren existiert - deshalb wird es 'Nicht-mehr-Wiederkehren' genannt."</p>
9-7		"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the Arhat think, 'I have attained the result of Arhatship'?"	"Subhuti, what do you think? Do those who have destroyed the foe ever think to themselves, 'Now I have achieved the state of destroying the foe'?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du - denkt ein Arhat: 'Ich habe das Ergebnis der Arhat-schaft erreicht'?"
9-8	"Warum [wäre dies mit dem Ergreifen eines Selbsts, eines Seins verbunden]? Herr, ich bin derjenige, auf den der Tathāgata, der Arhat, der Samyaksambuddha	<p>"Bhagavān, it is not so.</p> <p>Why is that? Because the phenomenon called 'arhat' does not exist whatsoever. Bhagavān, if the arhat were to think, 'I have</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, they do not.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because it is impossible for there ever to be any such state, of having destroyed the foe. For suppose, o Con-</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so.</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, weil das 'Arhat' genannte Phänomen überhaupt nicht existiert. Wenn ein Arhat dächte: 'Ich habe das Er-</p>

	<p>verwiesen hat als der Oberste von denen, die in Frieden weilen. Herr, ich bin ein Arhat, frei von Gier; und dennoch kommt mir nicht der Gedanke: 'Ich bin ein Arhat, frei von Gier!'. Denn würde mir der Gedanke: 'Ich habe die Arhatschaft erreicht!' kommen, dann hätte der Tathāgata, auf mich verweisend, nicht festgestellt: 'Subhūti, der Sohn aus guter Familie, ist der Oberste von denen, die in Frieden weilen; denn er weilt, [genau und im letzten Wortsinn genommen], nirgendwo. Und [eben] deswegen wird er 'In Frieden Weilender' genannt!'."</p>	<p>attained the result of arhatship,' that itself would be a grasping of that as a self, grasping as a sentient being, grasping as a living being, grasping as a person.</p> <p>Bhagavān, I was declared by the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha as the foremost of those who abide without afflictions. Bhagavān, I am an arhat, free of attachment; but, Bhagavān, I do not think, 'I am an arhat.' Bhagavān, if I were to think, 'I have attained arhatship,' the Tathāgata would not have made the prediction about me saying, 'The son of the lineage, Subhūti, is the foremost of those who abide without afflictions. Since not abiding in anything whatsoever, he abides without affliction, he abides without affliction.'"</p>	<p>queror, that such a destroyer of the foe were to think to themselves, 'Now I have achieved the state of destroying the foe.' They again would then begin to grasp to some self in it. And they would begin to grasp to a living being, and to something that lives, and to a person.</p> <p>O Conqueror, I declare that the Ones Thus Gone—those Destroyers of the Foe who are Totally Enlightened Buddhas—reside in the highest of all those states that are free of the mental afflictions. And I am, o Conqueror, a person who is free of desire; I am a Foe Destroyer. But I do not, o Conqueror, think to myself, 'I am a Destroyer of the Foe.' For suppose, o Conqueror, that I did think to myself, 'I have attained the state of a Foe Destroyer.' If I did think this way, then the One Thus Gone could never have given me the final prediction; he could never have said: 'O son of noble family, o Subhuti, you will reach the highest of all those states that are free of the mental afflictions. Because you stay in no state at all, you have reached the state free of mental afflictions; you have reached what we call the 'state free of mental afflictions'."</p>	<p>gebnis der Arhatschaft erreicht', würde eben dies zum Auffassen dessen als Selbst, zum Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Lebendiges, Auffassen als Person führen.</p> <p>Erhabener, der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha hat mir die Vorhersage als einem Hervorragenden unter denen, die ohne Geistesplagen bleiben, gemacht; dennoch, Erhabener, und wäre ich auch Arhat, frei von Begierden, so dünkte ich, o Erhabener, nicht: 'Ich bin Arhat'. Erhabener, dünkte ich: 'Ich habe Arhatschaft erreicht', so hätte der Tathāgata mir nicht prophezeit: 'Subhūti, der Sohn edler Art, ist hervorragend unter denen, die ohne Geistesplagen bleiben – weil er bei überhaupt nichts verweilt, bleibt er ohne Geistesplagen.'"</p>
10-1	<p><i>Essler: 'Weggelassen ist hier ein Einschub, den früheren Buddha Dīpaṃkara betreffend.'</i></p>	<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does that dharma that was received by the Tathāgata from the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha Dīpaṃkara exist whatsoever?"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Was there anything at all which the One Thus Gone ever received from that One Thus Gone, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Perfectly Enlightened Buddha called 'Maker of Light'?"</p>	<p>"Was meinst du, Subhūti, existiert jener Dharma, welchen der Tathāgata vom Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommenen verwirklichten Buddha Dīpaṃkara empfing, überhaupt?"</p>
10-2		<p>"Bhagavān, it is not so. That dharma that was received by the Tathāgata from the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha Dīpaṃkara does not exist whatsoever."</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, there was not. There exists nothing at all which the One Thus Gone received from that One Thus Gone, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Perfectly Enlightened Buddha called 'Maker of Light'."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so. Der Dharma, welchen der Tathāgata von dem Tathāgata Dīpaṃkara empfing, existiert überhaupt nicht."</p>
10-3a 10-3b		<p>"Subhūti, if some bodhisattva were to say, 'I shall actualize arranged fields,' they would speak untruly.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because arranged fields called 'arranged fields,' those arrangements are taught by the Tathāgata as non-existent; therefore, they are called 'arranged fields.'</p>	<p>"Suppose, o Subhuti, that some bodhisattva were to say, 'I am working to bring about my paradise.' This would not be spoken true.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because the Ones Thus Gone have stated that these paradises, what we call 'paradises,' these lands that we work to create, do not even exist. And this is precisely why we can even call them 'paradise'."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, würde ein Bodhisattva sagen: 'Ich werde die errichteten [Buddha-]Felder verwirklichen', so wäre das unwahr gesprochen. Warum? Die errichteten [Buddha-]Felder, die errichtete [Buddha-]Felder genannt werden, Subhūti, - jene Errichtungen sind vom Tathāgata als nicht-existent gelehrt worden, deshalb sind sie 'errichtete [Buddha-]Felder' zu nennen."</p>
10-4		<p>"Subhūti, therefore, the bodhisattva mahāsattva thus should generate the mind without abiding, should generate the mind not abiding in anything. They should generate the mind not abiding in form, should generate the mind not abiding in sound, smell, taste, tactility, or phenomenon."</p>	<p>"Since this is so, o Subhuti, those bodhisattvas who are great beings develop their wish without staying in these thoughts. They develop their wish without staying in anything at all. They develop their wish without staying in anything you can see. They develop their wish without staying either in sounds, nor in smells, nor in tastes, nor in things you can touch, nor in objects of the</p>	<p>"Folglich sollte ein Großer Bodhisattva das Bewusstsein entwickeln, ohne auf solche Art zu verweilen, Subhūti, sollte das Bewusstsein entwickeln, ohne bei überhaupt irgendetwas zu verweilen. Das Bewusstsein sollte auch entwickelt werden ohne bei Formen zu verweilen und auch ohne bei Tönen, Gerüchen, Geschmäckern, Tastbarem und Phänomenen zu verweilen."</p>

			thought."	
10-5		"Subhūti, it is like this: If, for example, the body of a being were to become thus, were to become like this, as big as Sumeru, the king of mountains, Subhūti, what do you think about this? Would that body be big?"	"O Subhuti, it is thus: Suppose, for example, that someone's body were to grow this large—suppose it were to grow as large as the king of all mountains, Mt. Sumeru. What do you think, Subhuti? Would that person's body be large?"	"Zur Veranschaulichung Folgendes, Subhūti: Wenn der Körper eines Lebewesens, zum Beispiel, so wie der König der Berge, Berg Meru, ist - was meinst du, Subhūti, ist dieser Körper groß?"
10-6		"Bhagavān, that body would be big. Sugata, that body would be big. Why is that? Because it is taught by the Tathāgata as not being a thing; therefore, it is called a 'body.' Since it is taught by the Tathāgata as not being a thing; therefore, it is called a 'big body.'	"O Conqueror, such a body would be large. O You who have Gone to Bliss, such a body would be large. And why is it so? Because Those Gone Thus have stated that it could never be a thing at all. And this is precisely why we can call it a 'body.' Because Those Gone Thus have stated that it could never be a thing at all, we call it a 'large body'."	"Dieser Körper ist groß, Erhabener, dieser Körper ist groß, Sugata. Warum? Der Tathāgata lehrte, dass er kein Ding ist; deshalb wird dieser Körper 'groß' genannt. Weil er kein Ding ist, deswegen wird er Körper genannt."
11-1	<i>Essler: 'Dass das gesamte [11] ein nachträglich erfolgter Einschub ist, bedarf wohl keiner näheren Begründung.'</i>	"Subhūti, what do you think about this? If there were also just as many Ganges Rivers as there are grains of sand in the river Ganges, would their grains of sand be many?"	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Suppose you counted every drop of water in the Ganges River, and then had exactly that many Ganges Rivers. Would the number of drops in this many Ganges Rivers be very many?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du: Wenn es ebenso viele Ganges- Flüsse gäbe, wie es Sandkörner im Flussbett des Ganges gibt, wären die Sandkörner all jener Ganges-Flüsse zahlreich?"
11-2		"Bhagavān, if those very Ganges Rivers were many, there is no need to mention their grains of sand."	"O Conqueror, if the amount of drops in just this one Ganges River is so great, then what need mention the amount of drops in so very many Ganges Rivers?"	"Erhabener, wenn die Ganges- Flüsse schon so viele wären, was soll man da erst von deren Sandkörnern sagen!"
11-3		"Subhūti, you should appreciate; you should understand. If some man or woman, completely filling with the seven kinds of precious things that many world systems as there are grains of sand of those rivers Ganges, were to offer that to the Tathāgata Arhat perfectly completed Buddhas, Subhūti, what do you think about this? Would that man or woman produce much merit on that basis?"	"O Subhuti, try to imagine it. Try to comprehend it. Think now of a mass of planets equal in number to the number of drops in all these Ganges Rivers. And then imagine that some son or daughter of noble family has come and covered all of them with the seven kinds of precious substances, and then gone and made a gift of these planets to the One Gone Thus, to the Destroyer of the Foe, to the Totally Enlightened One, the Buddha. What do you think, Subhuti? Would they create much merit from such a deed?"	"Subhūti, du sollst es wertschätzen, sollst es ganz verstehen: Wenn ein Mann oder eine Frau so viele Weltsysteme wie die Sandkörner all jener Ganges- Flüsse ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und den Tathāgatas, Arhats, vollkommenen Buddhas als Gabe darbrächte, was meinst du, Subhūti, würde jener Mann oder jene Frau auf dieser Grundlage immenses positives Potenzial entwickeln?"
11-4		"Bhagavān, much. Sugata, much. That man or woman would produce much merit on that basis."	"O Conqueror, many would it be, o You who have Gone to Bliss, it would be many. This son or daughter of noble family would indeed create much merit from such a deed."	"Immens, Erhabener, immens, Sugata. Jener Mann oder jene Frau würde auf dieser Grundlage immenses positives Potenzial entwickeln."
11-5		"Subhūti, compared to someone who, completely filling that many world systems with the seven types of precious things, were to give gifts to the Tathāgata Arhat perfectly completed Buddhas, if someone, having taken even as little as a stanza of four lines from this discourse of Dharma, were to explain it and correctly and thoroughly teach it also to others, on that basis the merit that itself would produce would be much greater, incalculable, unfathomable."	"Yes Subhuti, suppose that someone did do this: suppose they did take all these planets, and cover them with the seven kinds of precious substances, and offer them as a gift to the One Gone Thus, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Totally Enlightened One, the Buddha. And now suppose that someone else held but a single verse of four lines from this particular presentation of the Dharma, and explained it to others, and taught it correctly. This second person would create much more	"Subhūti, verglichen mit jemandem, der so viele Weltsysteme ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und den Tathāgatas, Arhats, vollkommenen Buddhas darbrächte, erzeugt jemand, wenn er auch nur einen vierzeiligen Vers dieser Aufstellung des Dharma erfasst hat, anderen ganz richtig erklärte und völlig korrekt lehrte, auf eben dieser Grundlage noch viel mehr, unzählbares, unermessliches positives Potenzial."

			merit from their action; their merit would be countless, and beyond all calculation."	
12-1	<i>Essler: Wie 11</i>	"Furthermore, Subhūti, if, at whatever place on earth even a stanza of four lines from this discourse on Dharma is recited or taught, that place on earth is a real shrine of the world with Devas, humans, and Asuras, what need to mention that whoever takes up this discourse of Dharma, memorizes, reads, understands, and properly takes to mind will be most astonishing. At that place on earth [where] the Teacher resides; other levels of gurus also abide."	"And I say to you further, o Subhuti: any place where even just a single verse of four lines from this particular presentation of the Dharma is read out loud, or has ever before been read out loud, thereby becomes a temple; it becomes a place where the entire world, along with its gods, and men, and demigods, can come and pay them honor. And if this is so, then there is no need to say that any person who takes up this particular presentation of the Dharma, or who holds it, or who reads it, or who comprehends it, or who thinks of it in the proper way, thereby becomes someone who is truly wondrous. And this is because we can then say that the Teacher himself is in that place, as is every other spiritual teacher who has ever lived."	"Und, Subhūti, wenn schon der Ort, an welchem auch nur ein vierzeiliger Vers dieser Aufstellung des Dharma ausgesprochen oder gelehrt wird, zu einer Verehrungsstätte der Welt samt Göttern, Halbgöttern und Menschen wird, was braucht man dann noch zu erwähnen, dass jemand, der diese Aufstellung des Dharma aufnimmt, aufschreibt, behält, berührt, liest, ganz versteht und sich angemessen zu Bewusstsein bringt, zu etwas höchst Erstaunlichem wird! An jenem Ort verweilt unser Lehrer [Buddha] oder wer sonst als geeignete/r spirituelle/r Meister/in gilt."
13-1	"Welchen Namen soll diese Darlegung der Gegebenheiten erhalten, und wie also soll ich ihn in Erinnerung behalten?"	"Bhagavān, what is the name of this discourse of Dharma? How should it be remembered?"	"O Conqueror, what is the name of this particular presentation of the Dharma? How are we to consider it?"	"Wie heißt diese Aufstellung des Dharma, Erhabener, wie soll sie behalten werden?"
13-2	"Diese Darlegung der Gegebenheiten, Subhūti, wird 'Die über [Alles] hinausgehende Weisheit' genannt."	"Subhūti, the name of this Dharma discourse is the 'wisdom gone beyond'; it should be remembered like that. Why is that? Subhūti, because the very same wisdom gone beyond that is taught by the Tathāgata is not gone beyond; therefore, it is called 'wisdom gone beyond.'"	"Subhuti, this particular presentation of the Dharma is known as the 'perfection of wisdom,' and that is how you should consider it. Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, that same perfection of wisdom spoken by the Ones Thus Gone is a perfection of wisdom that does not even exist. And this is precisely why we can call it the 'perfection of wisdom'."	"Diese Aufstellung des Dharma heißt Vollkommenheit der Weisheit, Subhūti, behaltet sie so. Warum? Weil die Vollkommenheit der Weisheit, die der Tathāgata lehrte, nicht die Vollkommenheit der Weisheit ist, Subhūti, deshalb ist sie 'Vollkommenheit der Weisheit' zu nennen."
13-3		"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the dharma that is taught by the Tathāgata exist whatsoever?"	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Is there any dharma at all which the Ones Thus Gone ever speak?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du - existiert überhaupt irgendein Dharma, den der Tathāgata lehrte?"
13-4		"Bhagavān, the dharma that is taught by the Tathāgata does not exist whatsoever."	"O Conqueror, none of the dharmas ever spoken by the Ones Thus Gone exists at all."	"Erhabener, ein Dharma, den der Tathāgata lehrte, existiert überhaupt nicht."
13-5		"Subhūti, what do think about this? Are the quantities of particles of earth that exist in a billion-fold world system many?"	"O Subhuti, what do you think? If we took all the atoms of dust that exist in all the planets of the great world system— a system with a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets—would that be a great many atoms of dust?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du: Sind es viele Staubpartikel, die es im großen Welten-system der tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten gibt?"

13-6a 13-6b		<p>“Bhagavān, the particles of earth are many. Sugata, they are many.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because that which is a particle of earth was taught by the Tathāgata as not being a particle; therefore, it is called ‘particle of earth.’ That which is a world system was taught by the Tathāgata as not being a world system; therefore, it is called a ‘world system.’”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, it would indeed be a great many atoms of dust. O One who has Gone to Bliss, a great many would that be.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, the Ones Gone Thus have stated that whatever atoms of dust there may be are atoms of dust that could never exist. And this is precisely why we can call them 'atoms of dust.' The Ones Thus Gone have stated as well that whatever planets there may be are planets that could never exist. And this is, precisely why we can call them 'planets.'"</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es sind viele Staubpartikel, Sugata, es sind viele,</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, der Tathāgata lehrte, was Staubpartikel sind, als nicht-existente Partikel, deshalb sind sie 'Staubpartikel' zu nennen. Was Weltensysteme sind, hat der Tathāgata als nicht-existente Weltensysteme gelehrt, deshalb sind sie 'Weltensysteme' zu nennen."</p>
13-7		<p>“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Is one to be viewed as the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha due to those thirty-two marks of a great being?”</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Should we consider someone to be One Thus Gone, a Destroyer of the Foe, a Totally Enlightened One, a Buddha, just because they possess the 32 marks of a great being?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du: Ist jemand anhand der 32 Merkmale Großer Wesen als Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommener Buddha zu betrachten?"</p>
13-8		<p>“Bhagavān, it is not so.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because those thirty-two marks of a great being that are taught by the Tathāgata are taught by the Tathāgata as no marks; therefore, they are called ‘thirty- two marks of the Tathāgata.’”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, we should not.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because these 32 marks of a great being described by Those Gone Thus were said, by Those Gone Thus, to be marks that could never exist. And this is precisely why we can call them 'the 32 marks of One Gone Thus'."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so. Warum? Weil die 32 Merkmale Großer Wesen, die vom Tathāgata gelehrt worden sind, als merkmalslos gelehrt worden sind, deshalb sind sie 'die 32 Merkmale Großer Wesen' zu nennen."</p>
13-9		<p>“Further, Subhūti, compared with some man or woman completely giving up bodies numbering the grains of sand of the river Ganges, if someone, taking even as little as a stanza of four lines from this dis- course of Dharma, also were to teach it to others, they would produce on that basis many greater merits, incalculable, unfathomable.”</p>	<p>"And I tell you further, o Subhuti: Suppose some woman or man were to give away their own body, and do this with as many bodies as there are drops of water in the Ganges. And suppose on the other hand that someone held even so little as four lines of verse from this teaching, and taught it to others. The second person would create much greater merit from their act than the former; their merit would be countless, and beyond all calculation."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, verglichen mit einem Mann oder einer Frau, der/die die so viele Körper, wie es Sandkörner im Flussbett des Ganges gibt, vollständig aufgegeben hat, bringt jemand, wenn er auch nur einen vierzeiligen Vers dieser Darstellung des Dharma erfasst und anderen richtig gelehrt hat, auf dieser Grundlage noch viel mehr, zahlloses, unermessliches positives Potenzial hervor [als jene]."</p>
14-1	<p><i>Der Ehrwürdige Subhūti wurde durch diese [Darlegung der] Gegebenheiten zu Tränen gerührt. Nachdem er seine Augen getrocknet hatte, wandte er sich mit diesen Worten an den Bhagavan:</i></p>	<p><i>Thereupon, the venerable Subhūti, due to the impact of the Dharma, shed tears. Having wiped away the tears, he replied to the Bhagavān:</i></p>	<p><i>And then, by the sheer power of the teaching, the junior monk Subhuti began to weep. And when he had wiped away his tears, he spoke to the Conqueror in the following words:</i></p>	<p><i>Da kamen dem ehrbaren Subhūti, bewegt durch die Kraft des Dharma, die Tränen. Nachdem er die Tränen fortgewischt hatte, sagte er zum Erhabenen:</i></p>
14-2	<p>"Wunderbar ist es, o Bhagavan, ja, ganz außerordentlich wunderbar es, o Sugāta, wie trefflich der Tathāgata diese Darlegung der Gegebenheit vorgefragt hat; denn dadurch ist in mir [die ihr entsprechende] Einsicht entstanden!"</p>	<p>“Bhagavān, this discourse on Dharma taught thus by the Tathāgata, Bhagavān, is astonishing. Sugata, it is astonishing. Bhagavān, since my production of exalted wisdom, I have never before heard this discourse on Dharma. Bhagavān, those sentient beings who will produce correct discrimination upon this sutra being explained will be most astonishing.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because that which is correct discrimination is not discrimination; therefore, correct discrimination was taught by the Tathāgata saying ‘correct discrimination.’ Bhagavān, upon this</p>	<p>"This presentation of the Dharma given by Those Gone Thus, o Conqueror, is wondrous. O You who have Gone to Bliss, it is truly a wonder. O Conqueror, in all the time that has passed from the time I was able to gain wisdom until now, I have never heard such a presentation of the Dharma. O Conqueror, any living being who can think correctly of the sutra that you have just taught is wondrous in the highest.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, this same correct thinking is something that could never exist. And this is precisely why Those Gone Thus have spoken of thinking</p>	<p>"Auf wie viele Weisen der Tathāgata diese Darstellung des Dharma gelehrt hat, ist erstaunlich, Erhabener, erstaunlich, Sugata. Erhabener, seit meine ursprüngliche Weisheit entstand, habe ich diese Aufstellung des Dharma noch nirgends gehört. Erhabener, all die Wesen, die korrekte Unterscheidung in Bezug auf diese Sūtra-Erklärung entwickeln, werden höchst erstaunlich sein.</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, was korrekte Unterscheidung ist, eben dies ist keine Unterscheidung; daher lehrte der Tathāgata so [genannte] korrekte Unterscheidung. Erhabener, dass ich die Erklärung dieser Darstel-</p>

		<p>Dharma discourse being explained, that I imagine and appreciate is not astonishing to me. Bhagavān, in the final time, in the final age, at the end of the five hundred, those sentient beings who take up this Dharma discourse, memorize, read, and understand it will be most astonishing. Furthermore, Bhagavān, they will not engage in discriminating a self; will not engage in discriminating a sentient being, discriminating a living being, discriminating a person.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because that itself which is discrimination as a self, discrimination as a sentient being, discrimination as a living being, and discrimination as a person is not discrimination.</p> <p>Why is that? Because the Buddha Bhagavāns are free of all discrimination."</p>	<p>correctly; of what we call 'thinking correctly.' O Conqueror, the fact that I can feel this way towards this presentation of the Dharma that you have made, the fact that I believe in it, is for me no surprising belief. But when I think, o Conqueror, of those to come in the future—of those in the last five hundred who take up this particular presentation of the Dharma, or who hold it, or who read it, or who comprehend it—then truly do they seem to me wondrous in the highest. And these beings who come, o Conquering One, will not be beings who ever slip into any conception of something as a self; or into any conception of something as a living being; or into any conception of something as being alive; or into any conception of something as being a person.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, these same conceptions—conceiving of something as a self, or as a living being, or as being alive, or as being a person—could never exist at all.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because the Enlightened Ones, the Conquerors, are free of every kind of conception."</p>	<p>lung des Dharma verstehe und wertschätze, nicht das erstaunt mich, sondern die Wesen späterer Zeit, Erhabener, in der Zeit der letzten 500 [Jahre der Lehre], welche diese Aufstellung des Dharma aufnehmen, aufschreiben, behalten, berühren, lesen und ganz verstehen, die werden etwas höchst Erstaunliches sein. Und, Erhabener, sie werden sich nicht auf die Unterscheidung eines Selbst einlassen, sich nicht auf die Unterscheidung als Lebewesen, Unterscheidung als Lebendiges, Unterscheidung als Person einlassen.</p> <p>Warum? Was Unterscheidung als Selbst, Unterscheidung als Lebewesen, Unterscheidung als Lebendiges, Unterscheidung als Person ist, eben das ist keine existente Unterscheidung.</p> <p>Warum? Weil die Buddhas, Tathāgatas, frei von allen Unterscheidungen sind."</p>
14-3	<p>"[In diesem Sinn], Subhūti, sollte der Bodhisattva –[als ein] Mahāsattva–, nachdem er alle Unterscheidungen losgeworden ist, seinen Geist dahingehend entwickeln, dass er sich nicht [weiterhin] auf [das An-sich-Sein von] Gesehenem–Gehörtem–Gerochenem–Geschmecktem–Getastetem–Gedachtem stützt, dass er sich [bei seinem Denken und Sprechen] nicht auf [seinem Geist solchermaßen] Gegebenes und auch nicht auf [seinem Geist solchermaßen] Nicht-Gegebenes stützt, dass er sich dabei auf gar nichts stützt."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, it is so; it is so. Upon this sutra being explained, those sentient beings who are unafraid, unterrified, and will not become terrified will be most astonishing.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because this highest wisdom gone beyond, taught by the Tathāgata, the highest wisdom gone beyond that is taught by the Tathāgata, was also taught by unfathomable Buddha Bhagavāns – therefore, it is called 'highest wisdom gone beyond.'"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus is it. Any living being who receives an explanation of this sutra and who is not made afraid, and is not frightened, and who does not become frightened, is wondrous in the highest.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the One Thus Gone now speaks to you the highest perfection; and the highest perfection which the One Thus Gone now speaks to you is that same highest perfection which Conquering Buddhas beyond any number to count have spoken as well. And this is precisely why we can call it the 'highest perfection'."</p>	<p>"So ist es, Subhūti. So ist es. Lebewesen, welche bei dieser Sūtra-Erklärung nicht erschrecken, sich nicht fürchten, nicht von Furcht erfüllt sein werden, sind etwas höchst Erstaunliches.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, diese höchste Vollkommenheit der Weisheit, gelehrt vom Tathāgata, die höchste Vollkommenheit der Weisheit, welche der Tathāgata lehrte, ist von zahllosen erhabenen Buddhas ebenfalls gelehrt worden; deshalb ist sie 'höchste Vollkommenheit der Weisheit' zu nennen."</p>
14-4		<p>"Further, Subhūti, that itself which is the patience gone beyond of the Tathāgata has not gone beyond.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because when the king of Kaliūga cut off my limbs and appendages, at that time there did not arise in me discrimination as a self, discrimination as a sentient being, discrimination as a living being, nor discrimination as a person, and in me there was no discrimination whatsoever, yet there was also no non-discrimination.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because, if at that time there had arisen in me discrimination as a self, at that time there would also have arisen discrimination of malice; if there had arisen discrimination as a sentient being, discrimination as a living</p>	<p>"And I say to you further, o Subhuti, that the perfection of patience spoken by the Ones Thus Gone is a perfection that does not even exist. '</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, there was a time when the King of Kalinga was cutting off the larger limbs, and the smaller appendages, of my body. At that moment there came into my mind no conception of a self, nor of a sentient being, nor of a living being, nor of a person—I had no conception at all. But neither did I have no conception.</p> <p>Why is it so? Suppose, o Subhuti, that at that moment any conception of a self had come into my mind. Then the thought to harm someone would have come into my mind as well. The conception of some</p>	<p>"Und, Subhūti, die Vollkommenheit der Geduld, die der Tathāgata lehrte, eben diese ist nicht vollkommen.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, zu jener Zeit, als der König von Kalinga mir Gliedmaßen und kleinere Teile des Körpers abtrennte, kam in mir keine Unterscheidung als ein Selbst, als Lebewesen, als Lebendiges, als Person auf; in mir war keine Unterscheidung und auch keine Nicht-Unterscheidung.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, wenn zu jener Zeit in mir Unterscheidung als Selbst aufkommen wäre, wäre zu der Zeit auch die Unterscheidung von Böswilligkeit entstanden; und wenn Unterscheidung als Lebewesen, als Lebendiges, als Person aufgekommen wäre, so wäre ebenfalls die</p>

	<p>being, discrimination as a person, at that time there would also have arisen discrimination of malice.</p> <p>Subhūti, I know with clairvoyance that in the past period, during five hundred lifetimes, I was the rishi called 'Preacher of Patience'; even then there did not arise in me the discrimination as a self; there did not arise the discrimination as a sentient being, discrimination as a living being, discrimination as a person.</p> <p>Subhūti, therefore, the bodhisattva mahāsattva, completely abandoning all discrimination, should generate the mind for unsurpassed perfectly complete enlightenment. One should generate the mind not abiding in form. One should generate the mind not abiding in sound, smell, taste, tactility, or phenomena. One should generate the mind not abiding in non-phenomena either. One should generate the mind not abiding in anything whatsoever.</p> <p>Why is that? Because that itself which is abiding does not abide. Therefore, the Tathāgata taught, 'The bodhisattva should give gifts not abiding.'</p> <p>"Further, Subhūti, the bodhisattva should thus totally give away gifts for the welfare of all sentient beings. However, that itself which is discrimination as a sentient being is non-discrimination. Those themselves who were taught by the Tathāgata saying 'all sentient beings' also do not exist."</p>	<p>sentient being, and the conception of some living being, and the conception of some person, would have come into my mind. And because of that, the thought to harm someone would have come into my mind as well. I see it, o Subhuti, with my clairvoyance: I took, in times past, five hundred births as the sage called 'Teacher of Patience'. And all during that time I never had any conception of a self, nor of a living being, nor of something being alive, nor of a person.</p> <p>And this is why, o Subhuti, that the Bodhisattvas who are great beings give up every kind of conception, and develop within themselves the Wish to achieve perfect and total enlightenment. And they develop the Wish within them without staying in any of the things you see, nor in sounds, nor in smells, nor in tastes, nor in the things you can touch, nor in any object of the thought as well. Neither do they develop this Wish within them staying in what these objects lack. They develop the Wish without staying in anything at all.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because these things to stay in never stay themselves. And this then is why the One Thus Gone has said that 'Bodhisattvas should undertake the practice of giving without staying.' And I say to you further, o Subhuti, that this is how bodhisattvas give all that they have, for the sake of every living being. And this same conception of anyone as a living being is a conception that does not exist; when the One Gone Thus speaks of 'every living being,' they too are living beings that do not even exist."</p>	<p>Unterscheidung von Ubelwollen entstanden. Subhūti, durch Hellsicht weiß ich, dass auch als ich 500 Leben in vergangener Zeit ein Rishi namens 'Verkünder von Geduld' war, keine Unterscheidung als Selbst, Unterscheidung als Lebewesen, Unterscheidung als Lebendiges und als Person in mir aufkam.</p> <p>Indem er also jegliche Unterscheidungen völlig aufgibt, Subhūti, sollte ein Großer Bodhisattva das Streben nach unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung entwickeln. Diese Einstellung sollte auch entwickelt werden, ohne bei Formen zu verweilen und auch ohne bei Tönen, Gerüchen, Geschmäckern und Tastbarem zu verweilen. Das Bewusstsein soll entwickelt werden, indem man auch bei Phänomenen nicht verweilt. Das Bewusstsein soll entwickelt werden, indem man auch bei Nicht-Phänomenen nicht verweilt. Das Bewusstsein soll entwickelt werden, ohne bei überhaupt irgendetwas zu verweilen.</p> <p>Warum? Was verweilt, eben das verweilt nicht. Deswegen hat der Tathāgata gesagt: Der Bodhisattva soll Gaben geben, ohne bei irgendetwas zu verweilen. Und so, Subhūti, soll der Bodhisattva zum Wohl aller Wesen die Gabe vollständig hingeben. Eben das, was Unterscheidung als Lebewesen ist, ist keine Unterscheidung. Die, die der Tathāgata alle Lebewesen nennt, eben diese Lebewesen sind ebenfalls nicht-existent."</p>
14-5	<p>"Why is that? Subhūti, because the Tathāgata teaches reality, teaches truth, teaches what is; the Tathāgata teaches what is without error.</p> <p>Further, Subhūti, the dharma that is manifestly and completely realized or shown by the Tathāgata has neither truth nor falsity."</p>	<p>"And why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the One Thus Gone is one who speaks right. He is one who speaks true. He is one who speaks precisely what is. The One Thus Gone is one that speaks, without error, precisely that which is. And I speak to you further, o Subhuti, of that thing where Those Gone Thus reach some absolutely total enlightenment; and of that thing which is the Dharma that they teach. It has no truth, and it has no deception."</p>	<p>"Warum? Weil der Tathāgata einwandfrei spricht, wahr spricht, so spricht, wie es ist. Weil der Tathāgata nicht verkehrt spricht, Subhūti. Und, Subhūti, in dem Dharma, den der Tathāgata in vollkommener Buddhaschaft verwirklichte oder zeigte, ist weder Wahrheit noch Falschheit."</p>
14-6	<p>"Subhūti, it is like this, for example: if a man with eyes has entered darkness, he does not see anything whatsoever; likewise should one view the bodhisattva who totally gives up a gift by falling into anything.</p> <p>Subhūti, it is like this, for example: upon dawn and the sun rising, a man with eyes sees various kinds of forms; likewise</p>	<p>"This, Subhuti, is how it is. Think of the example of a man who has eyes to see, but who is sitting in the dark. He sees nothing at all. You should consider a bodhisattva who has fallen into things, and who then practices the act of giving, to be just like this man. And now, Subhuti, think of this man, a man who has eyes to see, as dawn breaks and the sun</p>	<p>"Subhūti, zur Veranschaulichung Folgendes: So wie ein Mensch, der Augen hat und in Dunkelheit eintritt, nichts sieht – so ist ein Bodhisattva zu betrachten, der eine Gabe ganz und gar hingibt, weil er in [die Vorstellung von etwas als] Ding verfällt. Oder, Subhūti, zur Veranschaulichung Folgendes: So wie ein Mensch, der Augen hat, bei Tagesan-</p>

		<p>should one view the bodhisattva who totally gives up a gift by not falling into anything.</p> <p>Further, Subhūti, those sons of the lineage or daughters of the lineage who take up this Dharma discourse, memorize, read, understand, and correctly and thoroughly teach it to others in detail are known by the Tathāgata, they are seen by the Tathāgata. All those sentient beings will produce an unfathomable heap of merit."</p>	<p>risers into the sky; think how then he sees a whole variety of different forms. You should consider a bodhisattva who has not fallen into things, and who then practices the act of giving, to be just like this man. I speak to you further, o Subhuti, of those sons or daughters of noble family who take up this particular presentation of the Dharma, or who hold it, or who read it, or who comprehend it, or who go on to impart it to others in detail, and accurately. These are the kind of people that the Ones Gone Thus know. These are the kind of people that the Ones Gone Thus look upon. Any living being like these people has created a mountain of merit which is beyond all calculation."</p>	<p>bruch, wenn die Sonne aufgeht, vielerlei Formen sieht – so ist ein Bodhisattva zu betrachten, der eine Gabe ganz und gar hingibt, ohne in [die Vorstellung von etwas als] Ding zu verfallen. Und Subhūti, die Söhne und Töchter edler Art, die diese Aufstellung des Dharma aufnehmen, behalten, berühren, lesen, ganz verstehen und anderen ausführlich und völlig korrekt lehren - der Tathāgata kennt sie, der Tathāgata sieht sie. All diese Wesen werden unermessliche Anhäufungen positiven Potenzials hervorbringen."</p>
15-1	<p><i>Essler zu Kap 15-31: 'Vermutlich sind diese Repetitionen als Antworten auf Entgegnungen von Vertretern anderer buddhistischer Schulen entstanden.'</i></p>	<p>"Further, Subhūti, compared to some man or woman, at the time of dawn, totally giving up bodies numbering the grains of sand of the river Ganges – also totally giving up bodies numbering the grains of sand of the river Ganges at the time of midday and evening, in such number totally giving up bodies for many hundred thousands of ten million, hundred billion eons – if someone, having heard this Dharma discourse, would not reject it, if they themselves would produce much greater merit on that basis, incalculable, unfathomable, what need to mention someone who, having written it in letters, takes it up, memorizes, reads, understands, and correctly and thoroughly teaches it to others in detail?</p> <p>Further, Subhūti, this Dharma discourse is unimaginable and incomparable. This Dharma discourse was taught by the Tathāgata for the benefit of sentient beings who have correctly entered into the supreme vehicle, the welfare of sentient beings who have correctly entered into the best vehicle. Those who take up this Dharma discourse, memorize, read, understand, and correctly and thoroughly teach it to others in detail are known by the Tathāgata; they are seen by the Tathāgata. All those sentient beings will be endowed with an unfathomable heap of merit. Being endowed with an unimaginable heap of merit, incomparable, immeasurable, and limitless, all those sentient beings will hold my enlightenment on the shoulder.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, this Dharma discourse is unable to be heard by those who appreciate the inferior, by those viewing a self, by those viewing a sentient being, by those viewing a living being; those viewing a person are unable to hear, to take up, to memorize, to read,</p>	<p>"And I say to you further, o Subhuti: suppose there were some man or woman who could give away, in a single morning, their own body, the same number of times that there are drops of water in the Ganges River itself. And suppose then at midday, and in the evening, they would again give away their own body, the same number of times that there are drops of water in the Ganges River. And suppose they were to keep up this kind of behavior for many billion upon trillions of eons, giving their bodies away. I say to you that anyone who hears this particular presentation of the Dharma, and who never thereafter gives it up, creates much greater merit from this single act than the others do: their merit is countless, and beyond all calculation. And what need have I to mention then the merit of those who take it up by writing it down, or who hold it, or who read it, or who comprehend it, or who go on to impart it to others in detail, and accurately?</p> <p>Again I say to you, o Subhuti, that this presentation of the Dharma is inconceivably great, and beyond all compare. This presentation of the Dharma was spoken by the Ones Gone Thus for those living beings who have entered well into the highest of all ways; and it was spoken for those living beings who have entered well into the foremost of all ways. Think of those who take up this particular presentation of the Dharma, or hold it, or who read it, or who comprehend it, or who go on to impart it to others in detail, and accurately. These are the kind of people that the Ones Gone Thus know. These are the kind of people that the Ones Gone Thus look upon. Any living being like these people is possessed of a mountain of merit beyond all calculation. They are possessed of a mountain of merit</p>	<p>"Und Subhūti, wenn, verglichen mit einem Mann oder einer Frau, der oder die zur Morgenzeit so viele Körper vollständig aufgibt, wie es Sandkörner im Flussbett des Ganges gibt, zur Mittags- und Abendzeit wiederum so viele Körper wie Sandkörner im Flussbett des Ganges vollständig aufgibt und in solcher Anzahl viele Millionen Milliarden Aonen lang Körper vollständig aufgibt - wenn dann jemand, der diese Darstellung des Dharma, nachdem er sie gehört hat, nicht ablehnt, daraus noch viel <i>mehr</i>, [nämlich] zahlloses, unermessliches positives Potenzial hervorbringt, was soll man dann erst von jemandem sagen, der sie, nachdem sie niedergeschrieben ist, aufnimmt, behält, berührt, liest, ganz versteht und anderen ausführlich und völlig korrekt lehrt!</p> <p>Subhūti, diese Aufstellung des Dharma ist unvorstellbar und unvergleichlich, und auch ihr vollständiges Heranreifen sollte als genauso unvorstellbar erkannt werden. Der Tathāgata hat sie zum Wohle der Wesen gelehrt, die wirklich ins höchste Fahrzeug eingetreten sind, zum Wohle der Wesen, die wirklich ins vortrefflichste Fahrzeug eingetreten sind. Der Tathāgata kennt sie, der Tatagata sieht sie, die diese Aufstellung des Dharma aufnehmen, behalten, berühren, lesen, ganz verstehen, anderen ausführlich und völlig korrekt lehren. All diese Wesen werden mit einer unermesslichen Anhäufung positiven Potenzials ausgestattet sein, mit einer unvorstellbaren, unvergleichlichen, unschätzbaren, maßlosen Anhäufung positiven Potenzials ausgestattet sein. All diese Wesen tragen meine Erleuchtung auf der Schulter.</p> <p>Warum? Diejenigen mit Hang zum Niederen können diese Aufstellung des Dharma nicht hören, Subhūti, nicht die-</p>

		<p>and to understand because that cannot be.</p> <p>Further, Subhūti, at whatever place on earth this sutra is taught, that place on earth will become worthy to be paid homage by the world with devas, humans, and Asuras. That place on earth will become worthy as an object of prostration and worthy as an object of circumambulation. That place on earth will become like a shrine."</p>	<p>which is inconceivable, which is beyond all comparison, which cannot be measured, which is beyond all measure. Any such living being is one that I lift up, and carry forth upon my own shoulders, to the enlightenment I have reached.</p> <p>And why is it so? O Subhuti, those who are attracted to lesser things are incapable of hearing this presentation of the Dharma. Neither is it something for those who see some self, or for those who see some living being, or for those who see something that lives, or for those who see some person. They are incapable of hearing it; they are incapable of taking it up; they are incapable of holding it; they are incapable of reading it; and they are incapable too of comprehending it. There would never be any place for them to do so.</p> <p>And I say further to you, o Subhuti: Any place where this sutra is taught thereby becomes a place worthy of the offerings of the entire world, with its gods, and men, and demigods. It becomes a place which is worthy of their prostrations, and worthy of their circumambulations. That place becomes a temple."</p>	<p>jenigen mit der Ansicht eines Selbst, der Ansicht als Lebewesen, der Ansicht als Lebendiges, der Ansicht als Person - sie können dies nicht hören, aufnehmen, behalten, lesen, ganz verstehen; das ist nicht möglich.</p> <p>Selbst der Ort, Subhūti, an welchem dieses Sūtra gelehrt wird, ist würdig verehrt zu werden von der Welt samt Göttern, Menschen und Halbgöttern; dieser Ort ist der Verneigung würdig und der Umrundung, dieser Ort wird gleichsam zu einem Schrein."</p>
16-1		<p>"Subhūti, whatever son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage takes up the words of a sutra like this, memorizes, reads, and understands, they will be tormented; will be intensely tormented.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because whatever non-virtuous actions of former lifetimes that were committed by those sentient beings that would bring rebirth in the lower realms, due to torment in this very life, those non-virtuous actions of former lifetimes will be purified, and they will also attain the enlightenment of a Buddha.</p> <p>Subhūti, I know with clairvoyance that in the past period, in even more countless of countless eons, much beyond even beyond the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha Dipankara, there were eighty-four hundred thousands of ten million, hundred billion Buddhas whom I pleased, and having pleased, did not upset. Subhūti, from whatever I did, having pleased and not having upset those Buddha Bhagavāns and in the future period, at the end of the five hundred, from someone taking up this sutra, memorizing, reading, and understanding, Subhūti, compared to this heap of merit, the former heap of merit does not approach even a hundredth part, a thousandth part, a hundred-thousandth</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, any son or daughter of noble family who takes up a sutra like this, or who holds it, or who reads it, or who comprehends it, will suffer. They will suffer intensely.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, such beings are purifying non-virtuous karma from the entire string of their past lives, karma that would have taken them to the three lower realms. As they purify this karma, it causes them to suffer here in this life. As such they will succeed in cleaning away the karma of these non-virtuous deeds of their previous lifetimes, and they will as well achieve the enlightenment of a Buddha.</p> <p>Subhuti, I see this with my powers of clairvoyance. In days long past—over the course of countless eons that are themselves even more than uncountable—far beyond the time even before the time of the One Gone Thus, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Perfect and Totally Enlightened One named 'Maker of Light'—there came 840 billion billion Buddhas. And I was able to please them all, and never disturb their hearts. But then Subhuti, there are those who, in the days of the last five hundred, will take up this sutra, and they will hold it, and they will read it, and they will comprehend it.</p>	<p>"Doch werden die Söhne und Töchter edler Art, welche die Worte eines solchen Sūtra aufnehmen, behalten, berühren, lesen, ganz verstehen, geplagt werden, schwer geplagt werden, Subhūti.</p> <p>Warum? Weil diesen Wesen dadurch, dass sie geplagt werden, in eben diesem Leben bereinigt wird, was sie in früheren Leben an unheilsamen Handlungen begangen haben, welche [sonst] zu Geburten in niederen Bereichen führen würden. Sie werden auch die Erleuchtung des Buddha erlangen, Subhūti.</p> <p>Subhūti, durch Hellsicht weiß ich, dass es in einer Zeit, die noch viel länger zurückliegt als ein zahlloses Aon, viel früher noch als selbst vor dem Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommenen Buddha Dipankara, 84 Millionen Milliarden Buddhas gab, die ich erfreut habe, nicht enttäuscht habe, da ich nichts tat, was sie betrübte. Subhūti, von allem, was ich tat, jene erhabenen Buddhas zu erfreuen, sie nicht zu enttäuschen, und dem, was in späterer Zeit, in den letzten 500 [Jahren der Lehre], jemand tut, der dieses Sūtra aufnimmt, aufschreibt, behält, berührt, liest und ganz versteht, kommt dieser letzten Anhäufung positiven Potenzials jene frühere Anhäufung positiven Potenzials nicht mal zum hundertsten Teil, nicht einmal zu einem Tausendstel oder Hun-</p>

		<p>part; does not withstand enumeration, measure, calculation, similarity, equivalence, or comparison. Subhūti, at that time, the sons of the lineage or daughters of the lineage will receive a quantity of heap of merit that, if I were to express the heap of merit of those sons of the lineage or daughters of the lineage, sentient beings would go mad, would be disturbed.</p> <p>Further, Subhūti, this Dharma discourse being unimaginable, its maturation indeed should also be known as unimaginable."</p>	<p>And I tell you, o Subhuti, that the great mountains of merit that I collected from pleasing all those Buddhas, all those Conquerors, and from never disturbing their hearts, would not come to a hundredth of the mountains of merit that the ones to come will create. Nor would it come to a thousandth part, nor one part in a hundred thousand, nor any other countable part, any part at all; the difference could never be put in numbers; there is no example I could use; no comparison; no reason at all to attempt any comparison.</p> <p>And suppose, o Subhuti, that I were to describe just how many mountains of virtue would come to be possessed by one of these women or men of noble family, the ones to come who will create those mountains of merit. The living beings who heard me would go mad; their minds would be thrown into chaos.</p> <p>I tell you further, o Subhuti; and you must understand it: this presentation of the Dharma is absolutely inconceivable; and how its power ripens in the future is nothing less than absolutely inconceivable as well."</p>	<p>der tausendstel auch nur nahe, sie kann Zahl, Berechnung, Maß, Beispiel, Vergleich und Grund nicht standhalten.</p> <p>Subhūti, wenn ich beschreiben würde, wie viel positives Potenzial die Söhne und Töchter edler Art zu der Zeit erhalten, würde den Wesen schwindelig werden und ihr Geist ganz verwirrt.</p> <p>Subhūti, diese Aufstellung des Dharma ist unvorstellbar und unvergleichlich, und auch ihr vollständiges Heranreifen sollte als genauso unvorstellbar erkannt werden."</p>
17-1		<p>"Bhagavān, how should one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle abide, how practice, how control the mind?"</p>	<p>"O Conquering One, what of those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva? How shall they live? How shall they practice? How should they keep their thoughts?"</p>	<p>"Wie sollen diejenigen, die wirklich ins Fahrzeug der Bodhisattvas eingetreten sind, darin verbleiben, wie es ausüben, wie den Geist am besten lenken, Erhabener?"</p>
17-2		<p>"Subhūti, here, one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle should generate the mind thinking this: 'I shall cause all sentient beings to pass completely beyond sorrow into the realm of nirvana without remainder of the aggregates. Although sentient beings were caused to pass completely beyond sorrow like that, no sentient being whatsoever was caused to pass beyond sorrow.'</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because if a bodhisattva engages in discriminating a sentient being, he is not to be called a 'bodhisattva.' Also, if he engages in discriminating a person, he is not to be called a 'bodhisattva.'</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because the dharma called 'one who has correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle' does not exist whatsoever."</p>	<p>"Subhuti, this is how those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva must think to themselves as they feel the Wish to achieve enlightenment: I will bring every single living being to total nirvana, to that realm beyond all grief, where they no longer possess any of the heaps of things that make up a suffering person. Yet even if I do manage to bring all these living beings to total nirvana, there will be no living being at all who was brought to their total nirvana. And why is it so? Because, Subhuti, if a bodhisattva were to slip into conceiving of someone as a living being, then we could never call them a 'bodhisattva,' And so too if they were to slip into thinking of someone in all the ways up to thinking of them as a person, neither then could we ever call them a 'bodhisattva.'</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, Subhuti, there doesn't even exist any such thing as what we have called 'those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva.'</p>	<p>"Dazu, Subhūti, sollte jemand, der wirklich ins Fahrzeug der Bodhisattvas eingetreten ist, das Bewusstsein entwickeln, indem er denkt: Ich werde alle Lebewesen dazu bringen, über alles Leid hinauszugelangen in den Bereich des Nirvāṇa ohne Überreste von Skandhas. Doch obwohl so unermesslich viele Lebewesen über alles Leiden hinausgelangt sein werden, wird doch gar kein Lebewesen über alles Leid hinausgelangt sein.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, wenn ein Bodhisattva sich auf die Unterscheidung von Lebewesen einlässt, ist er nicht Bodhisattva zu nennen, und auch wenn er sich auf [die anderen] Unterscheidungen bis hin zu der der Person einlässt, ist er nicht Bodhisattva zu nennen.</p> <p>Warum? Weil die wirklich ins 'Bodhisattva-Fahrzeug Eingetretensein' genannten Phänomene überhaupt nicht existieren, Subhūti."</p>

17-3	<p>“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata from the Tathāgata Dipaṅkara, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, exist whatsoever?”</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Was there anything at all which the One Thus Gone ever received from the One Thus Gone called 'Maker of Light,' which helped bring about my total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha?"</p>	<p>"Was meinst du, Subhūti: Existiert jener Dharma, welchen der Tathāgata von dem Tathāgata Dipaṅkara in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung, verwirklichter, vollkommener Buddhaschaft erlangte, überhaupt?"</p>
17-4	<p>“Bhagavān, that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata from the Tathāgata Dipaṅkara, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever.”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, there never could have been anything at all which the One Thus Gone ever received from the One Thus Gone called 'Maker of Light' which helped bring about your total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha."</p>	<p>"Jener Dharma, welchen der Tathāgata von dem Tathāgata Dipaṅkara in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung, verwirklichter, vollkommener Buddhaschaft erlangte, existiert überhaupt nicht, Erhabener."</p>
17-5	<p>“Subhūti, it is so. It is so, that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata from the Tathāgata Dipaṅkara, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever. Subhūti, if that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata were to exist at all, the Tathāgata Dipaṅkara would not have made the prediction to me, saying,</p> <p>‘Young Brahmin, in a future period you will become the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha called Sakyamuni.’ Subhūti, thus, since that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever, therefore, the Tathāgata Dipaṅkara made the prediction to me, saying, ‘Young Brahmin, in a future period you will become the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha called Sākyamuni.’</p> <p>Why is that? Because, Subhūti, ‘Tathāgata’ is an epithet of the suchness of reality.</p> <p>Subhūti, if someone were to say, ‘The Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha manifestly and completely realized unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment,’ they would speak wrongly.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever. Subhūti, that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata has neither truth nor falsity.</p> <p>Therefore, ‘all dharmas are Buddha dharmas’ was taught by the Tathāgata. Subhūti, ‘all dharmas’, all those are non-dharmas.</p> <p>Therefore, it is said that ‘all dharmas are</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, it is thus, and thus is it. There is nothing at all which the One Thus Gone ever received from the One Thus Gone called 'Maker of Light' which helped me bring about my total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha. And if there had been, o Subhuti, anything of the sort where the One Thus Gone reached his total enlightenment, well then the One Gone Thus, 'Maker of Light,' could never have granted me my final prediction, by saying—</p> <p>'O child of Brahman family, in days to come you will become One who has Gone Thus, a Destroyer of the Foe, a Totally Enlightened Buddha called 'Able One of the Shakyas.' "</p> <p>But since, o Subhuti, there was nothing of the sort where the One Thus Gone before you now reached his total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha, well then the One Gone Thus named 'Maker of Light' did in fact grant me my final prediction, by saying—</p> <p>'O child of Brahman family, in days to come you will become One who has Gone Thus, a Destroyer of the Foe, a Totally Enlightened Buddha called 'Able One of the Shakyas.' "</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the very words 'One Gone Thus' are an expression that refers to the real nature of things. Now suppose, o Subhuti, that someone were to say, 'The One Gone Thus, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Perfect and Totally Enlightened One, reaches his total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha. This would not be spoken true.</p> <p>And why is it so, Subhuti? Because there is no such thing as One Gone Thus reaching their total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state</p>	<p>"So ist es, Subhūti, so ist es. Der Dharma, welchen der Tathāgata von dem Tathāgata Dipaṅkara in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung, verwirklichter, vollkommener Buddhaschaft erlangte, existiert überhaupt nicht. Würde irgendein Dharma, den der Tathāgata von dem Tathāgata Dipaṅkara in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung, verwirklichter, vollkommener Buddhaschaft erlangte, existieren, Subhūti, so hätte mir der Tathāgata Dipaṅkara nicht prophezeit:</p> <p>'Brahmanen-Junge, du wirst einst in Zukunft der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha Shakyamuni genannt werden'.</p> <p>Subhūti, weil der Dharma der in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung verwirklichten, vollkommenen Buddhaschaft überhaupt nicht existiert, deswegen hat der Tathāgata Dipaṅkara mir prophezeit:</p> <p>'Brahmanen-Junge, du wirst einst in Zukunft der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha Shakyamuni genannt werden'.</p> <p>Warum? Weil 'Tathāgata' eine Bezeichnung für die Soheit der Realität ist, Subhūti. Wenn irgendjemand sagt: 'Der Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommene Buddha hat in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung die vollkommene Buddhaschaft verwirklicht', so spricht er verkehrt, Subhūti.</p> <p>Warum? Weil jener Dharma der in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung vollkommen verwirklichten Buddhaschaft überhaupt nicht existiert, Subhūti. In dem Dharma, den der Tathāgata in vollkommener Buddhaschaft verwirklichte oder zeigte, ist weder Wahrheit noch Falschheit, Subhūti.</p> <p>Daher hat der Tathāgata gesagt: 'Alle Dharmas sind Buddha-Dharmas'. Sie alle</p>

		<p>Buddha dharma. Subhūti, it is like this, for example: like a human endowed with a body and the body became large.”</p>	<p>of a Buddha. Subhuti, this thing—where One Gone Thus has reached their total enlightenment—is something which involves neither anything which is real nor anything which is false.</p> <p>And this is why the Ones Gone Thus have said that 'Every existing thing is something of the Buddhas. And when we speak of 'every existing thing,' o Subhuti, we are talking about every existing thing that has no existence. And this is, in fact, why we can call them 'every existing thing' and say that they are 'something of the Buddhas.'</p> <p>You can think, o Subhuti, of the illustration of a person with a body, whose body becomes larger. '</p>	<p>- alle so genannten Dharmas, Subhūti - sind keine Dharmas; deswegen wird gesagt: 'Alle Dharmas sind Buddha-Dharmas'.</p> <p>Subhūti, es ist folgendermaßen – wie wenn zum Beispiel ein Wesen mit einem menschlichen Körper versehen und der Körper groß wäre."</p>
17-6		<p>“Bhagavān, that taught by the Tathāgata, ‘a human endowed with a body and a large body,’ is taught by the Tathāgata as not being a body. Therefore, ‘endowed with a body and a large body’ is said.”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, the One Gone Thus has just spoken of a person with a body, whose body becomes larger. This same body, the One Thus Gone has also stated, is a body that could never exist. And this is precisely why we can call them a 'person with a body,' or 'a larger body'."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, was der Tathāgata 'Wesen mit einem menschlichem Körper versehen' und 'großer Körper' nannte, das wurde vom Tathāgata als nicht-existenter Körper gelehrt; deswegen ist es 'mit Körper versehen' und 'großer Körper' zu nennen."</p>
17-7a		<p>“Subhūti, it is so; if some bodhisattva were to say, ‘I shall cause sentient beings to completely pass beyond sorrow,’ he should not be called ‘bodhisattva.’</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, does the dharma that is called ‘bodhisattva’ exist whatsoever?”</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, this is how it is. Suppose some bodhisattva were to say, 'I will bring all living beings to total nirvana.' We could never then call them a 'bodhisattva.' Why is it so? Subhuti, do you think there is any such thing as what we call a 'bodhisattva?'"</p>	<p>"So ist es, Subhūti, so ist es. Ein Bodhisattva, welcher sagt: 'Ich werde alle Wesen dazu bringen, über alles Leid hinauszugelangen, ist nicht Bodhisattva zu nennen. Warum? Meinst du, Subhūti, dass das Bodhisattva genannte Phänomen überhaupt existiert?'"</p>
17-7b		<p>“Bhagavān, it does not.”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, no such thing could ever be."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es ist nicht so."</p>
17-7c		<p>“Subhūti, therefore, it was taught by the Tathāgata that ‘all dharmas are without a sentient being, without a living being, without a person.’</p> <p>Subhūti, if some bodhisattva were to say, ‘I shall actualize arranged fields,’ he too should be expressed similarly. Why is that? Subhūti, because the arranged fields called ‘arranged fields’ are those taught by the Tathāgata as non-arranged. Therefore, they are called ‘arranged fields.’ Subhūti, whatever bodhisattva appreciates that dharmas are selfless, saying ‘dharmas are selfless,’ he is expressed by the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha as a bodhisattva called a ‘bodhisattva.’"</p>	<p>"This is why, o Subhuti, that the One Thus Gone says that all existing things are such that no living being exists, and nothing that lives exists, and no person exists. And suppose, o Subhuti, that some bodhisattva were to say, 'I am working to bring about my paradise.' That would not be spoken rightly.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, that paradise that you are working to bring about when you say 'I am working to bring about my paradise' is something that the One Thus Gone has said that you could never bring about. And this is precisely why we can call them 'paradises to bring about.' And suppose again, o Subhuti, that there were a bodhisattva who believed that no existing object has a self, that 'no existing object has a self.' This now is a person that the One Thus Gone, the Destroyer of the Foe, the Perfect and Totally Enlightened One would call a bodhisattva: a 'bodhisattva'."</p>	<p>"Deswegen hat der Tathāgata gesagt: 'Alle Dharmas sind ohne Lebewesen, ohne Lebendiges, ohne Person', Subhūti. Wenn irgendein Bodhisattva sagt: 'Ich werde die errichteten [Buddha-]Felder verwirklichen' - dies ist ebenfalls nicht so auszudrücken, Subhūti.</p> <p>Warum? Die errichteten [Buddha-] Felder, die errichtete [Buddha-]Felder genannt werden, Subhūti, - jene Errichtungen sind vom Tathāgata als nicht-existent gelehrt worden, deshalb sind sie 'errichtete [Buddha-]Felder' zu nennen. Einen Bodhisattva, welcher Phänomene ohne Selbst, genannt 'Phänomene ohne Selbst', wertschätzt, Subhūti, den nennt der Tathāgata, der Arhat, der vollkommene Buddha einen Großen Bodhisattva."</p>

18-1		“Subhūti, What do you think about this? Does the Tathāgata possess the flesh eye?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone possess the eyes of flesh?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du, besitzt der Tathāgata das physische Auge?"
18-2		“Bhagavān, it is so; the Tathāgata possesses the flesh eye.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: the One Thus Gone does possess the eyes of flesh."	"So ist es, Erhabener. Der Tathāgata besitzt das physische Auge."
18-3		“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the Tathāgata possess the divine eye?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone possess the eyes of a god?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du, besitzt der Tathāgata das göttliche Auge?"
18-4		“Bhagavān, it is so; the Tathāgata possesses the divine eye.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: the One Thus Gone does possess the eyes of a god."	"So ist es, Erhabener. Der Tathāgata besitzt das göttliche Auge."
18-5		“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the Tathāgata possess the wisdom eye?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone possess the eyes of wisdom?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du, besitzt der Tathāgata das Auge der Weisheit?"
18-6		“Bhagavān, it is so; the Tathāgata possesses the wisdom eye.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: the One Thus Gone does possess the eyes of wisdom."	"So ist es, Erhabener. Der Tathāgata besitzt das Auge der Weisheit."
18-7		Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the Tathāgata possess the dharma eye?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone possess the eyes of all things?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du, besitzt der Tathāgata das Auge des Dharma?"
18-8		“Bhagavān, it is so; the Tathāgata possesses the dharma eye.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: the One Thus Gone does possess the eyes of all things."	"So ist es, Erhabener. Der Tathāgata besitzt das Auge des Dharma."
18-9		“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does the Tathāgata possess the Buddha eye?”	"Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone possess the eyes of an Enlightened Being?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du, besitzt der Tathāgata das Buddha-Auge?"
18-10		“Bhagavān, it is so; the Tathāgata possesses the Buddha eye.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: the One Thus Gone does possess the eyes of an Enlightened Being."	"So ist es, Erhabener. Der Tathāgata besitzt das Buddha-Auge."
18-11	18-12 18-13	“Subhūti, what do you think about this? If, there being also just as many Ganges Rivers as there are grains of sand in the river Ganges, there were just as many world systems as there are grains of sand of those, would those world systems be many?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Suppose you had a quantity of Ganges Rivers equal themselves in number to the number of drops of water in the Ganges River. And suppose that every one of the drops of water in all these rivers became a separate planet. Would this be very many planets?"	"Subhūti, was meinst du - wenn die Sandkörner, die es im Flussbett des Ganges gibt, zu ebenso vielen Ganges-Flussbetten würden, und deren Sandkörner zu ebenso vielen Weltenbereichen, wären die Weltenbereiche dann viele?"
18-14		“Bhagavān, it is so; those world systems would be many.”	"O Conqueror, it is indeed so: that would be a great many planets."	"Erhabener, so wäre es. Es wären viele Weltenbereiche."
18-15		“Subhūti, as many sentient beings as exist in those world systems, I totally know their continua of consciousness of different thoughts. Why is that? Subhūti, because a so-called ‘continuum of consciousness’ is that taught by the Tathāgata as a non-continuum. Therefore, it is called a ‘continuum of consciousness.’ Why is that? Subhūti, because past consciousness does not exist as an observable, nor does future consciousness exist as an observable, nor does present consciousness exist as an observable.”	"O Subhuti, I know, perfectly, the separate mindstreams—each of the thoughts—that each of the total number of living beings in each of these planets possesses. Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, that thing we call a 'mindstream' is a mindstream that the One Thus Gone has said does not even exist. And this is precisely why we can call it a 'mindstream'. And why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, a mind which is past is non-existent. And a mind in the future is non-existent. And a mind that is going on at the present is non-existent as well."	"Subhūti, die Bewusstseinsströme der unterschiedlichen Gedanken sämtlicher Lebewesen, die es in jenen Weltenbereichen gibt, erkenne ich ganz genau. Warum ist das so? Weil der Bewusstseinsstrom, der Bewusstseinsstrom genannt wird, Subhūti, vom Tathāgata als nicht-existenter Bewusstseinsstrom gelehrt wurde; deshalb ist er 'Bewusstseinsstrom' zu nennen. Warum? Weil ein vergangenes Bewusstsein nicht zu beobachten ist, ein zukünftiges Bewusstsein nicht zu beobachten ist und auch ein jetzt entstandenes Bewusstsein nicht zu beobachten ist."

19-1		<p>“Subhūti, what do you think about this? If someone, completely filling this billionfold world system with the seven types of precious things, were to give gifts, do you think that son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage would produce an enormous heap of merit on that basis?”</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Suppose someone were to take all the planets of this great world system, a system with a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets, and cover them all with the seven kinds of precious substances, and offer them to someone. Would that son or daughter of noble family create many great mountains of merit from such a deed?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du: Wenn jemand dieses große Weltensystem von tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und als Gabe darbrächte, würde dann dieser Sohn oder diese Tochter edler Art auf jener Grundlage immenses positives Potenzial hervorbringen?"</p>
19-2		<p>“Bhagavān, enormous. Sugata, enormous.”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, many would it be. O You who have Gone to Bliss, it would be many."</p>	<p>"Immens, Erhabener, immens, Sugata."</p>
19-3		<p>“Subhūti, it is so. It is so; that son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage would produce an enormous heap of merit on that basis. Subhūti, if a heap of merit were a heap of merit, the Tathāgata would not have taught a heap of merit called a ‘heap of merit.’</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus is it. That son or daughter of noble family would indeed create many great mountains of merit from such a deed. And yet, o Subhuti, if these great mountains of merit were in fact great mountains of merit, then the One Thus Gone would never call these great mountains of merit 'great mountains of merit'."</p>	<p>"So ist es, Subhūti, so ist es. Der Sohn oder die Tochter edler Art brächte auf jener Grundlage eine immense Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervor. Aber wenn 'Anhäufung positiven Potenzials' Anhäufung positiven Potenzials wäre, hätte der Tathāgata die 'Anhäufung positiven Potenzials' genannte Anhäufung positiven Potenzials nicht gelehrt."</p>
20-1		<p>“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Should one be viewed as the Tathāgata due to total achievement of the form body?”</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Should we ever consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they have attained the physical form of an Enlightened Being?"</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du: Ist jemand anhand der vollkommenen Verwirklichung des Formkörpers als Tathāgata zu betrachten?"</p>
20-2		<p>“Bhagavān, it is not so; one should not be viewed as the Tathāgata due to total achievement of the form body. Why is that? Bhagavān, because ‘total achievement of the form body’ is that taught by the Tathāgata as not being total achievement; therefore, it is called ‘total achievement of the form body.’”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, it is not so: we should never consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they have attained the physical form of an Enlightened Being. And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, the attainment of the physical form of an Enlightened Being—this thing we call the 'attainment of the physical form of an Enlightened Being'—is an attainment that the One Thus Gone has said could never exist. And this is precisely why we can even call it the 'attainment of the physical form of an Enlightened Being'."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, so ist es nicht. Jemand ist nicht anhand der vollkommenen Verwirklichung des Formkörpers als Tathāgata zu betrachten. Warum? Erhabener, weil die so genannte vollkommene Verwirklichung des Formkörpers vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente vollkommene Verwirklichung gelehrt wurde; deshalb ist sie 'vollkommene Verwirklichung des Formkörpers' zu nennen."</p>
20-3		<p>“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Is one to be viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks?”s</p>	<p>O Subhuti, what do you think? Should we ever consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess the exquisite marks of an Enlightened Being?</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du: Ist jemand anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten?"</p>
20-4		<p>“Bhagavān, it is not so; one is not to be viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks. Why is that? Because that which was taught by the Tathāgata as perfect marks was taught by the Tathāgata as not being perfect marks; therefore, they are called ‘perfect marks.’”</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, it is not so: we should never consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess the exquisite marks of an Enlightened Being. And why is it so? Because the marks of an Enlightened Being which have been described by the One Gone Thus are marks of an Enlightened Being that the One Gone Thus has said could never exist. And this is precisely why we can even call them 'marks</p>	<p>"Erhabener, so ist es nicht. Jemand ist nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten. Warum? Weil die vollkommenen Merkmale, die der Tathāgata lehrte, vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente vollkommene Merkmale gelehrt worden sind; deshalb sind sie 'vollkommene Merkmale' zu nennen."</p>

			of an Enlightened Being'."	
21-1a 21-1b		<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? If it is thought that the Tathāgata considers, 'the dharma is demonstrated by me,' Subhūti, do not view it like that, because the dharma that is demonstrated by the Tathāgata does not exist whatsoever."</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Does the One Thus Gone ever think to himself, 'Now I will teach the Dharma?' If you think he does, then I tell you, o Subhuti, that you should never look at it that way, for there doesn't exist any Dharma that the One Thus Gone ever teaches."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, was meinst du - falls du meinst, der Tathāgata hegt den Gedanken: 'Ich habe den Dharma aufgezeigt' - sieh es nicht so an, Subhūti, denn den vom Tathāgata aufgezeigten Dharma gibt es überhaupt nicht."</p>
21-2		<p>Subhūti, if someone were to say 'the dharma is demonstrated by the Tathāgata,' Subhūti, he would deprecate me since nonexistent and wrongly seized. Why is that? Subhūti, because that demonstrated dharma called 'demonstrated dharma,' which is referred to saying 'demonstrated dharma,' does not exist whatsoever."</p>	<p>"Subhuti, anyone who ever says that 'The One Thus Gone teaches the Dharma' is talking about something that does not even exist; they are completely mistaken, and they are denying who I am. Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the teaching of the Dharma that you are thinking of when you say 'teaching of the Dharma' is a 'teaching of the Dharma' that does not exist at all."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, wenn jemand sagt: 'Der Tathāgata zeigte den Dharma auf', so würde mich das herabsetzen, Subhūti, weil dieser nicht existiert und verkehrt aufgefasst wäre. Warum? Subhūti, der so genannte aufgezeigte Dharma, der aufgezeigte Dharma, auf den [man sich] als 'aufgezeigter Dharma' bezieht, jener Dharma existiert überhaupt nicht."</p>
21-3		<p>"Bhagavān, in the future period, will there be any sentient beings who, having heard this demonstration of such a dharma as this, will clearly believe?"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, will there be, in days to come, any living being who ever hears a teaching of the Dharma like this and who believes completely what it says?"</p>	<p>"Erhabener, wird es in zukünftiger Zeit Lebewesen geben, welche, nachdem sie solche Dharma-Erklärungen gehört haben, klar und deutlich davon überzeugt sein werden?"</p>
21-4		<p>"Subhūti, they are not sentient beings nor non-sentient beings. Why is that? Subhūti, so-called 'sentient beings,' because they were taught by the Tathāgata as non-sentient beings, therefore are called 'sentient beings.'"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, such beings will not be living beings, nor will they not be a living being. Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the things we call 'living beings' are living beings that the Ones Gone Thus have said are not. And that is precisely why we can call them 'living beings'."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, jene sind weder Lebewesen noch nicht Nicht-Lebewesen. Warum? Die so genannten Lebewesen, die wurden vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente Lebewesen gelehrt, Subhūti; deshalb sind sie 'Lebewesen' zu nennen."</p>
22-1a		<p>"Subhūti, what do you think about this? Does that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, exist whatsoever?"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, what do you think? Is there any such thing as Ones Gone Thus reaching their total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha?"</p>	<p>"Was meinst du, Subhūti, existiert der Dharma der vom Tathāgata in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung verwirklichten, vollkommenen Buddhaschaft überhaupt?"</p>
22-1b		<p>"Bhagavān, that dharma that was manifestly and completely realized by the Tathāgata, unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment, does not exist whatsoever."</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, there could never be any such thing as the Ones Gone Thus reaching their total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, der Dharma der vom Tathāgata in unübertrefflicher, vollständiger Erleuchtung vollkommen verwirklichten Buddhaschaft existiert überhaupt nicht."</p>
22-2		<p>"Subhūti, it is so; it is so. For it even the least dharma does not exist and is not observed; therefore, it is called 'unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment.'"</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus is it. There is no such thing, not in the least: it is something non-existent. And that is precisely why we can even call it the 'unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha'."</p>	<p>"So ist es, Subhūti, so ist es. Darin ist auch nicht das kleinste bisschen Dharma zu beobachten und existiert auch nicht. Deshalb ist sie 'unübertreffliche, vollständige Erleuchtung' zu nennen."</p>
23		<p>"Further, Subhūti, that dharma is equivalent since, for it, inequivalence does not exist whatsoever; therefore, it is called 'unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment.' That unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment – equivalent as selfless, without sentient being, with-</p>	<p>"I say to you further, o Subhuti, that this thing too is completely equal; there is nothing at all about it which is not equal. This too is precisely why we can call it the 'unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha.' This unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of a Buddha is 'completely</p>	<p>"Und jener Dharma ist gleichartig, Subhūti; es gibt keinerlei Ungleichheit, er ist gleichermaßen ohne Lebewesen, ohne Lebendiges, ohne Person; vollkommene Buddhaschaft wird durch alle die heilsamen Dharmas verwirklicht. Und die heilsamen Dharmas, die heilsame Dhar-</p>

		out living being, without person – is manifestly and completely realized through all virtuous dharmas. Subhūti, virtuous dharmas called ‘virtuous dharmas,’ they, taught by the Tathāgata as just non-dharmas, are therefore called ‘virtuous dharmas.’”	equal’ in being something without a self, and without a living being, and without something that lives, and without any person. Every single thing which is virtue leads to this total enlightenment.”	mas genannt werden, Subhūti, eben die wurden vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente heilsame Dharmas gelehrt; deshalb sind sie ‘heilsame Dharmas’ zu nennen.
24		“Further, Subhūti, compared to any son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage collecting a heap of the seven types of precious things about equaling whatever Sumeru, king of mountains, exist in a billion world systems, and giving gifts, if someone, having taken up even as little as a stanza of four lines from this wisdom gone beyond, were to teach it to others, Subhūti, compared to this heap of merit, the former heap of merit having not approached even a hundredth part, does not withstand comparison.”	"And I say to you further, o Subhuti: think of all the number of universal mountains that you would find on all the planets of this great world system: a system with a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets. And suppose that some daughter or son of noble family were to pile together the same number of heaps of the seven precious things, each heap the same size as the mountain, and offer it as a gift to someone. Suppose that someone else were to take up, and teach to others, even so little as a single verse of four lines from this perfection of wisdom. I tell you, o Subhuti, that the mountain of created by the first person would not come to even a hundredth part of the mountain of merit created by the second; it would not come to any of the parts we spoke of before, all the way up to saying that there would be no reason to attempt any comparison between the two."	"Und, Subhūti, auch wenn irgendein Sohn oder eine Tochter edler Art so viele Anhäufungen der Sieben Kostbaren Dinge zusammentrüge, wie es höchste Berge, Könige der Berge, im großen Weltensystem der tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten gibt, und als Gabe darbrächte, und demgegenüber jemand auch nur einen vierzeiligen Vers aus diesem Sūtra der Vollkommenheit der Weisheit aufnimmt und auch anderen lehrt, so kommt die erstere Anhäufung positiven Potenzials dieser letzteren nicht einmal zu einem Hundertstel auch nur nahe, hält dieser bis zum Grunde nicht stand."
25		“Subhūti, what do you think about this? If it is thought that the Tathāgata considers, ‘Sentient beings are liberated by me,’ Subhūti, do not view it like that. Why is that? Subhūti, because those sentient beings who are liberated by the Tathāgata do not exist whatsoever. Subhūti, if some sentient being were to be liberated by the Tathāgata, that itself would be, of the Tathāgata, grasping a self, grasping a sentient being, grasping a living being, grasping a person. Subhūti, so-called ‘grasping a self,’ that is taught by the Tathāgata as non-grasping, yet that is grasped by childish ordinary beings. Subhūti, so-called ‘childish ordinary beings,’ they were taught by the Tathāgata as just non-beings; therefore, they are called ‘childish ordinary beings.’”	"Subhuti, what do you think? Do the Ones Thus Gone ever think to himself, 'I am going to free all living beings'? If you think that they do, then I tell you, o Subhuti, you should never look at it like this. And why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, there is no living being at all that Those Gone Thus could ever free. And if, o Subhuti, the One Gone Thus ever did free some living being, then he would be grasping to some self of the One Gone Thus, and to some living being, or to something that lives, or to some person of the One Gone Thus. And the One Gone Thus, o Subhuti, has said that this very act that we call 'grasping to some self' is a grasping to a self that does not even exist. It is, in fact, something that common beings, those who are still children, grasp to. And these same common beings, o Subhuti, those who are still children, are beings that the One Gone Thus has said never existed at all. And that's precisely why we can call them 'common beings'."	"Subhūti, was meinst du: Hegt der Tathāgata den Gedanken: 'Ich habe Lebewesen befreit'? Falls du so denkst - Subhūti, sieh es nicht so an. Warum? Weil die Lebewesen, welche vom Tathāgata befreit wurden, überhaupt nicht existieren, Subhūti. Wenn irgendein Lebewesen vom Tathāgata befreit worden wäre, Subhūti, wäre eben dies ein Auffassen des Tathāgata als Selbst, ein Auffassen als Lebewesen, Auffassen als Person, Ergreifen als Lebendiges. Subhūti, als der Tathāgata die so genannte Auffassung vom Selbst als nicht-existente Auffassung lehrte, hielten kindische gewöhnliche Lebewesen dennoch daran fest. Subhūti, die so genannten kindischen gewöhnlichen Lebewesen wurden vom Tathāgata als eben nicht-existente Lebewesen gelehrt, Subhūti; deshalb sind sie 'kindische gewöhnliche Lebewesen' zu nennen."
26-1		“Subhūti, what do you think about this? Is one to be viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks?”	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Should we consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess exquisite	"Subhūti, was meinst du: Ist jemand anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten?"

			marks?"	
26-2		"Bhagavān, it is not so; one is not viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks."	"O Conqueror, it is not so: we should never consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess the exquisite marks of One Gone Thus."	"Erhabener, so ist es nicht. Jemand ist nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten."
26-3		"Subhūti, it is so; it is so. One is not viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks. Subhūti, if one were viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks, even a chakravartin king would be the Tathāgata; therefore, one is not viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks."	"O Subhuti, thus it is, and thus is it. We should never consider someone the One Gone Thus just because they possess exquisite marks. If we were, Subhuti, to consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possessed exquisite marks, then a Wheel Emperor would have to be One Gone Thus. As such, we should never consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess exquisite marks."	"So ist es, Subhūti, so ist es: Jemand ist nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten. Wäre jemand anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten, so wäre auch ein Chakravartin ein Tathāgata; folglich ist jemand nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten."
26-4		"Bhagavān, as I understand the meaning of what the Bhagavān has said, one is not viewed as the Tathāgata due to perfect marks."	"As far as I grasp the thrust of what the Conqueror has said, we should never consider someone One Gone Thus simply because they possess exquisite marks."	"Erhabener, so wie ich die Bedeutung dessen, was der Erhabene lehrte, verstehe: Jemand ist nicht anhand vollkommener Merkmale als Tathāgata zu betrachten."
26-5		<i>Then, these verses were spoken by the Bhagavān at that time:</i>	<i>At this point then the Conqueror spoke the following lines of verse:</i>	<i>Zu dieser Zeit sprach dann der Erhabene folgende Verse:</i>
26-6		"Whoever sees me as form, whoever knows me as sound, has wrongly engaged by abandoning, those beings do not see me. The buddhas are dharmatā viewed; the guides are the dharmakāya. Since dharmatā is not to be known, it is unable to be known."	"Whoever sees me in things you can see, Whoever knows me in sounds to hear, Is living in error, has given me up; People like this cannot see me at all." (See that Buddhas are the nature of things. Our guides are the Dharma bodies. Those for whom this nature of things Is beyond the things they know Will never be able to know.)	"Diejenigen, welche mich sehen als Form, Diejenigen, welche mich kennen als Ton, Sind auf verkehrte Wege geraten; Diese Wesen sehen nicht mich. Sieh die Buddhas als Dharmatā [die Natur aller Phänomene]; Die Führer des Weges sind Dharmakāya [Körper letztendlicher Wahrheit]. Da Dharmatā nicht zu 'kennen' ist, Kann man es nicht in Aspekten erkennen."
27		"Subhūti, what do you think about this? If one grasps that 'the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha is due to perfect marks,' Subhūti, you should not view so for, Subhūti, the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha does not manifestly and completely realize unsurpassed perfect and complete enlightenment due to perfect marks. Subhūti, if one grasps that 'some dharma has been designated as destroyed or annihilated by those who have correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle,' Subhūti, it should not be viewed so; those who have correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle have not designated any dharma whatsoever as destroyed or annihilated."	"O Subhuti, what do you think? Suppose a person thought to themselves that someone was One Gone Thus, a Destroyer of the Foe, a Perfect and Total Buddha, just because they possessed the exquisite marks of an Enlightened Being. Subhuti, you should never think the way they do. This is because, Subhuti, of the fact that there is no such thing as the exquisite marks meaning that One Gone Thus, a Destroyer of the Foe, a Perfect and Total Buddha, has reached their total enlightenment within the unsurpassed, perfect, and total state of an Enlightened Being. O Subhuti, suppose you were to think to yourself that those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva ever deny any particular thing that exists, or that they imagine that there is nothing which exists. You should never, Subhuti, think that this is so. Those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva ne-	"Subhūti, was meinst du, wenn man den Tathāgata, Arhat, in vollständiger Erleuchtung vollkommen verwirklichten Buddha aufgrund vollkommener Merkmale erfasst - Subhūti, so solltest du es nicht sehen, denn der Tathāgata, Arhat, ist nicht aufgrund vollkommener Merkmale ein vollkommen verwirklichter Buddha, Subhūti. Subhūti, falls du es so auffasst, dass diejenigen, die wirklich ins Bodhisattva-Fahrzeug eingetreten sind, irgendwelche Phänomene zerstört oder vernichtend geschildert hätten - so ist es nicht anzusehen, Subhūti. Die wirklich ins Bodhisattva-Fahrzeug Eingetretenen haben überhaupt kein Phänomen zerstört oder vernichtend geschildert."

			ver deny any particular thing, nor do they imagine that there is nothing which exists."	
28-1		"Further, Subhūti, compared to any son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage who, completely filling with the seven kinds of precious things as many world systems as there are grains of sand of the rivers Ganges, were to give gifts, if any bodhisattva attained forbearance that dharmas are selfless and unproduced, on that basis the heap of merit they themselves would produce would be much greater. Further, Subhūti, a heap of merit should not be acquired by the bodhisattva."	"And I say to you again, o Subhuti: Suppose that some son or daughter of noble family were to take planets equal in number to the drops of water in the Ganges River, and cover them with the seven kinds of precious things, and offer it as a gift to someone. Suppose on the other hand that a particular bodhisattva were able to gain the state of mastery towards the fact that no object in the universe has any self-nature, nor ever begins. This second person would create from his act mountains of merit that are infinitely greater than those of the first. I say to you again, o Subhuti, that bodhisattvas never gather into themselves great mountains of merit."	"Nochmals, Subhūti, verglichen mit einem Sohn oder einer Tochter edler Art, welche/r so viele Weltensysteme, wie es Sandkörner im Flussbett des Ganges gibt, mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen ganz anfüllte und als Gabe darbrächte, bringt ein Bodhisattva, wenn er in Bezug auf diese Aufstellung des Dharma - Nicht-Selbst und Nicht-Entstehen – Duldsamkeit erreicht, auf eben dieser Grundlage eine Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervor, die viel mehr, zahllos und unermesslich ist. Jedoch sollten Bodhisattvas Anhäufung positiven Potenzials nicht erfassen, Subhūti."
28-2		"Bhagavān, should not a heap of merit be acquired by the bodhisattva?"	"O Conqueror, do you mean to say that bodhisattvas should never try to gather into themselves great mountains of merit?"	"Erhabener, der Bodhisattva soll Anhäufung positiven Potenzials nicht erfassen?"
28-3		"Subhūti, acquire, not wrongly grasp; therefore, it is called 'acquire.'"	"Of course they should gather them in, Subhuti. But they should never gather them in in the wrong way. And this is precisely why we can call it 'gathering them in'."	"Zwar erfassen, doch nicht verkehrt erfassen. Von daher ist es 'Erfassen' zu nennen."
29		"Subhūti, if someone says, 'The Tathāgata goes or comes or stands or sits or lies down,' he does not understand the meaning explained by me. Why is that? Subhūti, because 'the Tathāgata' ('the One Gone Thus') does not go anywhere nor has come from anywhere; therefore, one says, 'the Tathāgata Arhat Perfectly Completed Buddha.'"	"And suppose, o Subhuti, that someone were to say that 'the One Thus Gone goes, and comes; and he stands, and sits; and he lies down as well.' Such a person has failed to understand what I am teaching you here. Why is it so, Subhuti? Because the one we call 'One Thus Gone' neither goes anywhere nor comes from anywhere. And this is precisely why we can call them 'Ones Gone Thus, Destroyers of the Foe, Perfect and Totally Enlightened Ones'."	"Auch wenn irgendjemand sagt: 'Der Tathāgata geht, kommt, erhebt sich, verweilt, legt sich nieder', Subhūti, versteht er die Bedeutung nicht, die ich erklärte. Warum? Subhūti, weil der, den man Tathāgata [den 'Dahingegangenen'] nennt, weder irgendwohin geht noch irgendwoher kommt. Deshalb ist er 'Tathāgata, Arhat, vollkommener Buddha' zu nennen."
30-1		"Further, Subhūti, if some son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage were to render as many atoms of earth as exist in a billionfold world system, like this for example, into powder like a collection of subtlest atoms, Subhūti, what do you think about this? Would that collection of subtlest atoms be many?"	"And I say again to you, Subhuti. Suppose some daughter or son of noble family were to take all the atoms of dust that made up all the planets in the great world system, of a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets. And suppose for example that they were to crush each of these atoms into a pile of even tinier atoms that were equal in number to all these atoms of the planets. What do you think, Subhuti? Would the tiny atoms in these piles be very many?"	"Subhūti, und wenn ein Sohn oder eine Tochter edler Art alle Erdkrumen, die es im großen Weltensystem von tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten gibt, zum Beispiel so wie eine Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen zu Puder zermahlte - was meinst du, Subhūti, wäre die Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen dann immens?"
30-2		"Bhagavān, it is so. That collection of subtlest atoms would be many."	"Conqueror, it is so: the tiny atoms in those piles would be very great in number."	"Erhabener, so ist es, die Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen wäre immens."

		<p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because if there were a collection, the Bhagavān would not have said 'collection of subtlest atoms.'</p> <p>Why is that? Because that 'collection of subtlest atoms' that was taught by the Bhagavān was taught by the Tathāgata as no collection; therefore, one says 'collection of subtlest atoms.' That 'billionfold world system' that was taught by the Tathāgata was taught by the Tathāgata as no system; therefore, one says 'billionfold world system.'</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because if there were to be a world system, that itself would be grasping a solid thing. That taught by the Tathāgata as grasping a solid thing was taught by the Tathāgata as no grasping; therefore, one says 'grasping a solid thing.'"</p>	<p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, if such a pile were even possible, then the Conqueror would never have even bothered to mention any piles of tiny atoms.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because the One Thus Gone has said that the 'piles of tiny atoms' described by the Conqueror are piles that could never exist. And this is precisely why we can call them 'piles of tiny atoms.'</p> <p>And the One Thus Gone has also said that those 'planets in a great world system, a system of a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets,' are planets that could never exist. This is precisely why we can call them 'planets in a great world system, a system of a thousand of a thousand of a thousand planets.'</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, if there were any such thing as a planet, then one would have to be grasping to it as one whole solid thing. And the One Thus Gone has said that the 'tendency to grasp things as one whole solid thing' described by the One Thus Gone is a kind of grasping that could never exist anyway. And this is precisely why we can call it 'grasping something as a whole solid thing'."</p>	<p>Warum? Der Erhabene hätte nicht 'Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen' gesagt, wenn eine Anhäufung von Teilchen existent wäre, Erhabener.</p> <p>Warum? Die Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen, die der Erhabene lehrte, wurde vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente Anhäufung gelehrt; deshalb ist sie 'Anhäufung feinsten Teilchen' zu nennen. Das Weltensystem der tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten, das der Erhabene lehrte, wurde vom Tathāgata als nicht-existentes Weltensystem gelehrt; deshalb ist es 'das große Weltensystem von tausend mal tausend mal tausend Welten' zu nennen.</p> <p>Warum? Erhabener, würde das Weltensystem existieren, würde man es als ein festes Ganzes erfassen. Warum? Was der Tathāgata als 'Erfassen als festes Ganzes' lehrte, lehrte er als nicht-existentes Erfassen; deshalb ist es 'Erfassen als festes Ganzes' zu nennen."</p>
30-3		<p>"Subhūti, grasping a solid thing is it- self a convention; that dharma does not exist as expressed, yet it is grasped by ordinary childish beings."</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, this very tendency to grasp things as one whole solid thing is nominal; the thing is beyond all words. Nonetheless those who are still children—common beings—hold on to it."</p>	<p>"Subhūti, Erfassen als festes Ganzes ist ein Begriff; wenn auch das Phänomen nicht als Aussprechbares existiert, so halten kindische gewöhnliche Lebewesen doch eben daran fest."</p>
31-1		<p>"Subhūti, if someone were to say, 'Viewing as a self was taught by the Tathāgata and viewing as a sentient being, viewing as a living being, viewing as a person was taught by the Tathāgata.' Subhūti, would that be spoken by right speech?"</p>	<p>"And suppose, o Subhuti, that someone were to say: 'The One Thus Gone talks about seeing something as a self. The One Thus Gone talks about seeing something as a living being. The One Thus Gone talks about seeing something as something that lives. And the One Thus Gone talks too about seeing something as a person. Do you think, Subhuti, that this would ever be said by someone who was speaking correctly?"</p>	<p>Subhūti, wenn jemand sagt: 'Der Tathāgata lehrte die Ansicht vom Selbst, der Tathāgata lehrte die Ansicht als Lebewesen, als Lebendiges, als Person - wäre das eine korrekt gesprochene Aussage?"</p>
31-2		<p>"Bhagavān, it would not. Sugata, it would not.</p> <p>Why is that? Bhagavān, because that which was taught by the Tathāgata as viewing as a self, was taught by the Tathāgata as no viewing; therefore, one says, 'viewing as a self.'"</p>	<p>"O Conqueror, it would not be so. O You who have Gone to Bliss, that would not be so.</p> <p>And why is it so? Because, o Conqueror, the One Gone Thus has said that this same seeing something as a self described by the One Gone Thus is a way of seeing things that could never exist anyway. And this is precisely why we can call it 'seeing something as a self'."</p>	<p>"Erhabener, es wäre nicht so, Sugata, es wäre nicht so.</p> <p>Warum? Was der Tathāgata als Ansicht vom Selbst lehrte, lehrte er als nicht-existente Ansicht; deshalb ist es 'Ansicht vom Selbst' zu nennen."</p>
31-3		<p>"Subhūti, those who have correctly entered the bodhisattva's vehicle should know, should view, should appreciate all dharmas like this; they should appreciate like this, not abiding whatsoever in any</p>	<p>"O Subhuti, this is how those who have entered well into the way of the bodhisattva should understand every single object in the universe. This is how they should see these things; this is how they</p>	<p>"Dazu, Subhūti: Wer wirklich ins Bodhisattva-Fahrzeug eingetreten ist, sollte alle Dharmas auf diese Weise erkennen, sehen und wertschätzen: keinesfalls in deren Unterscheidung als irgendein</p>

		<p>discrimination as a dharma.</p> <p>Why is that? Subhūti, because discrimination as a dharma, called 'discrimination as a dharma,' is taught by the Tathāgata as non-discrimination; therefore, one says 'discrimination as a dharma.'</p>	<p>should think of them. They should never live in a way where they conceive of anything as an object at all, and thus should they think of things.</p> <p>Why is it so? Because, o Subhuti, the One Thus Gone has said that conceiving of something as an object, this thing we call 'conceiving of something as something,' is a conception that does not exist anyway. And this is precisely why we can call it 'conceiving of something as something'."</p>	<p>Dharma verweilend.</p> <p>Warum? Subhūti, Unterscheidung als Dharma, genannt 'Unterscheidung als Dharma', wurde vom Tathāgata als nicht-existente Unterscheidung gelehrt; deshalb ist sie 'Unterscheidung als Dharma' zu nennen."</p>
32-1		<p>"Further, Subhūti, compared to any bodhisattva mahāsattva who, completely filling unfathomable and incalculable world systems with the seven kinds of precious things, were to give gifts, if any son of the lineage or daughter of the lineage who, having taken as little as a stanza of four lines from this perfection of wisdom, were to memorize or read or understand or correctly and thoroughly teach it to others in detail, on that basis the merit he himself would produce would be more, incalculable, unfathomable.</p> <p>"How should one correctly and thoroughly teach? Just how one would not correctly and thoroughly teach; therefore, one says, 'correctly and thoroughly teach.'</p> <p>"As a star, a visual aberration, a lamp, an illusion, dew, a bubble, a dream, lightning, and a cloud – view all the compounded like that."</p>	<p>"And I say to you again, o Subhuti: Suppose some great bodhisattva were to take a countless number of planets, a number of planets beyond all calculation, and cover them with the seven kinds of precious things, and offer them as a gift to someone. Suppose on the other hand that some son or daughter of noble family were to take up even so little as a single verse of four lines from this perfection of wisdom, or hold it, or read it, or comprehend it, or teach it to others in detail, and accurately. They would from this act create infinitely more great mountains of merit, beyond all count, and beyond all calculation. And what would it be, to teach this perfection accurately to others? It would be just the same as not teaching it to others. And that is precisely why we can call it 'teaching it to others, accurately'.</p> <p>See anything brought about by causes As like a star, An obstruction of the eye, A lamp, an illusion, The dew, or a bubble; A dream, or lightning, Or else a cloud."</p>	<p>"Nochmals, Subhūti, verglichen mit einem Großen Bodhisattva, der zahllose, unermessliche Weltensysteme ganz mit den Sieben Kostbaren Dingen anfüllte und als Gabe darbrächte, bringt ein Sohn oder eine Tochter edler Art, wenn er oder sie auch nur einen vierzeiligen Vers aus dieser Vollkommenheit der Weisheit, nachdem sie niedergeschrieben ist, aufnimmt, berührt, liest, ganz versteht, anderen ausführlich und völlig korrekt lehrt, auf eben dieser Grundlage eine Anhäufung positiven Potenzials hervor, die noch viel mehr, zahllos und unermesslich ist. Und wie sollte man völlig korrekt lehren? Wie völlig korrektes, nicht existentes Lehren - so lehrt man bestens und korrekt. Von daher wird es völlig korrektes Lehren genannt.</p> <p>Wie einen Stern, eine Luftspiegelung, eine Butterlampe, Wie Illusion, Tautropfen, Luftblasen im Wasser, Wie einen Traum, einen Blitz, eine Wolke - So sieh alles an, was zusammengesetzt ist."</p>
32-2	<p><i>Dies sprach der Bhagavan. Entzückt und hocherfreut waren da der Sthavīra Subhūti, die Bhīksus und Bhīksunīs, die [sich üben-den] Laien und Laiinnen, die Bodhisattvas, und alle [anderen, die diese Darlegung gleichfalls gehört hatten], über diese vom Bhagavan gegebene Unterweisung.</i></p>	<p><i>That having been said by the Bhagavān, the elder Subhūti, those bodhisattvas, the four-fold disciples – bhikṣhus, bhikṣunis, upāsakas and upāsikas – and the world with devas, humans, asuras, and gandharvas, over-joyed, highly praised that taught by the Bhagavān.</i></p>	<p><i>When the Conqueror had spoken these words, then the elder Subhuti rejoiced. And so did the bodhisattvas there rejoice, and all four groups of disciples—the monks, and the nuns, and the men with lifetime vows, and the women with lifetime vows.</i></p>	<p><i>Nachdem der Erhabene diese Worte gesprochen hatte, erfreuten sich der Sthavira Subhūti, die Großen Bodhisattvas, der vierfache Kreis des Sangha - Mönche, Nonnen sowie Männer und Frauen mit Laiengelübden, die in Haushalten lebten - und die Welt samt Göttern, Halbgöttern und Gandharvas daran und priesen zuhöchst, was der Erhabene gelehrt hatte.</i></p>