

B = Stephen Batchelor? (according to internet site)

SB = Stephen Batchelor: VERSES FROM THE CENTER: A BUDDHIST VISION OF THE SUBLIME (New York: Riverhead Books, 2000)

S = Frederick J. Streng, EMPTINESS: A STUDY IN RELIGIOUS MEANING (New York: Abingdon Press, 1967), Appendix A & B; pp. 183-227

G = Jay L. Garfield, THE FUNDAMENTAL WISDOM OF THE MIDDLE WAY: NAGARAJUNA'S MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)

I = Kenneth K. Inada, NAGARJUNA: A TRANSLATION OF HIS MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA WITH AN INTRODUCTORY ESSAY (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1970)

K= David J. Kalupahana, MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA OF NAGARJUNA: THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE MIDDLE WAY (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1986)

For an English translation of the karikas (virtually identical with G above) together with Je Tsongkhapa's commentary on them, consult Ngawang Samten and Jay L. Garfield (trans.), OCEAN OF REASONING: A GREAT COMMENTARY ON NAGARJUNA'S MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA (NY: Oxford University Press, 2006)

मूलमध्यमककारिका आर्यनागार्जुनस्य

पूर्वपरीक्षा नाम नवमं प्रकरणं

B: Investigation of the Presence of Something Prior (Already)

S: An Analysis of "the Pre-existent Reality" (purva) (grasper and grasping)

G: Examination of the Prior Entity

I: Examination of the Antecedent State of the Self

K: Examination of the Prior Entity

दर्शनश्रवणादीनि वेदनादीनि चाप्यथ।

भवन्ति यस्य प्रागेभ्यः सो ऽस्तीत्येके वदन्त्युत ॥ १

B: Some say that whatever is involved in seeing, hearing etc. and feeling etc. exists prior to them.

S: Certain people say: Prior to seeing hearing, and other [sensory faculties] together with sensation and other [mental phenomena] is that to which they belong.

SB: Am I already here, Before I see and taste and feel?

G: Since sight and hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., exist, he who has and uses them must exist prior to those, some say.

I: Of the existence of an entity which sees, hears, etc., or which feels, etc., some people assert that it exists prior to its functions.

K: “For whomsoever there exists seeing, hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., he exists prior to these.” So do some declare.

कथं ह्यविद्यमानस्य दर्शनादि भविष्यति।

भावस्य तस्मात्प्रागेभ्यः सो ऽस्ति भावो व्यवस्थितः ॥ २

B: If [that] thing is not evident, how can there be seeing etc? Therefore, the presence [of that] thing [must] exist before them.

S: [They reason:] How will there be seeing, etc. of someone (i.e. as the subject seeing) who does not exist? Therefore, there exists a definite (vyavasthita) entity before that [seeing, etc.].

SB: If not, how could I see and taste and feel?

G: If there were no existent thing, how could seeing, etc. arise? It follows from this that prior to this, there is an existent thing.

I: How is it that seeing, etc., come to be of a presently non-existing entity?

Consequently, the entity (seemingly) exists prior to its functions.

K: How can there be seeing, etc., of an existent who is not evident? Therefore, it is determined that, prior to these things, such an existent is.

दर्शनश्रवणादिभ्यो वेदनादिभ्य एव च।

यः प्राग्व्यवस्थितो भावः केन प्रज्ञप्यते ऽथ सः ॥ ३

B: What configures/makes known that thing which is present before seeing and hearing etc. and feeling etc.?

S: But that definite entity is previous to sight, hearing, etc., and sensation, etc. -- How can that [entity] be known?

SB: How can I know if I'm already here or not?

G: How is an entity existing prior to seeing, hearing, etc., and the felt, etc., itself known?

I: If the entity exists abidingly prior to its functions of seeing, hearing, etc., or feeling, etc., then by what means is it known?

K: Whatever existent is determined as existing prior to seeing, hearing, etc., and also feeling, etc., by what means is he (it) made known?

विनापि दर्शनादीनि यदि चासौ व्यवस्थितः।

अमून्यपि भविष्यन्ति विना तेन न संशयः ॥ ४

B: If it were present even without seeing etc., there would be no doubt that they would exist even without it.

S: And if that [entity] is determined without sight [and other sensory faculties], then, undoubtedly, those [sensory faculties] will exist without that [entity].
SB: If I were here without them, They could be here without me.
G: If it can abide without the seen, etc., then without a doubt, they can abide without it.
I: If the abiding entity could exist apart from the functions of seeing, etc., then undoubtedly the functions too could exist without the entity.
K: If he is determined as existing even without seeing, etc., undoubtedly even these (i.e., seeing, etc.) will exist without him.

अज्यते केन चित् कश्चित् किं चित्केन चिदज्यते।

कुतः किं चिद्विना कश्चित्किं चित्कं चिद्विना कुतः ॥ ५

B: It is illuminated by them; they are illuminated by it. How could it exist without them? How could they exist without it?
SB: I reveal them and they reveal me. How can I be here without them? How can they be here without me?
S: Someone becomes manifest by something (i.e. like vision); something is manifest by someone. How would someone exist without something? How would something exist without someone?
G: Someone is disclosed by something. Something is disclosed by someone. Without something how can someone exist? Without someone how can something exist?
I: An entity is made manifest by its attendant functions and, vice versa, the functions are known by way of the entity to which they belong. How is it possible for an entity to be without its functions and the functions without their entity?
K: Someone is made known by something. Something is made known by someone. How could there be someone without something and something without someone?

सर्वेभ्यो दर्शनादिभ्यः कश्चित्पूर्वो न विद्यते।

अज्यते दर्शनादिनामन्येन पुनरन्यदा ॥ ६

B: It is not evident prior to the totality of seeing etc. From among seeing etc. a different one illuminates [it] at different times.
SB: I am not already here, Before experience as such: Seeing reveals just the seer, Tasting just the taster, Feeling just the feeler.
S: [The opponent admits:] Someone does not exist previous to (purva) sight and all the other [faculties] together. [Rather,] he is manifested by any one of [them:] sight, etc., at any one time. (A owner that of only one of the senses at a time ?)
G: While prior to all of seeing, etc., that prior entity doesn't exist, through seeing, etc., by another one, that other one becomes disclosed.
I: No entity could exist prior to all its functions of seeing, etc. By means of the different functions of seeing, etc., the entity appears in different moments.
K: Someone is not evident prior to all of seeing, etc. Again, on different occasions, one could be made known by things different from seeing, etc.

सर्वेभ्यो दर्शनादिभ्यो यदि पूर्वं न विद्यते।

एकैकस्मात्कथं पूर्वं दर्शनादेः स विद्यते ॥ ७

B: If it is not evident prior to the totality of seeing etc., how can it be evident prior to [each of them] seeing etc. individually?

SB: If I'm not already here before them all, Could I be here before each one?

S: [Nagarjuna answers:] But if nothing exists previous to sight and all the other [faculties] together, how could that [being] exist individually before sight, etc.?

G: If prior to all of seeing, etc., no prior entity exists, how could an entity prior to each seeing exist?

I: If the entity does not exist prior to all its functions of seeing, etc., then how could it exist prior to each of the functions.

K: If someone existing prior to all of seeing, etc., is not evident, how can someone existing prior to each of seeing, etc., be evident?

द्रष्टा स एव स श्रोता स एव यदि वेदकः।

एकैकस्माद्भवेत्पूर्वं एवं चैतन्न युज्यते ॥ ८

B: If the seer itself [were] the hearer and the feeler [were] it too, if it existed prior to each, in that way it would not make sense.

SB: Can the seer taste? Can the taster feel?

S: [Further,] if that [being] were the "seer," that [being] were the "hearer," that [being] were the one who senses, then one [being] would exist previous to each. Therefore, this [hypothesis] is not logically justified. (That would also mean that there is a owner for each senses; one at a time.)

G: If the seer itself is the hearer itself, and the feeler itself, at different times, prior to each of these he would have to arise. But this makes no sense.

I: If (it is granted that) an entity which sees is concomitantly an entity which hears or feels, then that entity will exist prior to its functions. But such a situation could not be in accordance with reason.

K: If a seer is, at the same time, a hearer and feeler, than someone would exist prior to each one (of the functions). But this is not proper.

द्रष्टान्य एव श्रोतान्यो वेदको ऽन्यः पुनर्यदि।

सति स्याद्भृष्टरि श्रोता बहुबं चात्मनां भवेत् ॥ ९

B: If the seer were different, the hearer different, the feeler different, at the time the seer exists, there would be a hearer. Many selves would come about.

SB: Were they different, I would be legion.

S: On the other hand, if the "seer" were someone else, or the "hearer" were someone else, or the one who senses were someone else, then there would be a "hearers when there

was already a "seer," and that would mean a multiplicity of "selves" (atma). (Or it would mean that there are multiple simultaneous owners.)

G: If the seer itself is distinct, the hearer is distinct and the feeler is distinct, then when there is a seer there would also be a hearer, and there would have to be many selves.

I: If again (granted that) the entity which respectively sees, hears, and feels is individually distinct, then as there will be an entity which sees there will also be an entity which hears. But this situation would impose many forms on the entity.

K: If seer and hearer and feeler are different, then, when there is a seer, there also would be a hearer, and as such there would be a plurality of selves.

दर्शनश्रवणादीनि वेदनादीनि चाप्यथ।

भवन्ति येभ्यस्तेष्वेष भूतेष्वपि न विद्यते ॥ १०

B: Also it is not evident in the elements from which seeing and hearing etc. and feeling etc. occur.

SB: Nor am I tucked inside the elements, Whence seeing and tasting and feeling unfold.

S: In those elements (bhuta) from which seeing, hearing, etc., and sensation, etc., arise -- even in those elements that [being] does not exist.

G: Seeing and hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., and that from which these are arisen: there is no existent there.

I: Of the arising of the functions of seeing, hearing, feeling, etc. out of the Elements, the entity too cannot be found to exist.

K: It (i.e., the self) is not evident in the elements from which seeing, hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., come to be.

दर्शनश्रवणादीनि वेदनादीनि चाप्यथ।

न विद्यते चेद्यस्य स न विद्यन्त इमान्यपि ॥ ११

B: If that to which seeing and hearing etc. and feeling etc. belong is not evident, they too could not be evident.

SB: If I to whom these things belong, Cannot be found, How can they be found?

S: When he to whom seeing, hearing, etc., and feeling, etc. belong does not exist, then certainly they do not exist.

G: Seeing and hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., if that to which they belong does not exist, they themselves do not exist.

I: If the entity which sees, hears, etc., or which feels, etc., cannot be found, then the functions themselves cannot also be found to exist.

K: If he, to whom belongs seeing, hearing, etc., and feeling, etc., is not evident, then even these would not be evident.

प्राक् च यो दर्शनादिभ्यः सांप्रतं चोर्ध्वमेव च।

न विद्यते ऽस्ति नास्तीति निवृत्तास्तत्र कल्पनाः ॥ १२

B: Reject the concepts “it exists,” “it doesn’t exist” about that which is not evident prior to, now or after seeing etc.

SB: I do not precede them. Nor am I with them. Nor do I follow them.

Let go of “I am.” Let go of “I am not.”

S: For him who does not exist previous to, at the same time, or after seeing, etc. the conception "He exists," "He does not exist," is dissipated.

G: For whomever prior to, simultaneous with, or after seeing, etc., there is nothing, for such a one, assertions like “it exists” or “it does not exist” – such conceptions will cease.

I: Of an entity which does not exist prior to, concomitantly, or posterior to the functions of seeing, etc., the notions of existence and non-existence are unnecessary.

K: Wherein someone prior to, simultaneous with or posterior to, seeing, etc. is not evident, therein thoughts of existence and non-existence are also renounced.