

། །ཚད་མའི་གཞུང་དོན་འབྲིང་པའི་བསྟུས་གྲུ་ལྷོ་རྣམ་པར་བཤད་པ་རིགས་ལམ་འཕུལ་གྱི་ལྷེ་མིག་

ཅེས་བྱ་བ་ལས་རིགས་ལམ་འབྲིང་གི་སྐོར་བཞུགས་སོ།

The Middling Path of Reasoning from What Is Called the Magic Key of the Path of Reasoning, the Presentation of the Collected Topics which Discern the Meaning of the Treatises on Prime Cognition

Chapter One: Mutual Exclusives and Relations

Author: Purchok Ngawang Jampa

Topic: Collected Topics (that help to understand the great philosophical treatises.)

Translator: Tenzin Dongak (Fedor Stracke)

Table of Contents

Refutation of Others' Systems	1
Debate One.....	1
Debate Two.....	1
Debate Three	2
Debate Four.....	2
Debate Five	2
Debate Six.....	3
Debate Seven	3
Debate Eight.....	3
Debate Nine	4
Debate Ten.....	4
Debate Eleven.....	5
Debate Twelve	5
Debate Thirteen.....	6
One's Own: Definitions & Divisions	7
Exclusives.....	7
Relations	7
Refuting Objections	8
Objection One.....	8
Objection Two.....	8
Objection Three	8
Objection Four.....	8
Objection Five.....	8

Mutual Exclusives and Relations

Refutation of Others' Systems

Debate One

1) *In case someone says, 'if it is mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena then there is a pervasion that it is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena'.*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'isolate of permanent', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. ***If 'reason not established'***: It follows it is A, - because it is different from functioning phenomena and there is no common base that is it as well as functioning phenomena. ***If 'first reason not established'***: Take that subject, - it follows it is different from functioning phenomena, - because it is permanent. ***If 'second reason not established'***: Take the subject 'permanent', - there is no common base that is its isolate as well as functioning phenomena, - because it is permanent. ***If root is accepted'***: Take the subject 'isolate of permanent', - It follows it isn't mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because it is non-mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena. ***If 'reason not established'***: Take that subject, - it follows it is that, - because there is a common base that is both it as well as mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because permanent is such a common base.

Debate Two

2) *In case someone says, 'if it is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from impermanent then there is a pervasion that it is mutually exclusive from impermanent.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'isolate of pillar', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. ***If 'reason not established'***: It follows it is A, - because it is different from mutually exclusive with impermanent and there is no common base that is it as well as mutually exclusive with impermanent. ***If 'reason not established'***: Take the subject 'pillar', - it follows there is no common base that is its isolate as well as mutually exclusive from impermanent, - because if it is its isolate there is a pervasion that it is non-mutually exclusive from impermanent. ***If root is accepted'***: Take the subject 'isolate of pillar', - It follows it isn't mutually exclusive from impermanent, - because it is non-mutually exclusive from impermanent. ***If 'reason not established'***: Take that subject, - it follows it is that, - because there is a common base that is both it as well as impermanent, - because pillar is such a common base. ***The reason is easy to understand.***

Debate Three

3) *In case someone says, 'if it is non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena there is a pervasion that it is non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'one with pillar and vase', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because there is a common base that is it as well as functioning phenomena, - because pillar and vase are such a common base. **If 'reason not established', that would be easy to refute. If root is accepted'**: Take the subject 'one with pillar and vase', - It follows it isn't non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because it is mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because it is different from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena and there is no common base that is it as well as non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena. **If 'reason not established'**: Take the subject pillar and vase, - it follows there is no common base that is one with it as well as non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because it is an object of knowledge without a possible is.

Debate Four

4) *In case someone says, 'if it is non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena there is a pervasion that it is non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'non-functioning phenomena', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because there is a common base that is it as well as non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because object of knowledge is such a common base. **If root is accepted'**: Take the subject 'non-functioning phenomena', - It follows it isn't non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because it is mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena.

Debate Five

5) *In case someone says, 'if it is non-mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from existent then there is a pervasion that it is mutually exclusive from permanent.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'non-product', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because there is a common base that is it as well as mutually exclusive from existent, - because permanent-impermanent are such a common base. **If root is accepted'**: Take the subject 'non-product', - it follows it isn't mutually exclusive from permanent, - because it is non-mutually exclusive from it. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is that, - because if it is permanent there is a pervasion that it is a common base with permanent.

Debate Six

6) *In case someone says, 'if it is related to functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it is related to related to functioning phenomenon.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'related to functioning phenomenon', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because it is related to functioning phenomenon by nature. **If 'reason not established'**: 'Take the subject 'functioning phenomenon', - it follows that its relation is related to functioning phenomena by nature, - because its relation is different from it and its relation exists. **If root is accepted**: Take the subject 'related to functioning phenomenon', - it follows it isn't related to itself, - because it is selflessness of person.

Debate Seven

7) *In case someone says, 'if it is related to functioning phenomenon then there is a pervasion that it is related to functioning phenomenon by nature.'*

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'the subsequent arisal of functioning phenomenon', - It follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because it has a causal relationship with functioning phenomenon. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it has that, - because it is the effect of functioning phenomenon. **If root is accepted**: Take that subject, - it follows it isn't related to functioning phenomenon by nature, - because it has a causal relationship with functioning phenomenon. **The reason has already been established.**

Debate Eight

8) *In case someone says, 'there is no common basis between mutually exclusive with mutually exclusive with one with pillar and vase and non- mutually exclusive with non-mutually exclusive with one with pillar and vase.'*

Burbu Chok: It follows that exists, - because the three complete features of the substantial existent of objects of knowledge is just that. The first is established because there is no common base that is it as well as mutually exclusive with one with pillar and vase, - because that suitable to be the object of awareness is non-mutually exclusive with that. **If 'second main reason not established'**: Take the subject 'those complete features of the substantial existent', - it follows it is non- mutually exclusive with non-mutually exclusive with one with pillar and vase, - because there is a common base that is it as well as non-mutually exclusive with one with pillar and vase, - because that suitable to be the object of awareness is that common base.

Debate Nine

9) *In case someone says, ' there is a common base that is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena and non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena and related to related to functioning phenomenon and unrelated to unrelated to functioning phenomenon.*

Burbu Chok: It follows that non-mutually exclusive from functioning phenomenon is such a common base, - because such a common base exists and unrelated to functioning phenomenon isn't it. **If ' second reason not established'**: Take the subject 'unrelated to functioning phenomenon', - it follows it is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from functioning phenomena, - because it is such a common base. **You accepted the reason. The predicate can't be accepted because:** there is a common base that is unrelated to functioning phenomenon as well as mutually exclusive from it, because the valid cognisor and subsequent cognisor that became the cause of functioning phenomenon is such a common base. **If ' reason not established'**: Take the subject those two, - it follows they are that, - because they are unrelated with and mutually exclusive from functioning phenomenon. The first is established, - because they are its cause. The second is established, - because they are an object of knowledge without a possible is.

Debate Ten

10) *In case someone says, ' there isn't a common base that is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from permanent and non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from permanent and related to related to permanent and unrelated to unrelated to permanent.'*

Burbu Chok: It follows that there is such a common base, - because unrelated to permanent is it. **If ' reason not established'**: Take that subject, - it follows it is such a common base, - because it is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from permanent and non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from permanent and related to related to permanent and unrelated to unrelated to permanent. **If ' first reason not established'**: Take that subject, - it follows it is that, - because it is different from it as and if it is unrelated to permanent it has to be non-mutually exclusive from permanent, - because if it is unrelated to permanent it has to be non-different from permanent. **If ' second reason not established'**: Take the 'subject unrelated to permanent', - it follows it is non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from permanent, - because there is a common base that is it as well as non-mutually exclusive from permanent, - because permanent is that common base. **If ' third reason not established'**: Take the 'subject unrelated to permanent', - it follows it is related to related to permanent, - because it is different from related to permanent as well as if related to permanent is non-existent then it also can't exist. **If ' third reason not established'**: Take the 'subject unrelated to permanent', - it follows it is un-related to itself, - because it is selflessness of person.

Debate Eleven

11) *In case someone says, ' there is a common base that is mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge and non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge and related to related to objects of knowledge and unrelated to unrelated to objects of knowledge.'*

Burbu Chok: It follows that non-mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge is such a common base, - because there is such a common base and related to objects of knowledge isn't it. **The first reason you posited. If the second isn't established:** Take the subject 'related to objects of knowledge', - it follows it is mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive with objects of knowledge, - because it is such a common base. **You accepted the reason. Impossible to accept the thesis because:** It is non-mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge, - because there is a common base that is it and non-mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge because, - one with vase is such a common base. **If root is accepted:** Take the subject ' non-mutually exclusive from objects of knowledge', - it follows it is related to unrelated to objects of knowledge, - because it is such a common base. **You accepted the reason. Impossible to accept the thesis because:** It is related to related to that because, - it is different from related to objects of knowledge and if related to objects of knowledge doesn't exist than it also can't exist. **Reason is easy.**

Debate Twelve

12) *In case someone says: 'It follows that all those common bases exist, - because there is a common base that is non-mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from pillar and mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from pillar and unrelated to related to pillar and related to unrelated to pillar.'*

Burbu Chok: **Here no pervasion. Reason is established because,** mutually exclusive from pillar is that common base. **If ' reason not established':** Take the subject 'mutually exclusive from pillar', - it follows it is such a common base, - because it is non-mutually exclusive from mutually exclusive from pillar and mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive from pillar and unrelated to related to pillar and related to unrelated to pillar. **First and second reasons are easy. If ' third reason not established':** Take that subject, - it follows it is unrelated to related to pillar, - because if related to pillar is non-existent it doesn't have to become non-existent as well because, - the pillar's base of negation is that. **If ' fourth reason not established':** Take that subject, - it follows it is related to unrelated to pillar, - because it is different from unrelated to pillar and if unrelated to pillar ceases to exist it doesn't have to stop existing as well. Reason is easy.

Debate Thirteen

13) In case someone says: If it is non-mutually exclusive with mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive there is a pervasion that it is non-mutually exclusive with mutually exclusive.

Burbu Chok: Take the subject 'isolate of mutually exclusive', - it follows it is B, - because it is A. **If 'reason not established'**: It follows it is A, - because there is a common base that is it as well as mutually exclusive from non-mutually exclusive. Mutually exclusive is that common base. **If root is accepted**: Take that subject, - follows it isn't non-mutually exclusive with mutually exclusive, - because it is different from mutually exclusive and it is impossible to have a common base between it and mutually exclusive because, - mutually exclusive isn't mutually exclusive. Discordant

One's Own: Definitions & Divisions

Exclusives

1. Definition: '*The common basis between being multiple and not having a possible is*' is the definition of being mutually exclusive.
2. Divisions:
 - Mutually eliminating exclusive; the definition is, '*discordant by way of cancelling each other out*'. It has the further division into:
 - a. Direct mutually exclusive, a dichotomy; def. is *directly mutually discordant*, for example like functioning phenomenon and non-functioning phenomenon.
 - b. Indirect mutually exclusive; def. is *not directly at odds but discordant on a base*, for example like hot and cold or like self grasping and the wisdom realising selflessness.
 - Mutually non-simultaneous exclusive; def. is *discordant by way of conflicting continuity*, for example like abandonment and antidote.

Relations

1. Relationship by nature; def. is '*A is different from B by way of being of one nature with it and if B is non-existent then A also is necessarily non-existent*', for example like vase and impermanence of vase.

If this definition is applied to an example, '*being different from functionality by way of being of one nature with it and if functionality is non-existent then it also is necessarily non-existent*' is the definition of being related by nature to functionality. For example like the subject 'vase'.
1. Causal relationship; def. is '*that belonging to the resultant family of A by way of being of different substance from A*'. For example like the subsequent arisals of functioning phenomenon having a causal relationship with functioning phenomenon.

Refuting Objections

Objection One

1) *In case someone says: Consider the subject 'existent and non-existent', - it follows they are different and without possible is, - because they are mutually exclusive.*

Burbu Chok: **Reason not established. If thesis would be accepted, then:** Take the subject 'existent and non-existent', - it follows they exist, - because they are different.

Objection Two

2) *In case someone says: Consider the subject 'smoke', - it follows it is a causal relation, - because it has a causal relation with fire.*

Burbu Chok: **No Pervasion.**

Objection Three

3) *In case someone says: It follows that causal relation doesn't exist, - because neither smoke nor vase are it.*

Burbu Chok: **No Pervasion. Thesis can't be accepted because:** Fire and smoke are a causal relation, - because they are cause effect. **If 'reason not established':** Take the subject 'fire and smoke', - it follows they are cause effect, - because they are mutually that generated and generator.

Objection Four

4) *In case someone says: Consider the subject 'functioning phenomenon', - it follows there is a common base that is it and vase, - because it is non-mutually exclusive from vase.*

Burbu Chok: **No Pervasion. If thesis would be accepted, then:** Take the subject 'vase and vase', - it follows it's common base doesn't exist, - because it is one. **If 'no pervasion',** then it follows there is a pervasion, - because in order to posit a common base between two dharmas, those two dharmas need to be different.

Objection Five

5) *In case someone says: Consider the subject 'buddha and sentient beings', - it follows they are discordant, - because the definition of being a mutually eliminating exclusive applies.*

Burbu Chok: **No Pervasion because:** If it is discordant by way of cancelling each other out there is no pervasion that it is discordant because, - functioning phenomena arise from a concordant cause.

This translation I did for the use of the Nalanda debate class.

© 2003 Tenzin Dongak

༄༅། །ཚད་མའི་གཞུང་དོན་འབྲེད་པའི་བསྐྱུས་གྲུ་ལྡན་རྣམ་པར་བཤད་པ་རིགས་ལམ་འཕུལ་གྱི་
ལྷེ་མིག་ཅེས་བྱ་བ་ལས་རིགས་ལམ་འབྲེད་གི་སྐོར་བཞུགས་སོ།

The Middling Path of Reasoning from What Is Called the Magic Key of the
Path of Reasoning, the Presentation of the Collected Topics which Discern
the Meaning of the Treatises on Prime Cognition

Chapter Four: Great Cause and Effect

Author: Purchok Ngawang Jampa

Topic: Collected Topics (that help to understand the great
philosophical treatises.)

Translator: Tenzin Dongak (Fedor Stracke)

Table of Contents

Refutation of Others' Systems	1
Debate One.....	1
Debate Two.....	1
Debate Three	2
Debate Four.....	2
Debate Five	2
Debate Six.....	2
Debate Seven	3
Debate Eight.....	3
Debate Nine	4
Debate Ten.....	4
Debate Eleven.....	4
Debate Twelve	5
Debate Thirteen	5
Debate Fourteen.....	5
Debate Fifteen	6
Debate Sixteen	6
Debate Seventeen.....	7
Debate Eighteen.....	7
Debate Nineteen.....	7
Debate Twenty.....	8
Debate Twenty-one	8
One's Own System: Definitions & Divisions.....	9
Causes	9
Conditions.....	11
Effects	12
Analysis Into the Existence of Past and Future	12
Refuting Objections	13

Objection One.....	13
Objection Two.....	13
Objection Three.....	14
Objection Four.....	15
Objection Five.....	15
Objection Six.....	15
Objection Seven.....	16
Objection Eight.....	16
Objection Nine.....	16
Objection Ten.....	16
Objection Eleven.....	17
Objection Twelve.....	17
Objection Thirteen.....	18
Objection Fourteen.....	18
Objection Sixteen.....	18

Chapter Four: Great Cause & Effect

Refutation of Others' Systems

Debate One

1) *In case someone says if it is a cause there is a pervasion it is all six causes.*

Take the subject 'form', - it follows it is all six causes - because it is a cause. **You accept that pervasion. If ' accept'**. Take the subject 'form' - it follows it is each a ripening cause, concomitant cause and all pervasive cause - because it is all six causes. **If ' accept'**. Take the subject 'form', - it follows it is contained by virtue or non-virtue - because it is a ripening cause. **If 'no pervasion'**. It follows there is a pervasion - because if it is a ripening cause there is a pervasion that it is contained within virtue or non-virtue - because it states in the Abhidharmakosha ' *A ripening cause is only non-virtue and contaminated virtue*'. **If above is accepted.** Take the subject 'form', - it follows it isn't contained in virtue or non-virtue - because it is a non-predicted phenomenon.

Further: Take the subject 'form', - it follows it is consciousness - because it is a concomitant cause. **If 'no pervasion'**. It follows there is a pervasion - because apart from substance and generalities concomitant causes are restricted to minds and mental factors - because it is stated ' *a concomitant cause is concomitant mind and mental factor*'.

Further: Take the subject 'form', - it follows it is afflicted - because it is all six causes. **If 'no pervasion'**. It follows there is a pervasion - because if it is an all pervasive cause there is a pervasion that it is afflicted - because it states in the Abhidharma ' *That called all pervasive is afflicted*'. The root can't be accepted - because there are countless non-afflicted forms.

Debate Two

2) *In case someone says that if it is any of the six causes of one phenomenon than there is a pervasion that it is a cause of that phenomenon.*

Take the subject 'vase', - it follows it is the cause of the eight atomic substances existing in its collection - because it is any of the six causes of them. **You accept that pervasion. If ' accept'**. Take the subject 'vase', - it follows it is any of the six cause of the eight atomic substances existing in its collection - because it is their simultaneously arising cause. **If 'reason not established'**. Take the subject 'vase', - it follows it is the simultaneously arising cause of the eight atomic substances existing in its collection - because it is a mass that contains the eight atomic substances. **If ' root is**

accepted'. Take the subject 'vase', - it follows it isn't a cause of the eight atomic substances existing in its collection - because it is established simultaneously with them.

Further: Take the subject 'mental consciousness', - it follows it is a cause of the five ever present mental factor present in its entourage - because it is any of the six causes of them. **You accept that pervasion.** It follows it is that - because it is their simultaneously arising cause. **If 'reason not established'**. Take that subject - it follows it is the simultaneously arising cause of the five ever present mental factors present in its entourage - because it is a main consciousness.

Debate Three

3) *In case someone says if it is consciousness there is a pervasion that it is a fruitional cause.*

Take the subject 'eye consciousness', - it follows it is a ripening cause - because it is consciousness. **You accept that pervasion. Can't accept** - because the subject is non-predicted.

Debate Four

4) *In case someone says if it is an action cause of vase there is a pervasion that it is a cause of vase.*

It follows that is incorrect - because there are many action causes of vase that are simultaneous with vase. **If 'reason not established'**. It follows that there are many action causes of vase that are simultaneous with vase - because here at the time of the Sautantrica action causes that newly generate vase and action causes that cause the abiding of vase after its generation are both accepted.

Debate Five

5) *In case someone says if it is a cause of its resultant fruitional effect there is a pervasion that it is a fruitional cause.*

Take the subject 'the life force of a hell being', - it follows it is B - because it is A. **You accept that pervasion. If 'reason not established'**. Take the subject 'the life force of a hell being', - it follows it is B - because its resultant ripening effect exists. **If 'reason not established'**. Take the subject 'the life force of a hell being', - it follows its resultant ripening effect exists - because it is the life force of a hell being.

Debate Six

6) *In case someone says that if it is a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it has all four types of conditions.*

Take the subject 'form', - it follows it is B - because it is A. **You accept that pervasion. If 'accept'**. Take the subject 'form', - it follows it has both a focal condition and an immediately preceding condition - because it has all four conditions. **If 'accept'**. Take the subject 'form', - it follows it doesn't have both a focal condition and immediately preceding condition - because neither its focal condition nor its immediately preceding condition exist. Each reason is established - because the subject is matter.

Debate Seven

7) *In case someone says that if it is matter there is no pervasion that it doesn't have a focal condition and immediately preceding condition - because the immediately preceding condition of vase exists. If 'reason not established'. It follows that the immediately preceding condition of vase exists - because the substantial cause of vase is it. If 'reason not established'. Take the subject 'substantial cause of vase', - it follows it is the immediately preceding condition of vase - because it is a condition of vase as well as the immediately preceding arising of vase.*

No pervasion. Take the subject 'vase', - it follows its immediately preceding condition doesn't exist - because its corresponding immediately preceding condition doesn't exist. **If 'reason not established'**. Take the subject 'vase'; - it follows its corresponding immediately preceding condition doesn't exist - because there is no condition producing it as clear and knowing. **If 'no pervasion'**. It follows there is a pervasion - because when saying corresponding immediately preceding condition the meaning of corresponding is that the condition and the effect correspond in being clear and knowing, and also, being an immediately preceding condition means to generate its effect as clear and knowing, which isn't possible for non-consciousnesses.

Further: Take the subject 'vase', - it follows its focal condition doesn't exist - because no aspect of any object appears to it. **If 'reason not established'**; Take the subject 'vase', - it follows no aspect of any object appears to it - because it is matter. It follows the above pervasion exists - because the meaning of being the focal condition of a phenomenon is to be a condition that causes that phenomenon to be generated in the aspect of the object. It follows it is like that because to be the focal condition of an eye-consciousness apprehending blue means to be a condition that primarily causes the eye-consciousness apprehending blue to be generated in the aspect blue and the eye-sense power that is the uncommon empowering condition of the eye-consciousness apprehending blue isn't the condition that primarily generates the eye-consciousness apprehending blue in the aspect of blue. The same applies to all other consciousnesses.

Debate Eight

8) *In case someone says take the subject 'eye sense power that is the empowering condition of the eye consciousness apprehending blue', - it follows it is the condition that primarily generates the eye consciousness apprehending blue as being in the aspect of blue - because it is the condition that out of the six sources specifically generates the apprehension of blue by the eye consciousness apprehending blue.*

No Pervasion. Reason is established because, - the eye sense power is the condition that, out of the six sources, specifically generates the eye consciousness as apprehending form source. It follows it is like that because the fact that each of the six consciousnesses apprehends only one of the six objects comes about through the influence of the uncommon empowering condition.

Debate Nine

9) *In case someone says it follows it is incorrect that the six types of consciousness are classified through their uncommon empowering condition - because it is possible for a taste sense power to become the uncommon empowering condition of the audio consciousness apprehending sound. If 'reason not established'; it follows that it is possible for a taste sense power to become the uncommon empowering condition of the audio consciousness apprehending sound - because it is possible for a taste sense power to become the empowering condition of the audio consciousness apprehending sound.*

No Pervasion. If 'reason not established'; it follows it is like that - because there is an audio consciousness apprehending sound that hears words spoken in dependence upon the empowering condition of the taste sense power.

Debate Ten

10) *In case someone says take the subject 'eye consciousness', - it follows it is mental consciousness - because it is a consciousness that depends upon its uncommon empowering condition of a mental sense power. If 'reason not established'; take the subject 'eye consciousness', - it follows it is a consciousness that depends upon its uncommon empowering condition of a mental sense power - because it is a consciousness that depends upon its empowering condition of a mental sense power.*

No Pervasion. If 'reason not established'; take the subject 'eye consciousness', - it follows it is a consciousness that depends upon its empowering condition of a mental sense power - because it is consciousness.

Debate Eleven

11) *In case someone says take the subject 'blue', - it follows it is the immediately preceding condition of the eye consciousness apprehending blue - because it is a condition that generates the eye consciousness apprehending blue as being clear and knowing. If 'reason is not established'; take the subject 'blue', - it follows it is a condition that generates the eye consciousness apprehending blue as being clear and knowing - because it is a condition that generates the eye consciousness apprehending blue and if an eye consciousness apprehending blue is generated it has to be generated as being clear and knowing.*

No Pervasion. If 'reason not established'; take the subject 'eye consciousness apprehending blue', - it follows that if it is generated it has to be generated as being clear and knowing - because it is clear and knowing.

Debate Twelve

12) *In case someone says take the subject 'eye sense power', - it follows it isn't the uncommon empowering condition of eye consciousness - because it isn't the empowering condition of eye consciousness. If 'reason is not established'; take the subject 'eye sense power', it follows it isn't the empowering condition of eye consciousness - because it the causal condition of eye consciousness.*

No pervasion because the causal condition and empowering condition¹ of any compounded phenomenon have to be posited as being synonymous.

Debate Thirteen

13) *In case someone says it follows that it is incorrect to posit blue as the focal condition of the eye consciousness apprehending blue because it is incorrect to posit blue as the focal condition of the conception apprehending blue.*

There is no pervasion because even though one posits for a valid visual cognisor the form source that is its object of comprehension as its focal condition, it is not the same for conceptual thoughts. It follows it is like that - because for thoughts the imprints on their immediately preceding condition are posited as the focal condition.

Debate Fourteen

1

14) *In case someone says it follows that it is correct to posit as the focal condition for all direct perceptions their object of apprehension - because from primary valid eye consciousness to primary valid body consciousness their apprehended object is posited as their focal condition.*

No pervasion. Not possible to accept the thesis because - for valid yogic cognitors their causal union of calm abiding and special insight is posited as their focal condition and for omniscient consciousness its causal accumulation of three countless great eons of merits is posited as its focal condition. It is different for sense consciousnesses.

Further: It follows that all wrong consciousnesses don't have a focal condition - because your way of positing the focal condition is correct. **Not possible to accept the thesis** - because if it is consciousness there is a pervasion that its focal condition is an existent. It follows it is like that - because for conceptual wrong consciousnesses one posits mostly an imprint on their immediately preceding condition as their focal condition and for non conceptual wrong consciousnesses there are multiple ways of positing their focal object.

It follows it is like that because for the eye consciousness to which one moon appears as two moons the clear appearance of the one moon is posited as its focal condition, for the eye consciousness to which a mirage appears as water the white sand and the sunlight are posited as its focal condition and for the eye consciousness to which an illusion appears as horse and elephant the illusory mantra substance is posited as its focal condition. There are countless different cases of focal conditions.

Debate Fifteen

15) *In case someone says if it is any of the first four types of effects there is a pervasion that it is an effect.*

Take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it is an effect - because it is any of the first four types of effect. You accepted the pervasion. **If 'reason is not established'**; Take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it is any of the first four types of effect - because it is a resultant cessation. **If 'reason is not established'**; Take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it is a resultant cessation - because it is the truth of cessation. **If 'no pervasion'**, it follows there is a pervasion - because resultant cessation and truth of cessation are synonymous. **If 'root is accepted'**; Take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it isn't a effect - because it is permanent.

Debate Sixteen

16) *In case someone says that the places of the three lower realms, mount meru, house etc. are the fruitional effect of non-virtue that is its cause.*

Take the subject 'the places of the three lower realms, mount meru, houses etc.' - it follows they are contained within the sentient being's continuum - because they are ripening effects. **If 'no pervasion'**; it follows there is a pervasion - because if it is a ripening effect there is a pervasion that it is contained within sentient beings continuum because - From the Abhidharma 'That called sentient being arises subsequent to prediction'.

Debate Seventeen

17) *In case someone says that there is a pervasion that if it is an effect of a phenomenon that it is that phenomenon's effect similar to the cause.*

Take the subject 'valid cognisor realising vase to be functional', - it follows it is an effect similar to the cause of vase - because it is an effect of vase. **You accept that pervasion. If 'reason not established'**; take the subject 'vase', - it follows the valid cognisor realising it to be functional is its effect - because it is functional. **If the above is accepted**; Take the subject 'valid cognisor realising vase to be functional', - it follows that vase is its cause of similar fortune - because it is functional. **If the above is accepted**; Take the subject 'valid cognisor realising vase to be functional', - it follows that vase is its cause of similar fortune - because it is an effect similar to the cause of vase. Can't accept because - vase and it aren't of similar fortune. It follows it is like that - because vase and it aren't of the same type.

Debate Eighteen

18) *If it is the fruitional effect of a phenomenon there is a pervasion that it isn't an effect created by a being of that phenomenon.*

Take the subject 'life force of a hell being', - it follows it isn't an effect created by a being of its causal non-virtue - because it is the fruitional effect of its causal non-virtue. **You accept that pervasion.** Reason is established because it is the life force of a hell being. **If 'root is accepted'**, - take the subject 'life force of a hell being', - it follows it is an effect created by a being of its causal non-virtue - because it is an empowered effect of that karma. **If 'reason not established'**, take the subject 'life force of a hell being', - it follows it is an empowered effect of its causal non-virtue - because its causal non-virtue is its empowering condition. It follows it is that - because its causal non-virtue is its cause.

Debate Nineteen

19) *In case someone says take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it is an effect - because it is an effect created by a being. If 'reason not established', take the subject 'liberation', - it follows it is an effect created by a being - because it is an effect created by a being of the uninterrupted path through which it is attained. It follows it is like that - because it is explained like that in the Abhidharma.*

No pervasion because that is according to the Vaibashika Tenet and not accepted here in the Sautantrika tenet.

Debate Twenty

20) *In case someone says if it has an effect created by a being it has to be a being.*

Take the subject 'vase', - it follows it is a being - because it has an effect created by a being. If 'reason not established', take the subject 'vase', - it follows it has an effect created by a being - because it is a functioning phenomenon. If 'no pervasion', it follows there is a pervasion - because if it is an effect of a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it is an effect created by a being of that phenomenon.

Debate Twenty-one

21) *In case someone says take the subject ' effect of vase', - it follows it isn't an effect created by a being of vase - because it is an empowered effect of vase.*

No pervasion. If 'reason not established', take the subject ' effect of vase', - it follows it is an empowered effect of vase - because vase is its action cause. There is a pervasion because it states in the Abhidharma ' *that called action cause is called owner*'.

One's Own System: Definitions & Divisions

(Explanation of cause, condition, effect and an auxiliary analysis into the existence of past and future.)

Causes

Generator or **benefiter** is the definition of cause;

Causes have three classes of divisions into direct and indirect cause, substantial cause and concurrently producing condition and the nominal division into the six causes.

- 1) Direct and indirect cause - **direct generator** is the definition of a direct cause and **indirect generator** is the definition of an indirect cause. i.e. **a direct generator of smoke** or **a direct benefiter of smoke** is the definition of the direct cause of smoke, for example like fire. Fire etc. are examples of a direct cause of smoke because the explanatory statement 'the example fire illustrates direct cause of smoke. It is a direct generator of smoke', is a valid illustrative statement.
- 2) Substantial cause and concurrently producing condition - **that mainly generating its substantial effect as its substantial continuum** is the definition of being a substantial cause. i.e. like the five contaminated aggregates. **That mainly generating its concurrently generated effect as not being its substantial continuum** is the definition of being a concurrently producing condition. If it is a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it is a concurrently producing condition. If it is a functioning phenomenon with ongoing continuum there is a pervasion that it is a substantial cause.
- 3) Nominally cause has a sixfold division. The Abhidharma states ' *Acting cause, simultaneous cause and; equal fortune, concomitant and; all pervasive and fruitional; six causes are ascertained;*'

a) Acting cause

Being of different substance from vase and not obstructing the generation of vase is the definition of acting cause of vase. i.e. like pillar.

Acting cause has a nominal twofold division into acting cause with potential and acting cause without potential.

- All compounded phenomena like vase, pillar etc.
- All non-compounded phenomena like object of knowledge, permanent, general characterised phenomena.

The reason that it is a nominal division is because acting causes without potential are never causes.

b) Simultaneous cause

Being mutually simultaneous and of different substance as well as mutually not obstructing each others generation is the definition of simultaneous cause.

i.e. like the simultaneously arising four elements, the five sense powers of eye etc. that form a group of direct causes, the taste and form of molasses that form a group of direct causes.

c) Cause of similar fortune

That generating its subsequent similar type similarly to itself is the definition of cause of similar fortune; i.e. like vase.

d) Concomitant cause

Being concomitant in five aspects and not obstructing each other's generation is the definition of concomitant cause; i.e. like the eye consciousness and its entourage of feeling.

e) All pervasive cause

An afflicted generator producing a subsequent afflicted effect on the same level is the definition of all pervasive cause; like attachment.

f) Fruitional cause

That contained within non-virtue or contaminated virtue is the definition of ripening cause; i.e. like the karma of killing.

Non-predicted phenomena aren't ripening causes because they can't produce a ripening result, similar to the non-generation of a sprout from a rotten seed. Non-contaminated virtue isn't a ripening cause because it is devoid of the moisture of affliction, like the non-generation of a sprout by dry barley devoid of moisture.

If it is a ripening cause there is no pervasion that it is non-virtue or contaminated virtue because the subject both non-virtue and contaminated virtue are a ripening cause but not either of the two.

There is a common basis for all six causes because the non-virtues mind that is an all pervading cause and its entourage of five ever-present mental factors of feeling etc. are it.

Conditions

Facilitator is the definition of condition

Conditions have the fourfold division into causal condition, focal condition, empowering condition and immediately preceding condition.

- 1) The first is synonymous with condition.
- 2) **That primarily directly generating the blue aspect of the direct perception apprehending blue** is the definition of the focal condition of the direct perception apprehending blue. Or: That primarily directly generating the direct perception apprehending blue as possessing its aspect. I.e. like blue.

In short, if it is of one substantial establishment with blue regarding place, time and nature then there is a pervasion that it is the focal object of the direct perception apprehending blue.

- 3) **That primarily direct generating y through its own power the direct perception apprehending blue** is the definition of the empowering condition of a direct perception apprehending blue; i.e. the eye sense power that is the uncommon empowering condition of the direct perception apprehending blue and the mental sense power that is the common empowering condition of the direct perception apprehending blue.
- 4) **A knower primarily directly generating a direct perception of blue as mere clear and knowing experience** is the definition of the immediately preceding condition of a direct perception apprehending blue; i.e. the consciousness paying attention to blue arising immediately before the direct perception apprehending blue.

In short, if it is a sense consciousness there is a pervasion that it has all three conditions and if it is consciousness there is a pervasion that it has an immediately preceding condition and an empowering condition.

If it is a sense consciousness there is a pervasion that a physical sense power is its uncommon empowering condition. In the Sutra of Valid Cognition it says '*its name came because of the sense power*'.

If it is a mental consciousness there is a pervasion that its uncommon empowering condition is a mental sense power because out of the statement in the Sutra on Valid Cognition that '*knowledge of form takes two aspects, depending on the eye and the mind*', the statement '*depending on the mind*' is a valid statement.

Effects

The presentation of effects has a threefold division into definitions, actual divisions and nominal divisions.

1) Definitions

Either **that generated** or **that benefited** is the definition of effect. If applied, **that benefited by fire** is the definition of **the effect of fire**.

2) Actual divisions

Direct effect and indirect effect; if it is a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it has both direct and indirect effects. In relation to one functioning phenomenon the direct and indirect effect are mutually exclusive. It is like that for all compounded phenomena.

3) Nominal divisions

Fruitional effect, environmental effect, effect similar to the cause, effect created by a person and resultant cessation.

- Fruitional effect: i.e. the five contaminated aggregates; ripened effect and ripened are synonymous.
- Environmental effect: i.e. like the impure transitory worlds.
- Effect similar to the cause has two subdivisions: the experience similar to the cause and the action similar to the cause. An example for the first is a short life span even though being born a human. An example for the second is an affinity for killing even though being reborn a human.
- Effect created by a being: i.e. the crop coming about through the effort of the farmer. In the commentary on the Compendium of Knowledge called Daughter of the Conqueror ' *effects created by beings, like crops etc.*'.
- Resultant cessation: i.e. like analytical cessation.

Analysis Into the Existence of Past and Future

In general there isn't a definition for the past and the future because there is a pervasion that if it is an established base that it exists in the present.

In relation to an object: **that which has both been generated and ceased at the time of vase** is the definition of what is past at the time of vase. That is synonymous with the preceding arising of vase.

That which is both established at the time of vase and simultaneous with vase is the definition of what is present at the time of vase. **That which is both generating at the time of vase but not yet generated** is the definition of what is future (what is to come) at the time of vase.

The future vase, cause of vase, past at the time of vase, past in relation to vase are synonymous.

Past of vase, effect of vase, future at the time of vase, future in relation to vase are synonymous.

In general ceased, disintegrated, just about to be generated, generating, facing generation don't exist. Past smoke, ceased smoke, future smoke, about to be generated smoke, smoke generating, facing the generation of smoke exist.

Smoke facing generation, smoke in the process of generating, smoke about to be generated, smoke that ceased, smoke that disintegrated, past smoke and future smoke don't exist.

Functioning phenomenon, impermanent, momentary, ceasing, disintegrating, facing past, facing disintegration are synonymous.

These statements are according to the Sautantrica following Logic. There are other tenets with supreme views that don't accept them such as the Vaibashika that accept a past path and future path and also the Prasangika that accept disintegration to be a functioning phenomenon.

Refuting Objections

Objection One

1) Take the subject ' Buddha dharma', - it follows it is a cause of migratory sentient beings - because it is a benefiter of migratory sentient beings. It follows it is that - because it is a benefiter for migratory sentient beings.

No pervasion. Reason is established because it eliminates their sufferings.

Objection Two

2) In case some says take the subject ' expressive sound', - it follows it primarily generates its substantial effect as its substantial continuum - because it is a substantial cause. You accepted the pervasion. The reason is established - because it is the substantial cause of the second moment of expressive sound. If 'reason not established', take the subject ' expressive sound', - it follows it is the substantial cause of its second moment - because it is a functioning phenomenon with substantial continuum - because it is one with that subject. If 'root is accepted', take the subject ' expressive sound', - it follows it doesn't primarily generate its substantial effect as its substantial continuum - because it doesn't have a substantial continuum - because it doesn't have a continuum of similar type.

No pervasion. Then, it follows that sound doesn't have a continuity - because it doesn't have a continuity of type or substance. You accepted the reason. If 'I accept the thesis', it follows that sound does have a continuity - because the speech of the Buddha has continuity.

Further, take the subject 'expressive sound', - it follows it lasts the smallest instance of a moment - because it is a functioning phenomenon as well as it doesn't have a continuum. **Can' accept** - because it is an object engaged by ordinary direct perception. **If 'no pervasion'**, there is a pervasion - because there is no ordinary person that directly perceives the smallest instance of a moment - because there is no ordinary person that directly perceives subtle impermanence.

Objection Three

3) *In case someone says it follows that object of knowledge is an action cause of vase - because if it is an action cause of vase there is no pervasion that it is an action cause. It follows it is like that - because if it is a simultaneous cause of vase there is no pervasion that it is a simultaneous cause.*

No pervasion. If 'reason not established', take the subject 'pillar', - it follows it is B - because it is A. **You accepted the pervasion. The reason is established** - because pillar is mutually simultaneous with vase, of different substance from vase as well as pillar and vase don't obstruct each other's generation. Each reason is established because the subject is one with pillar. If 'root is accepted', - **take** the subject 'pillar', - it follows it is mutually different substances - because it is mutually simultaneous different substances - because it is mutually simultaneous and of different substance as well as mutually not obstructing each other's generation - because it is a simultaneous cause. There is a pervasion - because that is the definition of simultaneous cause. You can't accept the thesis - because it is one.

Regarding the above 'no pervasion', it follows if it is a cause of equal fortune of eye main consciousness there is no pervasion that it is an equal fortune cause - because if it is its concomitant cause there is no pervasion that it is a concomitant cause. **The pervasion is assumed to be accepted. If 'reason not established'**, take the subject 'the feeling belonging to the entourage of eye main consciousness', - it follows it is a concomitant cause - because it is a concomitant cause of eye main consciousness. **You accept the pervasion.** The reason is established - because it is concomitant in five ways with eye main consciousness as well as it doesn't obstruct its generation. **The later is easy. If 'first reason is not established'**, - take the subject 'eye main consciousness', - it follows the feeling in its entourage is concomitant with it in five aspects - because it is a main consciousness. **If 'root is accepted'**, take the subject 'the feeling belonging to the entourage of

eye main consciousness', - it follows it isn't a concomitant cause - because it isn't mutually concomitant in five aspects - because it isn't many.

Objection Four

4) *Take the subject 'mental main consciousness', - it follows it isn't the simultaneous cause of the five ever-present mental factors in its entourage - because the five ever-present mental factors in its entourage are its simultaneous cause.*

No pervasion. The reason is established - because mental main consciousness is the simultaneous cause of the five ever-present mental factors in its entourage and the five ever-present mental factors in the entourage of mental main consciousness are its simultaneous cause as well - because it states in the Abhidharma ' *what is simultaneous is each others effect*'.

Objection Five

5) *In case someone says take the subject ' the karmic fruit ' - it follows that if it is its cause there is a pervasion that it is its preceding arisal - because it is selflessness of person.*

A mistaken basis of debate according to our system. Take the subject 'classifier', it follows that if it is its cause there is a pervasion that it is its preceding arisal - because it is selflessness of person. **The pervasion is correct. If 'I accept'**, take the subject ' that suitable to be made an object of awareness', - it follows it is the preceding arisal of classifier - because it is the cause of classifier. **The pervasion is verbally accepted on the predicate.** The reason is established - because it is a definition. There is a pervasion - because the cause of classifier and definition are synonymous, the result of classified and definiendum is synonymous.

Objection Six

6) *In case someone says, take the subject ' the life force arising preceding to the karmic fruit - it follows it is a fruitional effect - because it is a karmic fruit - because it is life force. If 'accept', take that subject - it follows it is a subsequent arisal of karmic fruit - because it is a fruitional effect. If one says no pervasion, take the subject 'karmic fruit' - if it is its effect there is a pervasion that it is its subsequent arisal - because it is selflessness of person.*

After having given the answer of 'mistaken subject', take the subject ' cessation', it follows it is a subsequent arisal - because it is a

resultant cessation. **You accept the pervasion.** Can't accept the thesis - because there is no cessation that is a subsequent arising - because cessation is permanent.

Then, if it is cause and effect they are generator and generated, but

Objection Seven

7) *In case someone says it follows that the past exists - because past time exists. If 'reason not established', it follows that exists - because the three times exist.*

No pervasion because the three, previous time, later time and present time exist.

Objection Eight

8) *In case someone says it follows that the past exists - because past buddhas exist - because the buddhas of the three times exist.*

No pervasion. Then, it follows that a past buddha is itself - because it exists. **You accept the reason. If 'I accept the thesis'**, take that subject - it follows wrongly that it is past. **If 'I accept'**, it follows wrongly that it is a common basis between something generated and disintegrated and functioning phenomenon.

Objection Nine

9) *In case someone says it follows that past exist - because a person of the past exists. It follows such a person exists - because a dead person exists. If 'reason not established', it follows that a dead person exists - because a killed person exists - because for example someone like King Langdharma, who was killed by Lungpel-gi-dorje. It follows it is like that because Lungpel-gi-dorje killed King Langdharma.*

No pervasion here.

Objection Ten

10) *In case someone says there is a pervasion that it isn't a person just about to die and transfer.*

Objection Eleven

11) *In case someone says as a follow up, take the subject ' a person having been born in the second moment in the form realm after having died and transferred from the desire realm in the first moment', - it follows it isn't a dead and transferred person - because it isn't a dead person. You can't accept the thesis - because it is a person that died and transferred in the first moment.*

Answering to the middling pervasion, take that subject - it follows it is a person that died and transferred from the desire realm during its own first moment - because it is a person that died and transferred from the desire realm in the first moment and here this first moment can only be the first moment of the subject. **You can't accept** - because it is a person that took rebirth in the form realm during its own first moment and there is no person that can simultaneously die in the desire realm and have taken rebirth in the form realm - because there is no person that can die and be born at the same time.

Taking up from the above middling pervasion, take the subject ' a field where in the first moment there is a complete accumulation of seed, water, air, heat and moisture but where in the second moment the seed is eaten by a crow', - it follows it is a field with a complete accumulation of seed, water, air, heat and moisture - because it is a field where in the first moment there is such a complete accumulation. **The pervasion is ok. Can't accept thesis** - because it is a field where this accumulation is incomplete - because it is a field that is incomplete in that way in the second moment. **You accept the pervasion.**

Objection Twelve

12) *In case someone says that if it is a functioning phenomenon it follows there is a pervasion that it is a just generated functioning phenomenon - because if it is a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it doesn't abide in its second moment.*

Having accepted that someone else says, take the subject 'a person that is one hundred years old', - it follows it is a just generated functioning phenomenon - because you accepted that. If 'accept', take that subject - it follows that it isn't just generated - because one hundred years have passed since its generation.

No pervasion - because it wasn't generated before one hundred years passed since its generation - because it didn't exist before one hundred years passed since its generation.

Objection Thirteen

13) *In case someone says regarding that, if it is just generated from the mother's womb there is a pervasion that it exists just after having been born from the mother's womb. If yes, take the subject 'person for whom one hundred years have passed since being born from the mother's womb - it follows it is B - because it is A.*

Reason not established - because if it is a person just generated from the womb just after having been born from the womb there is no pervasion that it is a person that has just been generated just after having just been born from the womb.

Objection Fourteen

14) *In case someone says again, it follows there isn't any person that can definitely remain for one hundred year - because if it is a functioning phenomenon there is a pervasion that it disintegrates in its second moment.*

No pervasion.

Objection Sixteen

16) *In case someone says to that, take the subject 'a person that can definitely remain for one hundred years', it follows it can't definitely remain for one hundred years - because it definitely disintegrates in its second moment and its second moment arrives before one hundred years have passed since its establishment.*

This is pounding objects of knowledge like garlic in the mortar. Take the subject 'the teachings of our teacher', - it follows they don't remain for ten periods of five hundred years - because they definitely disintegrate in their second moment and during their second moment the second moment of turning the dharma wheel of the four noble truths has been established. **Can't accept** - because the precious teachings of our teacher can't be disintegrated by any condition for five thousand years and will definitely abide for that period.

This translation I did for the use of the Nalanda debate class.

© 2003 Tenzin Dongak