

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 MULAMDHYAMAKAKARIKA (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)

OR: Ngawang Samten and Jay L. Garfield (trans.), OCEAN OF REASONING: A GREAT COMMENTARY ON NAGARJUNA'S MULAMADHYAMAKAKARIKA (NY: Oxford University Press, 2006)

संभवविभवपरीक्षा नामैकविंशतितमं प्रकरणं

sambhavavibhavaparīkṣā nāmaikaviṃśatitamam prakaraṇam

B: Investigation of Rising and Passing (Disappearance)

SB: Disappearance

G: Examination of Becoming and Destruction

I: Examination of Occurrence and Dissolution of Existence

S: An Analysis of Origination (sambhava) and Disappearance (vibhava) (coming to be and passing away)

विना वा सह वा नास्ति विभवः संभवेन वै।

विना वा सह वा नास्ति संभवो विभवेन वै ॥ १

vinā vā saha vā nāsti vibhavaḥ sambhavena vai |

vinā vā saha vā nāsti sambhavo vibhavana vai || 1

B: Passing does not exist without or together with rising. Rising does not exist without or together with passing.

SB: When you disappear, You do not appear or fail to appear. When you appear, You neither disappear nor fail to disappear.

S: There is no disappearance either with origination or without it.
There is no origination either with disappearance or without it.

G: Destruction does not occur without becoming. It does not occur together with it. Becoming does not occur without destruction. It does not occur together with it.

I: Dissolution does not exist either separated from or concurrent with the occurrence of being. Occurrence, likewise, does not exist either separated from or concurrent with its dissolution.

K: Dissolution does not exist either without or with occurrence. Occurrence does not exist either without or with dissolution.

OR: Destruction does not occur without becoming. It does not occur simultaneously with it. Becoming does not occur without destruction. It does not occur simultaneously with it.

भविष्यति कथं विभवः संभवं विना।

विनैव जन्म मरणं विभवो नोद्भवं विना ॥ २

bhaviṣyati katham vibhavaḥ sambhavam vinā |
vinaiva janma maraṇam vibhavo nodbhavam vinā || 2

B: How can passing exist without rising? Is there death without birth? There is no passing without rising.

SB: How can I disappear Without appearing? Can I die and not be born? What disappears appears.

S: How, indeed, will disappearance exist at all without origination?
[How could there be] death without birth?
There is no disappearance without [prior] origination.

G: How could there be destruction Without becoming? How could there be death without birth? There is no destruction without becoming.

I: How could there be dissolution separated from the occurrence of being? (As there would be the improbable phenomenon of) death without birth, there is no dissolution without occurrence.

K: How can there be dissolution without occurrence, death without birth, dissolution without uprising?

OR: How could there be destruction without becoming? There would be death without birth. There is no destruction without becoming.

संभवेनैव विभवः कथं सह भविष्यति।

न जन्ममरणं चैवं तुल्यकालं हि विद्यते ॥ ३

sambhavenaiva vibhavaḥ katham saha bhaviṣyati |
na janmamaraṇam caivam tulyakālam hi vidyate || 3

B: How could passing exist together with rising? Death does not exist at the same time as birth.

SB: Can I disappear and appear at once? Do I die the moment I am born? Can I appear and disappear at once? Am I born the moment I die?

S: How can disappearance exist concomitantly with origination?
Since, surely, death does not exist at the same moment as birth.

G: How could destruction and becoming Occur simultaneously? Death and birth Do not occur simultaneously.

I: How could there be dissolution concurrent with the occurrence of being? For, indeed, it is not possible for birth and death to exist simultaneously.

K: How can there be dissolution along with occurrence? Indeed, simultaneous birth and death are similarly not evident.

OR: How could destruction occur simultaneously with becoming? Death does not occur simultaneously with birth.

भविष्यति कथं नाम संभवो विभवं विना।

अनित्यता हि भावेषु न कदाचिन्न विद्यते ॥ ४

bhaviṣyati katham nāma sambhavo vibhavaṃ vinā |
anityatā hi bhāveṣu na kadācina vidyate || 4

B: How could rising exist without passing? Things are never not impermanent.

SB: When everything changes, How can I appear and not disappear?

S: How, indeed, will origination exist at all without disappearance?
For, impermanence does not fail to be found in existent things ever.

G: How could there be becoming Without destruction? For impermanence Is never absent from entities.

I: How could there be occurrence separated from the dissolution of being? For in the various modes of (true) existence, transient nature is never found not to exist.

K: How can there be occurrence without dissolution, for the impermanence in existences is never not evident.

OR: How could there be becoming without destruction? For things never lack impermanence.

संभवो विभवेनैव कथं सह भविष्यति ।

न जन्ममरणं चैव तुल्यकालं हि विद्यते ॥ ५

sambhavo vibhavaiva katham saha bhaviṣyati |
na janmamaraṇaṃ caiva tulyakālaṃ hi vidyate || 5

B: How could rising exist together with passing? Birth does not exist at the same time as death.

SB: Whether dead or alive, I am neither here nor gone.

S: How can origination exist concomitantly with disappearance?
Since, surely, death does not exist at the same moment as birth.

G: How could destruction And becoming occur simultaneously> Just as birth and death Do not occur simultaneously.

I: How could there be occurrence concurrent with the dissolution of being? For, indeed, it is not possible for both birth and death to exist simultaneously.

K: How can occurrence be evident along with dissolution? Indeed, simultaneous birth and death are similarly not evident.

OR: How could becoming be simultaneous with destruction? Birth does not occur simultaneously with death.

सहान्योन्येन वा सिद्धिर्विनान्योन्येन वा ययोः ।

न विद्यते तयोः सिद्धिः कथं नु खलु विद्यते ॥ ६

sahānyonyena vā siddhirvinānyonyena vā yayoḥ ।
na vidyate tayoh siddhiḥ katham nu khalu vidyate ॥ 6

B: How can those that are not established either mutually together or not mutually together be established?

S: When two things cannot be proved either separately or together,
No proof exists of those two things.
How can these two things be proved?

G: How, when things cannot be established as existing, With, or apart from one another, Can they be established at all?

I: The establishment of mutual concurrence or mutual separation is an impossibility. How then would it ever be possible to assert any completed states of the two?

K: The occurrence of things, either together or separately, is not evident. If so, how can their establishment be evident?

OR: How can those things which cannot be established as existing simultaneously and not simultaneously with each other exist at all?

क्षयस्य संभवो नास्ति नाक्षयस्यास्ति संभवः ।

क्षयस्य विभवो नास्ति विभवो नाक्षयस्य च ॥ ७

kṣayasya sambhavo nāsti nākṣayasyāsti sambhavaḥ ।
kṣayasya vibhavo nāsti vibhavo nākṣayasya ca ॥ 7

B: The finished does not rise; the unfinished too does not rise; the finished does not pass; the unfinished too does not pass.

S: There is no origination of that which is destructible, nor of that which is not-destructible.

There is no disappearance of that which is destructible nor of that which is non-destructible.

G: There is no becoming of the disappeared. There is no becoming of the nondisappeared. There is no destruction of the disappeared. There is no destruction of the nondisappeared.

I: There is no occurrence of being in either a ceased or an unceased entity. Again, there is no dissolution of being in either a ceased or an unceased entity.

K: Occurrence of that which is waning does not exist, nor is there occurrence of that which is not waning. Dissolution of that which is waning does not exist, nor is there dissolution of the not waning.

OR: There is no becoming of that which is exhausted. Nor is there becoming of that which is not exhausted. There is no destruction of that which is exhausted. Nor is there destruction of that which is not exhausted.

संभवो विभवश्चैव विना भावं न विद्यते।

संभवं विभवं चैव विना भावो न विद्यते ॥ ८

sambhavo vibhavaścaiva vinā bhāvaṁ na vidyate ।
sambhavaṁ vibhavaṁ caiva vinā bhāvo na vidyate ॥ 8

B: Rising and passing do not exist without the existence of things. Things do not exist without the existence of rising and passing.

SB: Without things, There would be no appearance or disappearance; Without which, There would be no things.

S: Origination and disappearance cannot exist without an existent thing. Without origination and disappearance an existent thing does not exist.

G: When no entities exist, There is no becoming or destruction. Without becoming and destruction, There are no existent entities.

I: Occurrence and dissolution are not possible apart from (true) existence. On the other hand, (true) existence is not possible apart from occurrence and dissolution.

K: Without an existent, occurrence as well as dissolution are not evident. Without occurrence as well as dissolution, an existent is not evident.

OR: Without the existence of things, there is neither becoming nor destruction. Without becoming and destruction, there is no existence of things

संभवो विभवश्चैव न शून्यस्योपपद्यते।

संभवो विभवश्चैव नाशून्यस्योपपद्यते ॥ ९

sambhavo vibhavaścaiva na śūnyasyopapadyate |
sambhavo vibhavaścaiva nāśūnyasyopapadyate || 9

B: Rising and passing are not possible for the empty; rising, passing are not possible for the non-empty also.

SB: Whether empty or not, Things neither appear nor disappear.

S: Origination and disappearance does not obtain for that which is empty.
Origination and disappearance does not obtain for that which is non-empty.

G: It is not tenable for the empty To become or to be destroyed. It is not tenable for the nonempty To become or to be destroyed.

I: Occurrence and dissolution cannot exist in the nature of the void (sunya). They cannot exist in the nature of non-void either.

K: Either occurrence or dissolution of the empty is not appropriate. Either occurrence or dissolution of the non-empty is also not appropriate.

OR: It is not tenable for the empty to become or to be destroyed. Nor is it tenable for the non-empty to become or to be destroyed.

संभवो विभवश्चैव नैक इत्युपपद्यते।

संभवो विभवश्चैव न नानेत्युपपद्यते ॥ १०

sambhavo vibhavaścaiva naika ityupapadyate |
sambhavo vibhavaścaiva na nānetyupapadyate || 10

B: Rising and passing cannot possibly be one; rising and passing also cannot possibly be other.

SB: Appearance and disappearance Are not the same or different – They fool you.

S: It does not obtain that origination and disappearance are the same thing.
It does not obtain that origination and disappearance are different.

G: It is not tenable That destruction and becoming are identical. It is not tenable
That destruction and becoming are different.

I: It is not possible that occurrence and dissolution are identical. They cannot be
different either.

K: It is not appropriate to assume that occurrence and dissolution are identical.
It is not appropriate to assume that occurrence and dissolution are different.

OR: It is not tenable that destruction and becoming are identical. Nor is it tenable
that destruction and becoming are different.

दृश्यते संभवश्चैव विभवश्चैव ते भवेत्।

दृश्यते संभवश्चैव मोहाद्विभव एव च ॥ ११

drśyate sambhavaścaiva vibhavaścaiva te bhavet |
drśyate sambhavaścaiva mohādvibhava eva ca || 11

B: If you think that you can see rising and passing, rising and passing are seen
by delusion.

SB: Appearance and disappearance Are not the same or different – They fool
you.

S: [You argue:] Origination, as well as disappearance, is seen.
[Therefore] it would exist for you.
[But] origination and disappearance are seen due to a delusion.

G: If you think you see both Destruction and becoming, Then you see destruction and becoming Through impaired vision.

I: You may think that both occurrence and dissolution can be perceived but such a perception only comes about from a deluded mind.

K: It may occur to you that both occurrence and dissolution are seen. However, both occurrence and dissolution are seen only through confusion.

OR: If you think you see both destruction and becoming, then you see destruction and becoming in virtue of confusion

न भावाज्जायते भावो भावो ऽभावान्न जायते।

नाभावाज्जायते ऽभावो ऽभावो भावान्न जायते ॥ १२

na bhāvājjāyate bhāvo bhāvo 'bhāvānna jāyate ।
nābhāvājjāyate 'bhāvo 'bhāvo bhāvānna jāyate ।। 12

B: Things are not created from things; things are not created from nothing; nothing is not created from nothing; nothing is not created from things.

SB: Things are not born From things or nothing, Nothing is not born From nothing or things.

S: An existent thing does not originate from [another] thing;
and an existent thing does not originate from a non-existent thing.
Also, a non-existent thing does not originate from another non-existent thing;
and a non-existent thing does not originate from an existent thing.

G: An entity does not arise from an entity. An entity does not arise from a nonentity. A nonentity does not arise from a nonentity. A nonentity does not arise from an entity.

I: (True) existence does not arise from itself nor does it arise from non-existence. Again, non-existence does not arise from itself nor does it arise from existence.

K: An existent does not arise from an existent; neither does an existent arise from a non-existent. A non-existent does not arise from a non-existent; neither does a non-existent arise from an existent.

OR: A thing does not arise from a thing. A thing does not arise from a non-thing. A non-thing does not arise from a non-thing. A non-thing does not arise from a thing.

न स्वतो जायते भावः परतो नैव जायते।

न स्वतः परतश्चैव जायते जायते कुतः ॥ १३

na svato jāyate bhāvaḥ parato naiva jāyate |
na svataḥ parataścaiva jāyate jāyate kutaḥ || 13

B: Things are not created from themselves, nor are they created from something else; they are not created from [both] themselves and something else. How are they created?

S: An existent thing does not originate either by itself or by something different. Or by itself and something different [at the same time]. How, then, can it be produced?

G: An entity does not arise from itself. It is not arisen from another. It is not arisen from itself and another. How can it be arisen?

I: (True) existence arises neither by itself nor by an other. It does not arise by both (forces). How then does it arise?

K: An existent does not arise from itself, or from another or from both itself and another. Whence can it then arise?

OR: Things do not arise from themselves. Nor do they arise from others. Since they arise neither from self nor from another, how can they arise?

भावमभ्युपपन्नस्य शाश्वतोच्छेददर्शनं।

प्रसज्यते स भावो हि नित्यो ऽनित्यो ऽथ वा भवेत् ॥ १४

bhāvamabhyupapannasya śāśvatocchedadarśanaṁ |
prasajyate sa bhāvo hi nityo 'nityo 'tha vā bhavet || 14

B: If you assert the existence of things, the views of eternalism and annihilationism will follow, because things are permanent and impermanent.

SB: If things are either Eternal or ephemeral, To believe in them is either Eternalism or nihilism.

S: For someone assuming an existent thing, either an eternalistic or nihilistic point of view would logically follow,
For that existent thing would be either eternal or liable to cessation.

G: If one accepts the existence of entities, Permanence and the view of complete nonexistence follow. For these entities Must be both permanent and impermanent.

I: One who admits existence will necessarily perceive permanence and disruption. For, it necessarily follows that such an existence must either be permanent or impermanent.

K: For him who is engrossed in existence, eternalism or annihilationism will necessarily follow, for he would assume that it is either permanent or impermanent.

OR: If one accepts the existence of entities, reification and nihilism will follow. For those entities would have to be both permanent and impermanent.

भावमभ्युपपन्नस्य नैवोच्छेदो न शाश्वतं।

उदयव्ययसंतानः फलहेतुर्भवः स हि ॥ १५

bhāvamabhyupapannasya naivocchedo na śāśvataṁ ।
udayavyayasamtānaḥ phalahetvorbhavaḥ sa hi ।। 15

B: If you assert the existence of things, eternalism and annihilationism will not be, because the continuity of the rising and passing of cause -effect is becoming.

SB: Isn't the appearance And disappearance Of seeds and fruits The flow of life itself?

S: [An opponent objects:]

For someone assuming an existent thing, there is not [only] eternalism or nihilism,

Since this is existence: namely, the continuity of the originating and stopping of causes and product.

G: If one accepts the existence of entities Nonexistence and permanence will not follow. Cyclic existence is the continuous Becoming and destruction of causes and effects.

I: On the other hand, as one admits (true) existence there could be no permanence or disruption. For, such an existence expresses the continuity in the rise and fall (i.e. disintegration) of a being in a cause-effect relationship.

K: (On the contrary), for him who is engrossed in existence, there would be neither annihilationism nor eternalism, for, indeed, becoming is the series of uprising and ceasing of cause and effect.

OR: Even if one accepts the existence of things, nihilism and reification will not follow. Cyclic existence is the continuous becoming and destruction of causes and effects.

उदयव्ययसंतानः फलहेत्वोर्भवः स चेत्।

व्ययस्यापुनरुत्पत्तेर्हेतूच्छेदः प्रसज्यते ॥ १६

udayavyayasamtānaḥ phalahetvorbhavaḥ sa cet |
vyayasyāpunarutpatterhetūcchedaḥ prasajyate || 16

B: If the continuity of the rising and passing of cause-effect is becoming, because what has passed will not be created again, it will follow that the cause is annihilated.

SB: Seeds would be annihilated: The disappearance cannot appear again.

S: [Nagarjuna replies:]

If this is existence: namely, the continuity of originating and stopping of causes and product,

It would logically follow that the cause is destroyed because the destroyed thing does not originate again.

G: If cyclic existence is the continuous Becoming and destruction of causes and effects, Then from the nonarising of the destroyed Follows the nonexistence of cause.

I: If such an existence expresses the continuity in the rise and fall (i.e. disintegration) of a being in a cause-effect relationship, then, since the fall does not have the nature of arising again, it will necessarily be the disruption of cause.

K: If it is assumed that becoming is the series of uprising and ceasing of the cause and effect, then with the repeated non-arising of that which ceases, it will follow that there will be annihilation of the cause.

OR: If cyclic existence were the continuous becoming and destruction of causes and effects, since that which is destroyed does not arise again, causes would, absurdly, be annihilated.

सद्भावस्य स्वभावेन नासद्भावश्च युज्यते।

निर्वाणकाले चोच्छेदः प्रशमद्भवसंततेः ॥ १७

sadbhāvasya svabhāvena nāsadbhāvaśca yujyate ।
nirvāṇakāle cocchedaḥ praśamādbhavasāntateḥ ।। 17

B: If things exist essentially, it would be unreasonable [for them] to become nothing. At the time of nirvana [they] would be annihilated, because the continuity of becoming is totally pacified.

SB: You would be erased in nirvana When the flow of life is stilled.

S: If there is self-existence of something which is intrinsically existing, then non-existence does not obtain.

At the time of nirvana there is destruction of the cycle of existence (bhavasamtana) as a result of the cessation.

G: If entities exist with entitihood, Then their nonexistence would make no sense. But at the time of nirvana, Cyclic existence ceases completely, having been pacified.

I: It is not justifiable to assert that an existence in virtue of self-nature becomes a non-existence. For, at the time of nirvana, there is a disruption in virtue of the quiescence of the continuity of being.

K: The non-existence of that which possesses existence in terms of self-nature is not appropriate. (On the contrary), at the time of freedom, there will be annihilation as a result of the appeasement of the stream of becoming.

OR: If things existed inherently, then their non-existence would make no sense. At the time of nirvana, because it is complete pacification, the continuum of cyclic existence would be annihilated.

चरमे न निरुद्धे च प्रथमो युज्यते भवः।

चरमे नानिरुद्धे च प्रथमो युज्यते भवः ॥ १८

carame na niruddhe ca prathamo yujyate bhavaḥ ।
carame nāniruddhe ca prathamo yujyate bhavaḥ ।। 18

B: If the end stops, it is unreasonable for there to be a beginning of becoming. When the end does not stop, it is unreasonable for there to be a beginning of becoming.

SB: If life stopped How would it start again? If it never stopped, How would it start again?

S: If the last [part of existence] is destroyed, the first [part of] existence does not obtain.

If the last [part of existence] is not destroyed, the first [part of] existence does not obtain.

G: If the final one has ceased, The existence of a first one makes no sense. If the final one has not ceased, The existence of a first one makes no sense.

I: It is not justifiable to assert that a being arises only at a time when a previous being ceases to be, nor also that a being arises when a previous being does not cease to be.

K: It is not proper to assume that there is first becoming when the last has ceased. Nor is it proper to assume that there is first becoming when the last has not ceased.

OR: If the final moment were to cease, the first moment of life would make no sense. If the final moment were not to cease, the first moment of life would make no sense.

निरुध्यमाने चरमे प्रथमो यदि जायते।

निरुध्यमान एकः स्याज्जायमानो ऽपरो भवेत् ॥ १९

nirudhyamāne carame prathamo yadi jāyate ।
nirudhyamāna ekaḥ syāj jāyamāno 'paro bhavet ।। 19

B: If the beginning is created while the end is stopping, the stopping would be one and the creating would be another.

S: If the first [part of existence] were produced while the final part were being destroyed,

There would be one thing being destroyed and being produced [both at the same time].

G: If when the final one was ceasing, Then the first one was arising, The one ceasing would be one. The one arising would be another.

I: If a being arises in the ceasing process of the previous being, then perhaps the ceasing process refers to one kind of being and the arising process to another.

K: If the first were to be born when the last is ceasing, then that which is ceasing would be one and that which is being born would be another.

OR: If the final moment were ceasing and the prior one were arising, the one ceasing would be one, and the one arising would be another.

न चेन्निरुध्यमानश्च जायमानश्च युज्यते।

सार्धं च म्रियते येषु तेषु स्कन्धेषु जायते ॥ २०

na cennirudhyamānaśca jāyamānaśca yujyate |
sārdham ca mriyate yeṣu teṣu skandheṣu jāyate | | 20

B: If it is also unreasonable for stopping and creating to be together, aren't the aggregates that die also those that are created?

S: If the one "being destroyed" and the one "being produced" cannot exist together,

Can someone be produced in those "groups of universal elements" (skandhas) in which he is [also] "dying"?

G: If, absurdly, the one arising And the one ceasing were the same, Then whoever is dying with the aggregates Is also arising.

I: If it is not justifiable to assert that existence can be expressed in the concurrent process of arising and ceasing, then it should arise as well as cease within the same realm of the *skandhas* (i.e., the five aggregates of being).

K: If it is asserted that the ceasing is also the being born, this would not be proper. For, in that case, whatever that is born in relation to the aggregates, would also be dying at the same time.

OR: It does not make sense that the one arising and the one ceasing are simultaneous. Whoever is dying with respect to the aggregates would also be arising with respect to them

एवं त्रिष्वपि कालेषु न युक्ता भवसंततिः

त्रिषु कालेषु या नास्ति कथं भवसंततिः ॥ २१

evaṃ triṣvapi kāleṣu na yuktā bhavasāntatiḥ
triṣu kāleṣu yā nāsti katham bhavasāntatiḥ | | 21

B: Likewise, if the continuity of becoming is not reasonable at any of the three times, how can there be a continuity of becoming which is non-existent in the three times?

SB: How can it flow Without flowing before, Flowing now, Or flowing later?

S: Thus, the chain of existences is not possible in any of the three times [i.e. past, present, and future];

And if it does not exist in the three times, how can the chain of existences exist?

G: Since the series of cyclic existence is not evident In the three times, If it is not in the three times, How could there be a series of cyclic existence?

I: Consequently, the continuity of being is not possible within the three temporal moments. AS it does not exist within the three temporal moments, in what manner does it exist?

K: Thus, the stream of becoming is not proper in the context of the three periods of time. How can there be a stream of becoming that does not exist during the three periods of time?

OR: Since the continuum of life makes no sense in terms of any of the three temporal periods, how could that which does not exist in the three temporal periods be the continuum of life?