

**These notes were taken by a student in class, and should used for reference only. Please check them against the audio for accuracy of content.**

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class One: Why Study Buddhist Logic

### Introduction

Gyaltsab Je was the main disciple of Je Tsongkapa (1357-1419), who started our lineage and was the teacher of the first Dalai Lama. “Gyaltsab” means “regent,” and he was assigned as Je Tsongkapa’s replacement, but before these two met, Gyaltsab Je was the most famous logician in Tibet. After becoming one of Je Tsongkapa’s great disciples, Gyaltsab Je said that the kindest thing Je Tsongkapa ever did for him was to teach him Buddhist logic.

Each class in this course will include three parts:

1. The **content** of Buddhist logic.
2. The **format** or structure of Buddhist logic.
3. The form of Buddhist **debating**.

### Logic Textbooks and Authors

<b>TSEMA</b>	<b>NAMDREL</b>	<i>Commentary on Valid Perception</i> , written by Lopon Chukyi Drakpa, Master Dharmakirti (650 ad). This classic logic text is a defense of an earlier book on Buddhist logic written by Master Dignaga who was the founder of Buddhist logic.
valid perception	commentary	
<i>pramana</i>	- <i>varttika</i> (skt.)	

**Valid perception means perception that is reasonable given the information available.** Based on what you know at the time, it’s true. However, perceptions that are valid may prove to be incorrect upon further analysis.

<b>RIK LAM</b>	<b>TRUL</b>	<b>GYI</b>	<b>DEAMIK</b>	<i>The key for Starting the Logic Machine</i> . This is the standard logic textbook at Sera monasteries. It was written by:
logic	path	machine	of starting key	

<b>PURBUCHOK JAMPA</b>	<b>TSULTRIM</b>	<b>GYATSO</b>	The author (1825-1901) for the modern commentary which we will use for this course. He was tutor to the thirteenth Dalai Lama.

### Three Reasons to Study Logic

1. **Studying Buddhist logic allows you to see emptiness directly.** Gyaltsab Je said the kindest thing Je Tsongkapa ever did for him was to teach him Buddhist logic. If you are ready, studying logic triggers your intellectual capacity, and powers you to see emptiness directly -- especially the study of mental images (*chi-jedrak*).

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class One, continued

Students can be described according to their level of intellectual and spiritual capacity:

<b>WANG TUL</b>	<b>DEPAY</b>	<b>JEDRANG</b>	<b>To follow Buddhism from blind faith is stupid,</b> for those with “dull power.” Faith is unstable, and to follow a teacher because they are attractive or appealing is foolish.
power	dull	faith to follow somebody	

<b>WANG NUN</b>	<b>RIKPAY</b>	<b>JEDRANG</b>	<b>To follow because of reasoning is smart</b> for those with “sharp power.” Don’t accept what any teacher says until it makes sense to you logically.
power	sharp	reasoning to follow somebody	

2. **TEN - DZIN**  
true to hold
- To hold as true.** It means “keeping the Dharma safe in the world.” The great Sakya Pandita said the only people qualified to keep Buddhism safe in the world are those who understand and can logically prove the truth of Buddhism.

<b>DETA</b>	<b>DRUP</b>	<b>DANG</b>	<b>SUNJIN</b>	<b>GYI</b>	<b>RIKPAY</b>	<b>SHANLUK</b>	<b>GANGI</b>	<b>SHEY</b>
like that	to prove	and	disprove	of	logic	books that teach	anyone who	understood
<b>KEPA</b>	<b>DENI</b>	<b>DZOKPA</b>	<b>YI</b>	<b>SANGGYE</b>	<b>KYI</b>	<b>NI</b>	<b>TENPA</b>	<b>DZIN</b>
Buddhist	that guy	totally enlightened	Buddha	of	keeper of Dharma			master

**Suppose a person comes to understand the scriptural tradition for how to reason: this art of proving or disproving things. A master like this is a person who keeps the teachings of the totally enlightened Buddhas safe here in the world.**

If you can’t prove your Buddhist faith to yourself, the teachings will disappear. You must understand why you believe the Dharma. If doesn’t make sense to you, drop it. If it does make sense, then drop the other stuff and follow this.

3. **NGA’AM** **DANG** **DRAWE** **GANGSAK** **GI** **TSU** **ZUNG** **GI**  
me or and one like me other people of you can judge them but...

<b>GANGSAK</b>	<b>GYI</b>	<b>GANGSAK</b>	<b>GI</b>	<b>TSU</b>	<b>MISUNG</b>	<b>TE</b>	<b>NYAMPAR</b>	<b>GYUR</b>	<b>TARE</b>
other people	than me	other people	you can’t judge them	you’ll fail	you’re going to				

**If you are me or someone like me [a Buddha] you can judge other people, but... other people [non-Buddhas] shouldn’t judge other people or they will fall down.**

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class One, continued

Only a Buddha who is omniscient can read other people's minds directly without getting into trouble. If you are a normal person, logically, you have to be very careful about judging other people because you can't see what is in their mind. It doesn't mean that you should let an apparently evil person do harm to others, etc. You should react to these situations and resist evil, but you should reserve final judgment. **The most important lesson of Buddhist logic is that you don't know who the people around you are.** You don't know their motivations, or whether they are a bodhissatva or a tantric deity, so you should just concentrate on your own practice. Don't judge or criticize others.

### The Definition of a Reason

TAK SU KUPA TAK KYI TSENNYI  
reason as a set forth reason of a definition

The definition of a reason is  
**anything you give as a reason.**

"It's right to study Buddhism *because the sky is green.*" The sky being green is a reason; it doesn't have to be a good reason. Anything you want to give as a reason will qualify as a reason. It doesn't have to be correct, and it doesn't even have to exist. Anything you put forth as a reason is accepted as a reason.

### The Right Motivation for Debating

NYI KU - RIM      Prayers said by monks before beginning a debate session. The first thing you do when you arrive at the debate ground is to pray that you will have the right motivation for debating: to explore reality with your friends, and to get to the bottom of the truth so that you can get enlightened as soon as possible and then help other people. Debating quickly speeds you to the direct perception of emptiness which will quickly get you to Buddhahood so you can then help people in a big way. You have the potential to save people's lives by teaching them how to stop their suffering and their own death. This is the only motivation you should have for debating.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Two: Changing and Unchanging Things

**DURA** A kind of literature where great Buddhist masters from each college have  
logic text taken important ideas out of Master Dharmakirti's *Commentary on Valid Perception (Pramana Varttika)*, and made separate books from them.

### Three Logic Texts

1. **YONG DZIN** **DURA** *The Key To the Logic Machine*, by Purbuchok, who was  
tutor of Dalai Lama logic text the tutor to the thirteenth Dalai Lama.
2. **SE** **DURA** Logic text written by Ngawang Trash (sp?) who is the  
spiritual logic text spiritual son of the great Jamyang Shepa, the textbook  
son/daughter writer from Gomang college of Drepung monastery.
3. **RATU** **DURA** The first great *dura*, written at Ratu monastery near a  
monastery logic text Hlasa.

### Three-Section Structure of Logic Texts

The structure of each *dura* (logic text) includes approximately 15 important topics, which are presented in three distinct sections (called *gak shak pong sum*):

1. **GAK** **To choke someone.** It means to blow away the incorrect arguments of  
to choke your opponent. Approximately 15 incorrect views are presented, then  
correctly refuted.
2. **SHAK** **To set forth your own correct views.** It includes definition, divisions,  
and clarifications. This is the critical section where our own correct  
views are presented.
3. **PONG** **To refute your opponents' rebuttal.**  
to eliminate

The logic texts begin with an opponent opening with an incorrect statement which challenges the defender to correct their false opening statement. You begin a debate with this statement:

**DI** **CHITAR CHU-CHEN** **Let's consider this topic...** Then you open with an  
wisdom let's consider... incorrect statement which is disproved by the  
defender.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Two, continued

### Presentation of All Existing Things

**SHI-DRUP KYI NAMSHAK**  
outline of all of types of things  
of existence

**Everything you always wanted to know about things you can establish as existing.** Buddhism divides all of existence into categories and sub-categories. Understanding this topic is very important because it will help you to see emptiness directly

### Synonyms for “Existence”

**YUPA** Existing things. Anything that exists.

**SHE JA** Knowable thing. Any object in the universe that can be known.

**CHU** Dharma, any existing thing. This is one of the many definitions for Dharma.

**SHI DRUP** Anything that can be established as existing.

**YUL** An object, any thing.

Any one of these words can be used for one specific existing thing, or for the category of all knowable existing things in the universe.

### An Outline of All Existing Things

**TSEME MIPA YUPAY TSENNYI**  
valid perceived existing definition  
perception thing

**The definition of an existing thing is that which can be perceived by a valid perception.** Almost all of our perceptions during the day are valid, except for when we are very emotionally upset, drunk or hallucinating, seeing an optical illusion, etc.

**YUPA**  
existing things

**Existing things.** We will divide all of existence into unchanging things and changing things.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Two, continued

## Unchanging Things

**TAKPA**                      **Unchanging thing.** *Takpa* is sometimes translated as “permanent” unchanging thing      which means it will last forever and never stop. However, *takpa* should be translated as “unchanging” rather than as “permanent,” because emptiness, which is the classic example of *takpa*, is unchanging but is *not* permanent. As long as the emptiness of the pen exists, i.e., the fact that the pen doesn’t have any nature of its own, that emptiness is completely unchanging. Then when the pen is destroyed, its emptiness goes out of existence, but its emptiness doesn’t gradually diminish. So because the emptiness of the pen doesn’t last forever, *takpa* should be translated as unchanging rather than permanent.

<b>TONGPA NYI</b>	<b>Emptiness</b> ( <i>shunyata</i> , skt.). This is the classic example of an
empti - ness	unchanging thing. Emptiness comes into and goes out of existence, but it doesn’t start or end.

## A Definition of Unchanging Things

<b>KECHIKMA</b>	<b>MA-YINPA</b>	<b>TA-MADRUP</b>	<b>DU</b>	<b>SHOK</b>
changing by the instant	not	it is	that is wrong	right what’s wrong

To “**not be changing instantaneously**” is a **bad definition of *takpa***, because a correct definition must include to “not be *a thing* that changes by the instant.” The point here is that things that don’t exist, like the horns of a rabbit, could be considered to be unchanging, but they are non-existent – they are not objects that exist. So you must define unchanging things as *existing things* that are unchanging.

<b>KECHIKMA</b>	<b>MA-YINPAY</b>	<b>CHU</b>
changing by the instant	not	it is thing

**An existing thing that is not changing instantaneously.** This is the correct definition of an unchanging thing.

## Class Two, continued



## Class Two, continued

1. **SUK**  
physical  
thing  
**A physical thing.** This is also called *pembo* which means a thing composed of atomic particles.

The definition of physical matter is anything that can be demonstrated as physical matter. For example, an object that is hot to the touch. If you try to explain to someone what the color blue is, the only way is to point to something that is blue.

SEL SHING RIKPA, SHEPAY TSENNYI, DEWA, YESHE  
invisible and aware mental thing definition happiness wisdom

3. DENMIN DUJE BEM SHE GANGRUN MAYINPAY DULJE GANGSAK  
 doesn't working physical mental either one it is not produced a person  
 possess thing matter thing thing

8

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Two, continued

### The Subject, Quality and Reason of a Debate

**DI CHITAR CHUCHEN**  
mantra of this one let's consider  
Manjushri

**Let's consider this one.** You begin a debate by introducing the topic.

**TONGPA NYI CHUCHEN**  
emptiness let's consider

**Let's consider emptiness.**

**NGUPO YIN TE**  
working thing it is

**It's a working thing.**

**DUJE NGUPA YINPAY CHIR**  
function it performs it is because

**Because it performs a function.**

**CHUCHEN**  
the subject

**The *subject* of a debate.** It means "let's consider..." For example, let's consider emptiness. The subject must have two qualities:

1. The opponent must have perceived the subject with a valid perception; they must be somewhat familiar with the topic.
2. The opponent must be unsure whether or not the subject has the qualities you will assert. Your reasoning is considered incorrect if the opponent already believes what you're trying to prove.

**DRUPAY CHU**  
prove quality

**The *quality* of the subject you're trying to prove.** For example, "being a working thing." It doesn't even have to exist; you just have to be willing to prove it. You and the opponent must agree that it is the quality you're trying to prove.

**DRUPJA**  
assertion

**The *assertion*,** which consists of the subject and the quality you're trying to prove. For example, "emptiness is a working thing."

**TAK**  
reason

**The *reason*.** The reason may include anything you want to say as a reason. For example, "because it performs a function."

Buddhist debate is all about exploring the unknown with your friends. It's a beautiful thing. It's not about the idea of competition that Americans typically have. Don't be shy, which is a kind of pride. Be courageous and try to sharpen your understanding by debating topics you don't understand well.

Note that this course on logic falls within the sautrantika, or logic school. In this school, the definition of ultimate reality is "anything you can confirm directly with your senses."

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three: The Door to Emptiness

The goal of this course is to be able to sit in a chair and help every living being in the universe perfectly without any conscious thought. This is called *hlundruk*, to be a perfect match with every living being and to help them unconsciously. To do this, you must be a Buddha, and to become a Buddha you must have reached nirvana which is the permanent removal of all of your mental afflictions, because you saw emptiness directly. So to remove all of your mental afflictions you must first see emptiness directly; and to see emptiness directly, you must first reach the realization called *chu chok*, or “supreme object” where you directly perceive and understand perfectly what it is to be dependent origination (lower reality), and how it works; and before you reach *chu-chok* you must first study emptiness deeply and understand how mental images work. If you understand mental images well you eventually will see directly how lower reality works; then you will perceive higher reality directly very shortly afterwards. So studying mental images is a direct lineage to reaching Buddhahood. The whole essence of Buddhist logic is to understand mental images and dependent origination.

The study of mental images is very difficult because you need some kind of energy or power to get it. You must have a great collection of good karma, which gives you the ability to understand this topic. Without this good karma you will not be able to absorb these teachings. This material is extremely important and you should go through each argument in the reading slowly and work on it one bit at a time. It will take a lot of effort.

<b>CHI</b>	<b>JEDRAK</b>	“General” and “specific,” or “set” and “subset” are easy simple definitions for <i>chi-jedrak</i> . We will illustrate the the concept of general ( <i>chi</i> ) and specific ( <i>jedrak</i> ) using the example of “car.” If car is the general ( <i>chi</i> ), then Chevies, Fords and Toyotas can be specific instances, or subsets of “car.” It is also true that every specific ( <i>jedrak</i> ) can also be a general ( <i>chi</i> ). For example, if Chevies are the general ( <i>chi</i> ), then old Chevies and new Chevies can be the specific ( <i>jedrak</i> ). A very general test of whether something is a <i>chi</i> of a <i>jedrak</i> , is that if you wiped out all of the <i>chi</i> ’s, it would automatically wipe out all of the <i>jedrak</i> ’s. Two of these next three are only nominal <i>chi</i> ’s -- they are not real <i>chi</i> ’s; and one of them is a real <i>chi</i> .
general category	specific member of that category	

### Three Types of CHI, or “Quality”

- |                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <b>RIK CHI</b><br>type, kind | <b>A type or kind, which has individual things which are characteristic of it.</b> It is formally defined as “that existing thing which subsumes the multiple things which are of its type.” It means, it’s a general quality (car-ness), and many things are characteristic of it. |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

You must think carefully about this: think of car as “car” or the quality of car-ness. It’s the difference between *a* car, *the* car, and “car.” This is a life or death question. Car-ness is not the same as a car. **Car-ness is a quality, an attribute, a nature and then there are different objects in the world that possess or are characteristic of that quality.** For example Chevies, Fords, and Toyotas. The way that your reality is occurring is closely tied to the question of car-ness. The reason you’re perceiving your reality the way you do, and the reason you’re suffering, is directly related to understanding car-ness and the quality called “car.” This is very very subtle and you have to work on it. If you understand this point, you will understand dependent origination and see it directly, and this will trigger the direct perception of emptiness. Then you will see your future enlightenment directly and you will know how many lifetimes you’ll have left and the nature of those lifetimes. You’ll know what you’ll be doing and how you will live. You will see the Buddha directly and you become an arya, or “superior being.” Then you will never doubt these truths, and you become very independent of everything going on in the world. You see the contents of the entire scriptures on emptiness. You see all these things and know they are true, so they are called the four arya truths.

So you must think of *chi jedrak* as “quality” and “characteristic of...” Don’t think of it as “a characteristic,” like blueness or whiteness is *a* characteristic of this pen. Think of it as “characteristic of...” or “typical of...” like a Chevy is characteristic or typical of the quality called car-ness. You have to work with this.

To understand this concept, you must pray for the help of your Lamas, and get divine assistance. Do really good preliminaries and visualize the Lamas and ask for help. Heavy duty guru yoga would be in order. You need to collect very powerful good karma to understand *chi jedrak*.

“Car” means the quality of car-ness, and those objects which are characteristic of car-ness. You must go home and think about this.

2. **DUN CHI**      **A mental image.** It can be defined as having these three aspects:  
mental image

1. **It’s a mental image of something you’ve already perceived**, like your refrigerator.
2. **You mistake it for the actual object.** The madhyamikas explain it like this. After studying *chi jedrak* like crazy, you’re making tea in a pot for your Lama, for example, and suddenly you realize that you’re not looking at a pot, you’re looking at a mental picture of a pot, because all there is is a circle of silver, a black long thing, other clues or indicators that your eyes can see. Your eye can’t see a pot of water. It can only see colors and shapes, and then your mind, under the influence of, ruled and dictated by your past karma, organizes that data into a certain object.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

Then your mind fills in the blanks and creates a mental image (*dun chi*) of a pot. You're actually staring mentally at an image of a pot in your mind, and then you mistake that for a pot because all you're actually getting is some sense data. A roach on the stove getting the same sensory data input, because of its karma, would interpret that data as a life-threatening hell realm with a burning hot floor -- validly so. It's no more a pot than a hell-realm floor. The roach would also be mistaking his mental image of a mountain of burning-hot metal as an external object. He's also looking at a mental image (*dun chi*) and not a real object -- and that's what makes him a roach. He is a roach because of the collective impressions that his karma is forcing him to have about the same sense data that you're getting. Your karma is forcing you to organize things into mental images (*dun chi*'s) that are much more comfortable normally. This is what makes you a human. Your karma is the human realm. There is no self-existent human realm independent of the mental images that force you to interpret the same sense data as a human realm. This makes tantric enlightenment possible, and you must change your karma so you will see the data around you as the nectar of the gods. Mental images (*dun chi*'s) are running your world and they make everything possible. Every single mental or physical event in your world is a mental image, and you're mistaking them for some outer object. When you do this, you like and dislike, and then you get into trouble. Only when you think of the object as being out there, and as not depending on your own mental images that you have created, can you dislike or like someone in the wrong way, and collect negative karma by having these negative emotions. If you really saw that everything that you experience is your fault, like every jerk you ever met is just something that you're maintaining, then you wouldn't get mad at anyone. You would just go home and be sad that you haven't kept your vows and so have lousy karma. If you changed your karma you would be freed from your bad karma and reach nirvana, because you understood the emptiness of your world.

To understand emptiness you must investigate the intimate relationship between a *rik chi* and a *dun chi*, between car-ness and your mental image in your mind when you think of a car. It will liberate you if you see the connection.

3. **You arrive at it by negating all which it is not** and then the mental image of the pen, for example, is all that's left. Take everything which is not the pen and cancel it, and you are left with only the pen. According to sautrantika school, this is a mental exercise you do every time you see something. This is not a crucial point; it's more important to think how your past karma is causing you to see this particular mental image in the way that you do.

A classic example of a mental image (*dun chi*) is "the opposite of all that a pen is not as I imagine it while I perceive something, and that which I mistake as the real pen."

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

If you explore this question it will take you very close to seeing emptiness: what is it in your mind that allows you to look at the parts of an object and organize its parts and to then understand that those parts make a larger object? The answer is that your past karma forces you to see it that way, which is what makes tantric enlightenment possible in this life.

3. **TSOK CHI**      **A physical collection of parts.** Physical members that make up a group, collection whole. *Tsok* means a group, and *chi* here means a general object that has its own parts. For example a water pitcher is composed of a handle, a base, etc. One particular car is composed of its physical parts. This is only a gross nominal *chi* and is not very helpful in seeing emptiness directly. Seeing how a car is a collection of its gross physical parts will not help you to see emptiness much.

By contrast, understanding the process of how you conceptualize car-ness when you think of a car could get you to see emptiness which will lead you to enlightenment. This is *the* key to seeing emptiness. You must go home and meditate about this for about five years. It's worth it.

### JEDRAK, or "Characteristic of..."

**JE DRAK**      **A member of a general category** is a simple definition. The real characteristic of... meaning is "**characteristic of...**" a quality. Two classical example are:

1. **NGUPO**      **A working thing.** This is a synonym for a changing thing. It is working thing characteristic of all existing things.
2. **BUMPA**      **A water pitcher,** which is characteristic of a working thing.  
water pitcher

### Three Tests for Being a JEDRAK

Is water pitcher a characteristic of (*jedrak*) the general category (*chi*) working thing (*ngupo*)? There are three tests for whether something is characteristic of (*jedrak*) of a general category (*chi*).

By the way, like every bit of Buddhist scripture, understanding these logic topics has a direct impact on your getting enlightened. All the topics are essential, and you have to get a good explanation of their application. If you could come to see that every scripture (*ka*) is directly relevant and applies to your personal enlightenment (*dam*), you could be called a *ka-dampa*, which means you understand that the Buddha didn't say anything that won't get you to your personal enlightenment.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

#### 1. KYU NGUPO YIN

it working thing is

**Is the object a subset or characteristic of (*jedrak*) the set/general category/quality (*chi*)?** A water pitcher is characteristic of (*jedrak*) the general category (*chi*) working thing. A Chevy (*jedrak*) is characteristic of the general category car (*chi*). The characteristic (*jedrak*) must be only one component, or a subset, of the quality (*chi*). For example, all working things and all changing things are equivalent -- just two different names for the same thing -- so one can't be characteristic of (*jedrak*) the other as a general category (*chi*).

#### 2. KYU NGUPO DANG DAKCHIK TU DREL

it working thing related to to be one is to be the other to share a relationship

**The characteristic (a water pitcher) shares a relationship with the quality (working things) such that to be one (a water pitcher) is to automatically be the other one (working thing).** Being a water pitcher is automatically to be a working thing.

#### 3. KYU MAYIN SHING NGUPO YANG YINPAY SHI TUNPA DUMA DRUP

it is not and working thing it is one thing which many there exists  
is both A and B

**There must exist multiple other things which are both a) not the subject or characteristic in question (a water pitcher), and b) are still a characteristic of the quality (working things).** For example, for a water pitcher (the subset) to be considered a part of the set working things, there must be multiple things other than water pitchers that are still working things. There must be multiple subsets to make up a set. In the example of "car", there are many other objects which are characteristic of the quality car-ness that are not Chevies (for example, Fords, Toyotas, etc.).

According to the highest school of Buddhist, every single perception you've ever had until the day you see emptiness directly is mistaken. You've been mistaking the mental image of a thing for the thing itself.

### Is Sound a Changing Thing?

Some non-Buddhists in ancient India claimed that the syllable "OM" is an unchanging eternal thing. Buddhists disagree. In fact, sound is changing instantaneously, and this is a metaphor for everything in your life. The Buddhists present the following argument:

**DRA CHUCHEN**      **Let's consider sounds.** This is called the **subject**, or *chuchen*.  
sounds let's consider

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

**MITAK TE**  
they're not  
unchanging things

**They are changing things.** This is called the **quality**, or *drupjay chu*; that sounds are changing things is the **assertion**, or *drupja*.

**CHEPAY CHIR**  
it's made because

**Because they are made.** (This is called the **reason**, or *tak*.)

The sound "OM" is a changing thing, because it is made or produced. However, the *fact* that sounds are changing is itself unchanging. Facts are unchanging things. The fact that sounds are changing is truth itself, and truth never changes. The set of all things about which you can say "sound is changing" is exactly equal to the set of all things about which you can say "they exist," which is exactly equal to the entire set of things about which you can say "they have no nature of their own; they are only my projections, they are empty." These are exactly equivalent sets; they never change.

### A Group of Similar Cases

**TUN CHOK**  
to be in group of  
harmony objects

**A group of similar cases**, which means things that are similar to the quality you're trying to prove. So if *sounds* is the subject, the whole set of all changing things is the group of similar cases.

**DRUPJAY CHU**  
the quality object

**The quality you're trying prove.**

### A Group of Dissimilar Cases

**MITUN CHOK**  
to not be group of  
in harmony objects

**A group of dissimilar cases.** Truth itself depends on whether these three relationships hold together. These three kinds of things are dissimilar to the quality "changing thing."

1. **MEPA MITUN CHOK**  
non-existent dissimilar cases

**Non-existing things.** For example, a sky flower which could grow out of thin air, or the horns of a rabbit.

2. **SHENPA MITUN CHOK**  
other thing dissimilar cases

**Something other.** A thing that is too big to be similar to the object being considered. For example, "all existing things."

3. **GELWA MITUN CHOK**  
contradiction dissimilar cases

**Directly contradictory or opposite.** For example, "all unchanging things."



## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Three, continued

### Two Objections To a Logical Statement

**CHIR**  
because

**Because...** This "because" indicates the reason. It comes at the end of the reason.

**DRA CHUCHEN**  
sounds let's consider

**Let's consider sounds...**

**MITAKTE**  
they are changing

**They are changing...**

**CHEPAY CHIR**  
it's made because

**Because they are made.**

There are two ways to object to an incorrect logical statement that ends with *chir* (because):

1. **TAK MA DRUP**  
reason not correct

**No! Your reason is not correct.** Consider the sky; it has a color because it's green. The reason doesn't correctly apply to the subject. The sky is not green.

2. **KYAPPA MA JUNG**  
to cover not it is

**No, it's not necessarily so.** Consider the sky; it's green because it has a color. The reason (because it has a color) is correct, but it doesn't prove the assertion (that the sky is green).

If the logical statement is correct, you just agree with it by saying "it is," or "it does." For example, consider the sky, it has a color, because it is blue. You would respond "it has (a color)."

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four: Causes and Results, and What Makes a Reason Correct

### Comments On Class Three

**MING-DE SHAK-TSAM**      **Established through a name (thought) and a term.** This  
name                      term                      is how the madhyamika prasangika school defines  
dependent origination. This is the only existence that  
things have. You should consider the relationship between the term *quality*, and *quality-*  
*ness* ("quality," meaning a mental image), and a *quality*, and the *quality*.

For this course, you should choose one small argument, and contemplate and meditate on it. Don't try to read through the readings like a novel. Be sure to read the middle sections of each reading which describes the correct viewpoint.

**RIKPAY DROTANG**      **The way it goes.** This term describes the flow of the arguments  
logic                      how it goes                      in the debates – the way they are structured.

### Causes and Results

**GYUN DRE**                      **Causes and results.** We will study the shorter and easier of the two  
causes      results                      presentations from the *Dura*.

**KYE - JE**      **GYUY TSENNYI**                      **Anything which brings about another thing is**  
to bring about      cause      definition                      **the definition of a cause.** The three following  
words are synonyms:

**DREBU**                      **Result.** It also means rice or fruit, which is the result you're hoping  
result                      for. Anything that is a result is also a working thing and a cause.

**NGUPO**                      **Working thing.** Anything that performs a function must be both a  
working thing                      result and a cause.

**GYU**                      **Cause.** Every cause must be a working thing and a result.  
cause

The text emphasizes that anything that does anything is automatically a cause; anything that is a cause is automatically a result. Even the last moment of the flame of a butter lamp causes the perception of darkness.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four, continued

### Direct and Indirect Causes

NGU GYU      Direct cause.  
direct cause

GYU GYU      Indirect cause.  
indirect cause

PEN GYI NGALOK      SU JUNGWA  
pen of flopped over the object as it was a moment before

**The pen as it was a moment ago.** The present thing that flopped over into the present. This is an example of a direct cause. So an example of an indirect cause would be the pen as it was the moment before the moment before (*pen gyi ngalok su jungwa ngalok su jungwa*). In Abhidharma, all the events of the past that didn't prevent the construction of a building are considered to be its causes. In meditation, you'll start to become aware of all the indirect causes of your current mind. You can trace your thoughts backwards far into the past and see the stream that led to your current thought. If you meditate regularly you can do this -- especially with Dharma teachings.

### Material Causes and Contributing Factors

To understand why you have been here before in past lives, it is necessary to draw the distinction between material causes and contributing factors. This is the main application of this division of causes.

NYERLEN GYI GYU      **Material cause.** A person can be a cause for a water pitcher, but the clay is the material cause, the stuff that turns into the water pitcher. So we say the potter is the contributing factor or secondary cause of a clay pot. A seed is the material cause of a tree, and sunlight, water, time, etc. are the contributing factors.

RANG GI DZE      GYUN      DU      TSOWOR      KYE-JE  
its stuff continuation as a primarily brings about

**Anything which brings about something else primarily as a continuation of the same stuff** is the definition of a material cause. Stuff can be physical or mental.

HLENCHIK JEKYEN      **Contributing factor.** Contributing factors for the first moment of your mind in your mother's womb are your parents, the sperm, the blood, the fact that they had relations, etc. If your parents' mental material were the material cause of your mind, your mind would automatically share the qualities of their minds, which it doesn't.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four, continued

One of the proofs for past and future lives is that there must have been a moment of consciousness prior to this life that turned into the first moment of your mind in your mother's womb. You can trace your thoughts back logically to the first conscious moment in the womb. Then look for the thing that flopped over from the bardo into that first moment of consciousness.

### The Definition of a Result

KYE-JA	DREBUY	TSENNYI
anything brought about by another	result	definition

**Anything brought about by another thing is the definition of a result.** Results can also be divided into results of material causes and results of contributing factors.

### Two Types of Relationships

There are two types of relationships between two different objects.

1. **Relationship of Identity.** This is the relationship between a quality and a characteristic, between car and Chevrolet: to be a Chevrolet is to be a car. This is called a *ngowo chikpay drawa* which means that to be one is to be the other automatically. The test for whether a relationship of identity exists is that if you remove one object the other one will also disappear. If you removed all cars in the world you would automatically remove all Chevrolets. So Chevrolet shares a relationship of identity with car, but car does not share a relationship of identity with Chevrolet (if you remove all Chevrolets all cars don't necessarily disappear. So this is a one-way relationship.
2. **Cause and Effect Relationship.** Normally causes and effects are in a one-way relationship: if you remove the cause you will automatically remove the result, but if you remove the result the cause can still have occurred. However, according to madhyamika prasangika, in terms of naming and identifying the cause as a cause, it's result also must exist, so they would get fancy and consider cause and effect to be a two-way relationship: the result depends on the cause; but the cause, in order to be a cause, also requires that it's result has also occurred.

There are only three possibilities for every pair of objects in the universe: they will either be in a relationship of identity, in a relationship of cause and effect, or not be in a relationship at all.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four, continued

### Cause and Effect According to Madhyamika Prasangika

The logic school considers cause and effect to be a one-way relationship. However, one of the proofs for emptiness is the fact that there is never a moment when the cause and the effect both are existing together at the same time. So it is impossible that a cause can bring about a result, independent of your projections. There is never an instant when the seed became a tree self-existently. Similarly, when the last moment of your mind in the intermediate state between death and rebirth flops over into the first moment of your mind in the womb, there is never a self-existent point in time when the previous mind caused the latter moment of mind. This is evidence that there is no external reality out there, and these things are merely coming from your mind. For example, the reason the sun comes up in the morning is also just your projection.

According to the madhyamika prasangika school, your rebirth, the growth of a tree and a sunrise are all projections of your mind. They don't have any self-existent reality independent of your projections. However, these projections, which your karma is forcing you to see, function quite well. It's incorrect to say that these things (the sun, etc.) are not real because they are only projections. These things *are* real *because* they are projections. When you die of cancer it will be real because your mind projections it as real.

### A Correct Reason

**Consider sounds; they are changing things, because they are made.**

<b>TAK</b> reason	<b>A Reason.</b> It can mean three things: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the whole three-part logical statement (above)</li><li>- the reason (because they are made)</li><li>- the thing mentioned in the reason (being a made thing)</li></ul>
----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**The definition of a reason is “anything you put forth as a reason.”** To qualify as a reason, it doesn't have to be a correct reason, and doesn't even have to make sense.

<b>TAK</b> reason	<b>YANG DAK</b> correct	<b>A correct reason.</b> It can refer to any of the three meanings of a reason listed above. You must learn to give correct reasons that are logical and correct in order to prove the truths of Buddhism to yourself, and then to be able to prove things to others by using only concepts that your audience already accepts.
----------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four, continued

### Reasons which Are Correct

**TSUL SUM YINPA**      **That which is the three ways.** This is the definition of a correct reason; it means **a reason where the three relationships hold.**  
way    three    that which is    If the reason is correct, these three conditions must hold true:

1. **CHOK CHU**      **The relationship between the reason and the subject must**  
subject    reason    hold. Does number three (the reason) apply to number one (the subject)? For *chok chu* to hold, the opponent must already accept that the reason applies to the subject. For example,

**DRA JEPA**      **Sounds are made.** Being a made thing applies to sound.  
sounds    are made

2. **JE KYAP**      **Positive necessity between the reason and the quality to be**  
positive    necessity    **proven.** If three (the reason) is true, then two (the quality) must be true. For example,

**JE NA MITAKPE KYAP**      **If something is made, it must be a changing thing.**  
if it's made    changing    it must be

3. **DOK KYAP**      **Negative necessity between the quality to be proven and the**  
negative    necessity    **reason.** If two (the quality) is not true, then three (the reason) can not be true. For example,

**TAK NA MA JEPE KYAP**      **If something is unchanging it can't be a**  
unchanging    if it's not made    it must be    **thing which is made.**

For an argument to be correct in Buddhism, you must use terms and concepts that the listener already understands, and you must only speak about relationships that the listener already accepts. Each of the three relationships above must already be accepted by the listener. So when you prove a Buddhist point you are merely taking people through ideas that they already accept but haven't yet tied together the three ideas.

You must reduce your argument to facts which the listener already believes. You must begin with assumptions that they already accept. You must stay on common ground. If you stick to this approach you can prove the existence of past and future lives, of emptiness, of karma, of the non-existence of a creator, and of the falsity of western world view. If someone then doesn't accept your good arguments, they simply are not able to dismiss their prejudices and think logically. People's lives are at stake based on our ability to persuade them using this proper approach. This presentation of logical reasoning is the immediate cause of having the highest mystical experience possible, which is the direct perception of emptiness. All of your meditation on up to the highest practices and

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Four, continued

realizations of tantric experiences are based thoroughly on logic. The way that logical thinking works is correct.

### Three Objections to an Incorrect Statement

Consider sounds;  
They are changing things,  
Because they are made.

1. TAK MA-DRUP  
reason not correct

**Your reason is incorrect.** For example, sounds are not made.

2. KYAPPA MA-JUNG  
necessary not hold

**It doesn't necessarily follow;** your reason doesn't hold. Sounds are changing things because they exist (not everything that exists is changing).

3. TELN GYUR  
Prasangika

**Prasangika.** You return a sarcastic absurd statement. For example, the attacker says "consider sounds they are changing things, because they exist." To this incorrect

reason you sarcastically respond, "so I guess emptiness is a changing thing" (because emptiness also exists, and your reason claimed that things that exist are changing). You are pointing out a necessary absurd consequence of his incorrect statement. This way of responding which points out the fallacy in your opponent's thinking is called *teln-gyur* or *prasangika*, and opponents can be led to a correct understanding of emptiness through hearing this kind of sarcastic response.

YINPA TA

**Are you telling me...?** When you believe your opponent's statement and speak *yinpa ta* in reply, your voice goes up when you say *ta*, like "it is so true that emptiness is an unchanging thing." When you don't believe your sarcastic statement your voice goes down when you say *ta*, like "so are you telling me that emptiness is a changing thing?"

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Five: Valid Perception

## Objects and Subjects

YUL YUL - CHEN  
object object possessing

**Objects and subjects.** A subject is “that which possesses an object.” Buddhist psychology is covered within this topic. This class will only touch on the basics. It is important for understanding emptiness clearly, specifically the idea that a person merges with the emptiness they are perceiving. This is a popular but ridiculous idea because a person is a changing positive object and emptiness is an unchanging negative thing.

## Objects

TSEME      SHELWAR JA WA  
valid perception    what is apprehended

**Anything that can be apprehended with a valid perception** is the definition of an object. Almost every perception you have is valid, meaning that given the information you have, your perceptions are reasonable. Perceptions that are not valid include when you are drunk, overcome with emotion, on a moving train, etc. Madhyamika school says that every perception you have ever had until you see emptiness directly has been incorrect, meaning that your perception doesn’t match the real nature of these objects (their emptiness). The perceptions are valid, but incorrect.

Three synonyms for object:

YUL      YUPA      SHEL-JA  
objects    existing thing    apprehended thing

1) All the objects in the world,  
2) any existing thing, and  
3) anything you can perceive with your mind. These three are synonyms. They all mean “everything that exists.” Every existing thing in the universe is an object of someone’s mind. A Buddha can see all the cosmic dust drifting around the universe, so it exists.

## Two Types of Objects

1. NGUPO      2. TAKPA  
working thing    unchanging thing

All objects can be divided into two types: **working things** and **unchanging things**. Every object must be a thing which is either a working, changing, produced, made, caused thing; or an unchanging thing.



## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Five, continued

## The Five Heaps

**PUNGPO NGA**    **The five heaps.** All working things can be divided into the five heaps. pile, heap    five    Understanding these divisions of all existing things and all changing things is very important in your studies of emptiness. *Pungpo*, or *skandha* (skt.), means a pile of something, like a pile of leaves or dirt or rocks. Every person is made up of five different parts or heaps. Each of these five parts itself includes many members so they are called heaps to indicate their many parts. So every existing object in the universe can be divided into the five parts of a person.

1. **SUK**                    **Form.** In class two we defined physical matter as anything that you form                    can show someone to be physical matter, such as the colors and shapes you can see with your eyes. Here, *suk* is usually translated as form and means physical matter in a more general sense. So the first heap refers to all physical matter, which can be divided into two:

1a. **CHIY SUK**                    **Outer physical matter.** If you think about it carefully, the outer form                    wall that you see is part of you also. Does your body stop at the edge of your skin? Are your fingernails not *you* because you can't feel or control them? The logic scriptures consider that outer physical matter is part of you also. Studying the five heaps allows you to see the emptiness of each heap and deconstruct yourself, or break yourself down into five parts. If none of the heaps are self-existent, then a self-existent you in total also probably doesn't exist. There is no "you" independent of these heaps.

1b. **NANG GI SUK**                    **Inner physical matter.** For example, the optic nerve inner form                    which can detect colors and shapes.

2. **TSORWA**                    **Feelings.** Simply speaking you have three kinds of feeling: good, bad feelings                    and neutral. It also can be broken into five kinds: good and bad physical feeling, neutral, and good and bad mental feeling. To be even more fancy, feelings can be broken into 18 kinds: feeling good, bad and neutral about each of the six sense objects (the things you see, hear, smell, taste, touch and think). The logic school identifies 51 distinct mental functions; but feelings gets to be its own big heap because it creates your future suffering as you like and dislike things then collect bad karma to get or avoid them. This *doesn't* mean that you shouldn't like or dislike things or that you shouldn't be attached to the good things in your life. Buddhas like and dislike things and want to keep their Buddha paradise. It means that you should never commit a bad karma in order to get a good feeling; doing so would be ignorant and wouldn't work because doing bad deeds can never bring you a good feeling.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Five, continued

3. **DUSHE**      **Discrimination.** Thinking “this is good, this is bad, this is tall or short, discrimination      red or blue; I like this, I don’t like that.” Discrimination also gets to be its own big heap because it’s the second trouble-maker. It doesn’t mean that you should ignore that something is mine and something is yours, or ignore the distinction between what hurts you and what is good for you. All living beings, including Buddhas, have discrimination. The discrimination that is harmful is when you say “this is mine and I’m not going to share it with you.” American Buddhists have made the mistake of trying not to feel or like anything. This is not the point. Buddhas like their Buddha paradise and they don’t like to see us suffering.
4. **DU-JE**      **Other factors.** It means **everything not in the other categories.** The other factors      word “factor” suggests something that acts as a cause, because all of these factors perform a function. It includes all the parts about you that didn’t make it into the other four heaps. In the logic school there are 49 different mental functions (in addition to feelings and discrimination). These include the person, Joanne (the concept of you).
5. **NAMSHE**      **Awareness, consciousness.** Your awareness is not equal to your brain. awareness      Why are you aware of everything? Your awareness doesn’t have a physical location. There are six types: awareness connected to your eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and hearing your thoughts in your own mind.

## Subjects

**YUL - CHEN**      **Subjects.**  
objects possessing

**RANG YUL LA JUKPAY CHU**      **Any existing thing which engages in an**  
it’s own object in engages existing thing      **object** is the definition of a subject. It implies any sentient beings apprehending an object with a valid perception. Subjects must be changing things because to engage in an object the subject must change. So in which division of changing things do subjects fall: physical, mental, or that which is neither physical nor mental? The most obvious choice would be mental stuff. Can the person Magda in our class (which is neither mental nor physical) be a subject? In one sense, yes, because Magda can decide to focus on something. Can her physical body also be a subject? In one sense, yes, because her physical optic nerve, her eye power, can engage in a visual object and send the message to her mental awareness. The eye power is the contributing factor that allows visual consciousness to exist (so the present environment is always occurring a milli-second before your consciousness is experiencing it). In the final analysis only mental things can be subjects, because only mental things can have a valid perception of an object.

**Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning**  
**Class Five, continued**

1. **RANG**    **RIK**            **Mental things that are self-aware.** The ability of the mind to know its self to know know itself – apperception -- simultaneous perception and awareness of that perception. The logic school believes in apperception, but the madhyamika school says that you can't be perceiving an object at the same time that you are perceiving yourself having that perception of the object, because the mind cannot simultaneously hold two different objects (e.g., you and the object you're perceiving).

- ## Two Divisions of Things that are Aware of Other Objects

- ## Valid Perceptions: Another Division of Mental Things

- |                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>SARDU MILUWAY RIKPA</b></p> <p>fresh      unerring   perception</p> | <p><b>A fresh unerring perception</b> is the definition of a valid perception. The logic school includes “fresh” in order to exclude memory which they consider not to be a valid perception (madhyamika includes memories as valid perceptions).</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Five, continued

### Two Kinds of Valid Perception

1. **NGUN-SUM**      **TSEMA**  
direct perception    valid perception      **Direct valid perception** which doesn't involve any conceptualization. It can be awareness of an object or of your own thoughts.
2.    **JEPAK**            **TSEMA**  
conceptualization    valid perception      **Valid perception involving conceptualization.**  
Your first perceptions of emptiness are conceptual. In Buddhist philosophy, conceptual perception is just as valid as direct perception. This is important, because it allows you to act consistent with a belief in emptiness, past and future lives, hell realms, etc. Anything you perceive validly, whether directly or conceptually, is accepted as an existing thing.

### Three Kinds of Conceptual Valid Perception

1. **NGUTOP**  
deductive            **Deductive, logical conceptual valid perception.** For example, the deductive perception that the pen behind my back is really there, or that sound is a changing thing.
2.    **DRAKPA**  
well known            **Valid conceptual perception based on convention, consensus or agreement.** For example, that Uncle Sam means the federal government, or that Tibetans agree that the house for the rabbit means the moon.
3.    **YI-CHE**  
rational belief        **Valid conceptual perception based on rational belief.** An unquestionable authority, that can be totally trusted, says that something is true. The Buddha said don't believe anything I say unless you have debated it thoroughly and can prove it to yourself through logic. Rational belief is based on logically establishing the existence of a being who cannot lie and who could never claim to have seen something that they haven't in fact seen. In your studies you will get to where you can test and then accept a being or text as unquestionably true. It must be consistent with scripture and be logically provable to you.

*Tra-nge* is the study of how to interpret when you should take the Buddha's words literally and when to take them figuratively. For example, the Buddha said "kill your father and kill your mother." This is obviously meant to be taken figuratively as meaning that if you are not able to practice the spiritual life well living at home with your parents, then move out on your own.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Five, continued

### Who Said That?!

**CHI CHIR**  
who said that?

**Who said that?** Literally, it means “wherefore?” This is one of two answers to a *tel* which is where the attacker in a debate sarcastically says “are you telling me that...?” If what the attacker says is false, you say “who said that was true?” If what the attacker says is true, you say *du* which means “yes, that’s right.”

### Three Kinds of Correct Reasons

**TAK YANGDAK**  
reason correct

**A correct reason.** We study these three kinds of correct reasons in order to be able to prove emptiness to ourselves in many different ways, which is necessary if you want to see emptiness directly.

1. **DRE TAK YANGDAK**  
result reason correct

**A correct reason that involves a *result*.**  
There is a cause and effect relation. For example,

**Consider a mountain pass where there is a big cloud of smoke.  
There must be a fire over there,  
Because there’s a big cloud of smoke.**

2. **RANGSHIN TAK YANGDAK**  
of its own nature reason correct

**A correct reason which involves a *nature*.**  
This will be covered in class six.

3. **MAMIKPAY TAK YANGDAK**  
absence of something reason correct

**A correct reason to prove the *absence* of something.** This will be covered in class seven. Most of the proofs of emptiness are based on this type of correct reason because

emptiness is simply the absence of a thing which never could have existed in the first place – a self-existent thing. Only the *idea* of a self-existent thing exists. Emptiness is the lack, or absence, of a self-existent thing.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Six: Negative and Positive

**GAK DRUP**      **Negatives and positives.** This topic, which focuses on negatives, is negative   positive   very important for the study of emptiness. In America, many wrong ideas about emptiness and ineffective techniques for realizing emptiness have emerged. For example, emptiness is the luminous awareness of your mind, or you can see emptiness by totally clearing your mind of any and all content. A fundamental problem in these misunderstandings is the failure to realize that **emptiness is a negative thing**.

### A Definition of Negative Things

**GAKPA**              **A negative thing.** A negative thing is a *chu*, a thing which *exists*.  
negative thing      For example, emptiness is a negative thing which exists.

**RANG NGU SU TOKPAY LU RANGGI GAKJA**  
it's own   directly   perceives it   state of mind   its own   thing we deny

**NGU SU CHE NE TOK GUPAY CHU**  
directly   eliminate   perceive   meaning   existing thing

**The definition of a negative thing is a thing which must be perceived by the state of mind which perceives it directly through a process of eliminating, directly, that which it denies.**

In order for the mind to perceive a negative thing, such as emptiness, it first must exclude, or directly cut out, the existence of something – a self-existent thing in this case. Your mind can only perceive emptiness accurately by eliminating something; first you must focus on the absence of a self-existent thing. **Emptiness is not a positive thing**, such as the awareness of your mind. **Emptiness is the absence of something**. You perceive a negative thing by first excluding the thing which that negative thing denies. *So to perceive emptiness directly or intellectually, you must first eliminate what emptiness denies: a self-existent object.* This is why emptiness is a negative.

### Three Examples of Negative things

1. **CHU-NYI**              **Thing-ness or selflessness.** It means “the real nature of things.” This thing-ness   is the logic school’s term for emptiness. The real nature of things is a negative thing because if you want to perceive it you must first eliminate all things which are *not* it. (Note that this process of mental exclusion is different from the logic school’s description of the way you perceive something through a mental image or *dun chi* -- by reversing everything which is not the thing; this was described in class three.)

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Six, continued

2. **NAM KA**      **Empty space**, or the absence of any physical obstruction. *Namka*  
empty space      literally means the sky; for example *kam-dro* is a sky-goer -- a *dakini* or  
Buddhist angel, but in Buddhist philosophy *namka* means the space  
which an object occupies -- empty space. When the object is occupying empty space, the  
space itself is still empty, which is why it is able to hold the object; and when the object is  
removed from the space, the space is obviously still empty. The place that the object  
occupies is always there, so empty space never changes. This is the deeper meaning of  
empty space. Empty space is defined as just **the simple absence of any physical  
obstruction**; it's always there and it never changes and never functions. The point is that to  
be able to conceive of empty space, you have to mentally exclude the idea of an  
obstruction.

3. **HLEJIN TSUNPO NYINWOR SE MI SA**      **John Smith, the chubby guy, who**  
John Smith   chubby   daytime   food never eats   **never eats during the day.** This  
is a joke that refers to a chubby  
monk who never eats during the day; his not eating during the daytime is the negative --  
the absence of his eating. However, it implies that he must be sneaking some food at  
nighttime because something is making him chubby.

**CHU SHEN PENPA**      **It implies some other thing.** By saying that *chubby* John  
thing   other   it implies   Smith never eats in the afternoon, you are implying that  
he must be bingeing at night.

### Two Divisions of Negative Things

1. **MEGAK**      **A simple absence of something.** Empty space and emptiness (or  
simple absence   selflessness) are examples. Emptiness is the simple absence of a  
self-existent thing, a thing that doesn't depend on your karma. The  
test of whether you understand emptiness well is the extent to which other people can  
cause a mental affliction in you, and whether you would commit a bad karma when  
reacting to them. To be a negative thing, the term used to express it doesn't have to contain  
any negative wording such as "not." Two examples are empty space, and selflessness.

2. **MAYIN GAK**      **An absence where the words imply that it is not something**  
implies   negative   **else.** For example, the fact that sound is changing, which  
something   implies that sound is *not* unchanging. Consider the statement,  
else   "*sounds are always* changing things." This is a negative concept  
because you can only conceive of it by eliminating something.

You must eliminate all cases where sounds would be unchanging things. Another example  
is "John Smith, the chubby guy, never eats during the day," which implies that he must  
stuff himself at night. Another example is "what you cooked *this time* is really good." This  
statement implies the exclusion of all the other *bad* dinners you cooked in the past. It seems  
that all general truths are *mayin gak*'s -- negative things which imply something else; and all  
unchanging things are negative.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Six, continued

### Common Ground

If you become a good Buddhist teacher, you will always be asked to prove things. You must remember that what you say is not a good reason for the person listening unless the three relationships required for a correct reason hold, and unless the listener accepts the three relationships as well as the language and concepts you use to express the three relationships. For example, you shouldn't talk about hell realms until you have proven the likelihood that the mind continues on after the body stops moving. You must go back to common ground that you both accept. This is more important than the truth of your statement itself. In fact, according to Buddhist logic, your statement cannot be true unless the listener accepts your terms and the three relationships. Understanding this principle is critical because you can teach people to stop their death if you can catch them on common ground.

### A Correct Reason that Involves a Nature

**RANGSHIN GYI TAK YANGDAK** A correct reason that involves a nature. This means that **to be the thing given as the reason is to automatically be the quality you're trying to prove**. For example, to be a Chevy is to automatically be a car. Or, consider sounds; they are changing things, because they are made. To be a thing which is made is to automatically be a changing thing; and in this case, to be a thing which is made is to automatically be a changing thing. In this case the relationship between three (the reason) and two (the quality) goes both ways.

However, the reverse is not necessarily true: to be the quality you're trying to prove is not necessarily to automatically be the thing given as the reason. For example, consider sound; it's a changing thing, because you can hear it. All things that you can hear are automatically changing things, but not all changing things are automatically sounds. This relationship only goes one way.

### Two Ways to Prove Something

1. **LUNG**  
scriptural  
authority      **Scriptural authority.** You must use a scripture that is accepted by both debating parties. For example, among educated Buddhists, the *Abhidharma Kosha* is accepted by virtually all Buddhist schools.
2. **RIK**  
logic      **Logical proof.**



## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Seven: Contradiction and Relationship

### The Importance of Studying Buddhist Logic

Without understanding Buddhist logic, you can't really read madhyamika scriptures or serious scriptures about emptiness. These are very important subjects. Each short argument (*kachikma*) in the readings is an important separate lesson in itself. So try to slowly read a few of them, and then go to the middle section of the reading where we present our own position and be sure to get this part. Each *kachikma* has a very important point to make and clarifies our own correct position. None of them are silly or trivial. Each one will give you deep insight into an important point if you take the time to get into it. You should have a lifetime relationship with this material. Memorize parts of it and then debate it with other people. It's like being married to the logic texts.

### Contradiction and Relationship

<b>GELN</b> contradiction	<b>DREL</b> relationship	<b>Contradiction and relationship.</b> These topics are very important for understanding emptiness and dependent origination.
------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>GELWA</b> contradiction	<b>Contradiction.</b> The study of when two objects are contradictory to each other.
-------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>DRELWA</b> contradiction	<b>Relationship.</b> The study of when two objects share a relationship with each other.
--------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Two Features of a Contradiction

For two things to be in contradiction with each other, they must have these two conditions:

- |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1. TADE</b><br>separate | <b>Separate, distinct.</b> The two things must be two separate things, and both must exist. Neither thing can be non-existent, because you can't discuss a contradiction between one thing that exists and another which doesn't exist, because there's only one thing there. |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
- |                                                                     |                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>2. SHI - TUN      MEPA</b><br>foundation   harmony   there is no | <b>No one thing can be both things at the same time.</b> <i>Shitunpa</i> means one thing which is both A and B. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

So the meaning of a contradiction between two objects is that both objects must be distinct from each other and there is no other thing which can be both objects at the same time.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Seven, continued

### Two Kinds of Contradictions

#### 1. PENTSUN PANG - GEL

mutually eliminate contradiction

**A contradiction where two things are mutually exclusive.** No one object can be entirely both things. This kind is a *real* contradiction. When you perceive one object, the other object is necessarily excluded. For example, a water pitcher, and everything which is not a water pitcher. This example of a mutually exclusive contradiction encompasses everything in the universe. Heat and coldness is another example. In this case, there are things which are neither heat nor coldness but no one thing can be both, so this is a mutual exclusion

#### Three examples of mutually exclusive contradictions:

**TAKPA**      **MITAKPA**  
unchanging   changing thing

**Unchanging thing and changing thing** is an example of a *direct* mutual exclusion, because one thing totally and directly excludes the other.

**TAKPA**      **NGUPO**  
unchanging   working thing  
thing

**Unchanging thing and working thing** is an example of an *indirect* mutual exclusion. "Coldness" and a "huge cloud of smoke" would be another *indirect* mutually exclusive contradiction.

**NGUPO**      **NGUME**  
working thing   non-working  
thing

**Working thing and a thing which does no work** is example of a *direct* mutually exclusive contradiction. Working thing, changing thing, and thing which is made all refer to the same material set of stuff, but the mental image that each term brings to mind is distinct for each.

#### 2. HLENCHIK MINE GEL

to stay together   can't   contradiction

**A contradiction where two things are diametrically opposed.** They conflict with each other such that one works to eliminate the other.

#### A scriptural example of a diametrically opposed contradiction:

**NYENPO**      **PANGJA**  
antidote,      problem you  
counteragent   want to eliminate

**A spiritual antidote and the negative personal quality which the antidote allows you to eliminate** is an example. For example, death meditation will eventually eliminate laziness, and meditating on the rotting innards of your body will eliminate desire for sense objects. One thing acts against the continued existence of the other thing. This kind of contradiction describes a gradual process of one object encountering, working on and removing the other object. Emptiness and the ignorance that sees things as self-existent are mutually exclusive (*pentsun panggel*) because they can't exist in one mind in the same instant, but they are diametrically opposed (*hlenchik mine gel*) in the sense that over time the developing understanding of emptiness will eventually remove the belief in self-existence.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Seven, continued

## Two Kinds of Relationships

**DRELWA**                      **Relationships.**  
relationship

1. **DAKCHIK** **GI** **DRELWA**  
oneself      of      relationship

**To be one thing is to automatically be the other thing. This is called a relationship of identity.**

For example, a changing thing and a thing which is made; this is a two-way relationship. A second example, car and Chevrolet, is only a one-way relationship because to be a Chevrolet is to automatically be a car but to be a car is not to automatically be a Chevrolet.

**YUPA**    **MITAKPA**    **DANG**    **GEL**  
existing   changing thing   and   contradiction  
thing

**Being all existing things is contradictory to being a changing thing**, but “being a changing thing” is not contradictory to “being all existing things.” So this is a one-way relationship. (This point relates to the previous section covering contradictions.)

**BUMPA**      **BUMPA**      **DOKPA**  
water pitcher   water pitcher   reverse of  
what it's not

**Water pitcher and the reverse of all that is not a water pitcher** is an example of one thing automatically being the other thing. Chevy and cars is another example.

According to the logic school, when you perceive the pen, you are perceiving the exclusion of all that the pen is not; but when you perceive the exclusion of all that the pen is not, you are perceiving the exclusion of all that is not the exclusion of all that the pen is not. The pen and the reverse of the pen's opposite are nominally and conceptually distinct, but are the same ontologically – they are the same material stuff, but are conceived of through different processes.

2. **DEJUNG**    **GI** **DRELWAY**  
came from it   of   relationship

**The relationship of a thing and the thing which it came from.** This is cause and effect, and it can only be a one-way relationship.

**NGUPOY**    **CHI - LOK**    **SU**    **JUNGWA**    **NGUPO**  
working thing   later   flip                      working thing

**A working thing in the moment after it and the original working thing** is an

example. You can't say that the original working thing shares a relationship with the working thing a moment after it, because at the time that the original working thing exists, the future working thing does not yet exist and has never existed.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Seven, continued

### Three Criteria for a Relationship of Identity

1. DAKNYI CHIKPA    To be one thing is to automatically be the other thing. They are the same thing materially or ontologically.
2. TADE                      The two must be separate things conceptually.  
separate
3. CHU DE    ME NA    KYU    ME GU                      If one thing ceased to exist, the other thing would have to cease to exist also. For example, if cars ceased to exist, then Chevis would have to cease to exist also.  
thing   that   cease to exist   this   cease to exist

### A Correct Reason To Prove an Absence

MA MIKPAY    TAK YANGDAK    A correct reason to prove the absence of something. This is extremely important. For example, consider this room full of educated Buddhists; it would be improper for anyone in this room to talk about hungry ghosts, if no one had had a valid perception of a hungry ghost. The thing that is *absent* in this proof is the propriety of anyone saying that hungry ghosts exist (if no one has seen one). The application is that you should not mention Buddhist ideas to others unless you have had a valid perception about the thing.

1. MINANGWA    MA MIKPAY    TAK YANGDAK                      A correct reason for proving the absence of something which is difficult for the other person to perceive. The thing we're denying involves something imperceptible to the opponent. Another example is: consider the guy standing in front of me; I can't say that he's not a Buddha, because I haven't had a valid perception about it. The better you get at Buddhist logic, the more you realize how little you really know about others and how much you are assuming illogically about others; and then you collect bad karma by thinking about and treating them poorly based on your perceptions about them that are not valid.  
abstruse, hidden not perceived reason correct

2. NANGRUNG    MA MIKPAY    TAK YANGDAK                      A correct reason to prove the absence of something which the other person can perceive. The thing we're denying can appear to a valid perception. For example, consider the top of this pen; there's no car there because there's no Chevy there.  
apparent    not perceived reason correct

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Seven, continued

### Debating Tactics

Like Mohammad Ali, the great boxing champion, you should try to confuse and distract your debating opponent. The motivation is not to be competitive or to beat your opponent. The point is to help your opponent to be able to focus his mind clearly in the middle of chaos so he can keep in mind his complicated responses. By practicing keeping your concentration, you will be able to focus clearly in future situations.

You can use the following format to review the class lessons. It will speed up your learning greatly.

*Attacker:* There are no different types of contradictions.

*Defender:* That's not correct.

*Attacker:* Are you telling me there are divisions of contradictions?

*Defender:* Yes.

*Attacker:* Show me them.

*Defender:* Mutually exclusive contradictions and diametrically opposed contradictions.

*Attacker:* Are you telling me those are the two contradictions?

*Defender:* Yes, that's right.

### Some Other Responses In a Debate

**UHN, or LAH**                      **What did you say?** (this buys you time to think of a response)

**SHOK**                                **Show me.**

**Dooooo CHIR**                      **Come on, show me something** (give me an answer already!)

**NGOooooooo TSA**                      **You should be ashamed** (of that answer)!

**KYEBA LUNG**                      **Give me the statement of necessity** (the *kyeba*).

**LEBTA**                                **Say something** (quit stalling).

**KORTEE KOR-SUM**                      **You just traveled in a big circular reason** -- for example, you  
circle      circle      three      accept that sounds are made and that anything that is made  
must be changing, but you refuse to accept that sound is a  
changing thing. You must be crazy!

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eight: Definitions and the Things They Define

#### Definitions and the Thing They Define

**TSEN - TSUN**  
definition thing defined      **Definition and the thing that is defined.** This topic is critical. It established precisely the objects you're debating. The rules of how a thing is to be defined must apply; they must be airtight.

**TSEN-NYI**  
definition      **The definition of a thing.** For example, the definition of a working thing is anything that performs a function.

**TSUNJA**  
thing defined      **That which you are defining.** For example a working thing.

#### Material and Nominal Existence

**DZE-YU**  
material      **Having material existence,** made of stuff. This term is part of the name of three qualities that make a good definition (see next page). According to the logic school, things that have a material existence can be perceived without first constructing them from their various parts and then conceptualizing the whole. For example, objects of the five senses such as colors and shapes, or the mind itself. The logic school says that perceiving it doesn't depend on perceiving its separate parts and then creating a conceptualization.

**TAK-YU**  
Nominal      **Having only nominal existence,** made up by ideas; it exists only conceptually. The logic school would say that to perceive things that have nominal existence you must first perceive the various parts and then put them together. An example from the lower madhyamika school would be your conception of a person, "John." It means the idea of "John" which is neither his mind nor his body.

The concept of material existence (*dzeyu*) is applied on the following page when considering the three qualities of a good definition. The distinction between things that have a material existence versus those that have only a nominal existence is also extremely important in the mind-only school and in the madhyamika school.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eight, continued

### Three Qualities of a Good Definition

DZEYU CHU - SUM TSANGWA  
material qualities three complete

Three qualities have to be complete for **something to be a definition**. Consider this definition of a *working thing*: it is a **thing that performs a function**.

1. CHIR TSENNYI YINPA  
generally definition it is a

Generally speaking, it is a **definition**. It sounds like a definition. For example, "that thing that performs a function."

2. RANGGI TSENSHIY TENDU DRUPPA  
its own classic example on top of it exists

It should **apply perfectly to the classic example**. For example, "a water pitcher."

3. SHEN GYI TSENNYI MAYINPA  
other thing of definition it's not

It **can't be a definition for any other thing**. It must be precise or airtight, and apply only to the thing defined.

### Three Conceptual Qualities of the Thing Defined

1. **It can be defined appropriately.** It sounds like a thing that is defined. Every existing thing can be defined.
2. **It should apply to a typical function.** The words "working thing" should apply to a water pitcher.
3. **It shouldn't be the thing defined by any other definition.**

In the *definition of a good definition* (above), these three qualities are called the *three material qualities*. In the *definition of something to be defined*, they are called the *three conceptual qualities*.

The reason for this may be that the thing you are defining, for example, "fire," is a conceptual thing, whereas the definition, for example "hot and burning" is more of a tangible material thing.

The thing that you choose as a classic example should combine the qualities of both the definition and the thing defined in one object. For example, a water pitcher should be both a working thing (the thing defined) and a thing that performs a function (the definition).

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eight, continued

### Direct Valid Perception as a Thing Defined

SARDU	MILUWAY	SHEPA	GANG SHIK	TOKDREL	MATRULWAY	SHEPA
fresh	unerring	state of mind	both A and B	free of conceptualization	un-mistaken	state of mind

**A fresh unerring state of mind that is non-conceptual and un-mistaken is the definition of a direct valid perception.** Each word in this definition supports either one or both of the goals of a definition, described below.

### Two Goals of a Good Definition

1. **RIK MITUN SELWA**      **Definitions which eliminate or disqualify things that**  
type dissimilar eliminates      **are dissimilar to the thing defined.** These terms serve to  
disallow other dissimilar perceptions that might be  
mistaken for the thing defined.

For example, in the definition above of a “direct valid perception:”

- The term “fresh” eliminates or disallows the dissimilar types of “memory.”
- The term “unerring” eliminates the dissimilar type of “perceptions that are not valid.”
- The term “free of conceptualization” eliminates the dissimilar type of “deductive” perception.

2. **LOK TOK SELWA**      **Definitions which eliminate wrong ideas about the**  
wrong idea eliminates      **thing defined.** These terms address common mis-  
perceptions about the thing defined.

For example, in the definition above of a “direct valid perception:”

- The term “un-mistaken” eliminates the wrong idea “direct perceptions are always correct” (some people considered any direct perception to be correct even if it was distorted, as when you press your eye and see double vision).
- The term “free of conceptualization” also eliminates the wrong idea that “perceptions with conceptualization could be direct.”

### A Correct Reason To Prove the Absence of Something Perceptible

One of the most important goals of Buddhist logic is to prove to yourself logically that **much of the world is really unknown to you, and that you collect bad karma when you assume negative things about people which are really unknown to you and may be incorrect.** This way of thinking disqualifies you from reaching a Buddha paradise. So logically speaking, *you should be very skeptical about your perceptions about anyone’s apparent negative qualities.*



## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eight, continued

<b>NANG RUNG</b>	<b>MAMIKPAY</b>	<b>TAK</b>	<b>YANGDAK</b>	<b>A correct reason to prove the</b>
appear	possible	not seen	reason	<b>correct</b>
				<b>absence of something which is</b>
				<b>normally perceptible to the</b>
				<b>opponent.</b>

#### Two examples:

Consider the surface of a dark, nighttime ocean;

There is no smoke out there,

Because there's no fire out there.

Consider a bare rocky mountain crag;

There's no juniper trees there,

Because there's no vegetation there.

In these cases, the things used as the reason (fire, or vegetation), are normally the cause of the quality to prove (smoke, or juniper trees), so you're proving the absence of the result by proving the absence of its cause. Without fire, there can't be any smoke; and without any kind of vegetation, there can't be any juniper trees. Smoke and juniper trees are easily perceptible to normal people.

### The Format of a Debate

<b>RIKPAY</b>	<b>DROTANG</b>	<b>The format of a debate; how it goes.</b>
debate	the way it goes	This describes the pattern
		of statements made by the attacker and defender in a debate.
		You should follow this structure, which begins by stating an
		incorrect reason, in order to get the debate going.

Attacker: *Bumpa takpa yinpay chir.* Because a water pitcher is an unchanging thing.

Defender: *Tak madrup.* Your reason is incorrect.

Attacker: *Bumpa takpa mayinpa tel.* Are you telling me water pitchers aren't unchanging things?

Defender: *Du.* Yea, that's right.

Attacker: *Mayin te:* Why not?

Defender: *Bumpa mitakpa yinpay chir.* Because water pitchers are changing things.

Attacker: *Bumpa mitakpa yinpay tel.* Are you telling water pitchers are changing things?

Defender: *Du.* That's right!

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Nine: Exclusion; Elements of a Logical Statement

**SHEN-SEL**      **Exclusion.** The elimination of all which is not the thing. This topic is  
other eliminate      very important for the understanding of emptiness. Exclusions are not  
                                 emptiness, but the topic addresses three common misperceptions  
                                 about emptiness. For example, "all which is not sound."

### Three Kinds of Exclusion

1. **DUN RAN GYI SHENSEL**      **An exclusion which is the objectification of a**  
object- specific of exclusion      **specific instance of a thing.** It means the act of  
ification instance      creating a negative thing by considering the  
                                 opposite of all which is *not* the thing. You establish  
what it *is* by mentally eliminating all that it *is not*. A pen, from the point of view of being  
the opposite of all that it is not, and a pen from the point of view of being a pen, are two  
separate ways of looking at a pen; and these are important for understanding emptiness.  
"Specific instance" here means one particular pen, as opposed to the generality of a pen. In  
the logic school, this kind of exclusion only applies to working things. It doesn't apply to  
empty space. This is important because the lower schools believed that things exist because  
they function, and not because of your own karmic projections which is what madhyamika  
prasangika's believe -- even the rising of the sun is a projection of your mind. It is not an  
external independent event. Each working thing in the world has its own nature of being  
the opposite of all that it is not.

**BUMPA MAYINPA LE LOKPA**      **A water pitcher considered as the reverse**  
water pitcher      it's not than flopped over      **of all that it is not** is an example.

2. **LOY SHENSEL**      **A mental exclusion.** You create a mental image  
mind exclusion      of a negative thing by imagining all which is not  
                                 the thing, and then you conceive of the opposite of  
that to arrive at the negative thing. This mental exclusion is very close to a *dun-chi*, or  
mental image (see class three), which is at the root of dependent origination because in the  
highest school you are mistaking a mental image for the actual object. It is defined as "the  
mental image that appears to conceptualization which is created by negating all that a  
thing is not." The logic school says that anything that has no true nature of its own has an  
exclusion. A purple elephant in this classroom doesn't exist, but it has its own emptiness -  
- so the quality of not being self-existent applies even to things that do not exist. So mental  
exclusions apply even to things that can only be imagined. You can picture the opposite of  
all that is not a purple elephant in this room (which doesn't exist but can be imagined). An  
imaginary thing cannot function, but the image of a thing can function -- to give you an  
ulcer, for example. In order to see emptiness directly you must be able to imagine what a  
self-existent thing would be like.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Nine, continued

**TOKPAY    NANG    YUL**  
conceptualizing    appears    object

An example is **the conceptualization of the object that appears to you**. It means the image that appears to conceptualization, e.g., the mental exclusion (*loy shensel*) of a rabbit's horns.

3. **ME    GAK    GYI    SHENSEL**      **An exclusion of a thing, which is a negative thing involving the absence of the thing.** It means that the object is not all that it is not. An exclusion and a negative are the same thing. This third kind of exclusion is a negative in the sense of being the simple absence of something (*me gak*). The first type of exclusion is a negative in the sense of not being something (that is, a *mayin gak*). For example, the pen is *not* all that is not – it is the opposite of all that it is not. The classic *me gak* is ultimate reality or emptiness. It is the simple absence of a self-existent thing. For example, a person or situation that could irritate you from its own side, independent of your karmic projections.

**BUMPA    MAYINPAY    TONGWA**      An example is **the condition of a water pitcher being devoid of anything that belongs to the group of things that it is not**. When your mind thinks of this and draws a blank, you are thinking about emptiness.

water pitcher    it's not      empty

### The Elements of a Logical Statement

**DRA    CHU CHEN;    MITAK TE;    JEPAY    CHIR;    PERNA      BUMPA      SHIN**  
sound    consider    it's changing    it's made because    for example    water pitcher    it's like

**Consider sound; it is a changing thing, because it is a thing which is made.  
It is, for example, like a water pitcher.**

**JORWA**      **Putting it all together.** This is the root word used for *yoga* or *yolk*.  
put together      Fourteen elements of a logical statement are outlined below.

The reason you give an example, like a water pitcher, is to put you and your opponent on common ground. The reasoning is obvious when you use a water pitcher, and then you can say that the same line of reasoning applies to sound as the subject.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Nine, continued

1. **DRA, CHUCHEN**  
sound the subject      **Sound** is the *subject*.
2. **DRA MITAKPA, DRUPJA**  
sound it's changing assertion      **Sound is a changing thing** is the *assertion*.
3. **MITAKPA, DRUBJAY CHU**  
being changing to prove thing      **Being a changing thing** is the *quality to be proven*.
4. **MITAKPA, NGU KYI DRUBJAY CHU**  
being changing explicit of to prove thing      **Being a changing thing** is the *explicit quality to be proven*.
5. **KECHIKMA, SHUK KYI DRUPJA CHU**  
instantaneously implicit of to prove thing  
changing      **Being instantaneously changing**  
is the *implicit quality to be proven*
6. **DRA TAKPA, GAKJA**  
sound unchanging what we deny      **Sound is an unchanging thing** is the *position we deny*.
7. **TAKPA, GAKJAY CHU**  
unchanging we reject thing      **Being an unchanging thing** is the *quality denied*.
8. **MITAKPAY CHU, TUNCHOK**  
changing thing group of  
similar things      **All changing things** is the *group of similar cases*.
9. **TAKPAY CHU, MITUNCHOK**  
unchanging thing group of  
dissimilar things      **All unchanging things** is the *group of dissimilar cases*.
10. **JEPA, TAK**  
it's made reason      **It's a made thing** is the *reason*.
11. **DRA JEPA, CHOKCHU**  
sound it's made if 1 then 3      **Sound is a made thing** is the *relationship between the subject and the reason*.
12. **JENA MITAKYE KYAB, JE-KYAB**  
it's made be changing it must if 3 then 2      **A made thing must be a changing thing**  
is the *positive necessity between the reason and the quality to be proven*.
13. **TAKNA MAJEPE KYAB, DOK-KYAB**  
not made it must if not 2, not 3      **A thing that isn't changing can't be a made thing** is the *negative necessity between the quality and the reason*.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Nine, continued

14. **BUMPA, TUNPE**      A water pitcher is the *similar example*.  
water pitcher   example

### Two Kinds of Correct Reasons Relative to the Opponent

**RANGDUN KAB KYI TAK YANGDAK**      A correct reason for your own sake, to  
for your own sake   of   reason   correct      prove something to yourself. Buddhism  
really is a private thing. You need to use  
logic to prove emptiness to yourself, and to meditate on emptiness by yourself. Then you  
will know that you can't judge anyone because you can't read other people's minds. You  
will realize that you can not prove that anyone around you is not a Buddha or tantric deity.

**SHENDUN KAB KYI TAK YANGDAK**      A correct reason for others' sake, to prove  
for others' sake   of   reason   correct      something to other people.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Ten: The Concept of Time

#### Presentation of the Three Times

DU SUM NAMSHAK  
time three presentation

**Presentation of the three times:** past, present and future. The different Indian schools, and especially madhyamika prasangika, have very different views on the nature of time.

DO DEPA  
sutra

**The Sutrist or Logic School**, which uses the sutras to prove things. These are the higher of the two hinayana schools.

RIKPAY JEDRANG  
logic followers

**Logic followers.** This is a subset of the sutrist or logic school. The following presentation on time is from their point of view.

1. DEPA  
past **Past time.**
2. DATAWA  
present **Present time.**
3. MA-ONGPA  
not come **Future time**, not yet come.

MEPE NA TSENNYI ME  
don't exist definition none

**[Past and future] don't exist so there is no definition** for them. In an absolute sense, the past is gone, and the future has not yet come, so in general terms they don't exist and can't be defined. However, relative to a specific object that exists now, the past and future can be defined.

#### The Definition of the Past, Relative to a Water Pitcher

Two requirements are necessary in order to define the past. The past can only be defined relative to a specific object that exists in the present moment, such as a current water pitcher:

1. BUMPAY DUSU KYE SINPA  
water pitcher in the time began already

**By the time of the [current] water pitcher, it [the past] must have already begun.**

2. BUMPAY DUSU GAK SINPA  
water pitcher in the time cease already

**By the time of the water pitcher, it must have already stopped.**

The definition of the past, relative to the time of a water pitcher, is that time which has already begun by the time the current water pitcher exists, and which has already stopped by the time of the present water pitcher.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Ten, continued

#### The Definition of the Present, Relative to a Water Pitcher

- |                                                                               |                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <b>BUMPAY DUSU DRUP SINPA</b><br>water pitcher at time of happened already | By the time of the [current] water pitcher it [the present] should have already happened. |
| 2. <b>BUMPA DANG DU NYAMPA</b><br>water pitcher with time equal               | By the time of the water pitcher, it should happen simultaneous to the water pitcher.     |

The definition of the present, relative to the time of a water pitcher, is that time which has occurred by the time the current water pitcher exists, and which is simultaneous to the present water pitcher.

#### The Definition of the Future, Relative to a Water Pitcher

- |                                                                                     |                                                                                             |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <b>BUMPA DUSU KYE SHINPA</b><br>water pitcher at time of beginning in the act of | By the time of the [current] water pitcher, it [the future] is in the process of beginning. |
| 2. <b>BUMPA DUSU MA KYEPA</b><br>water pitcher at time of not beginning             | By the time of the water pitcher, it hasn't happened yet.                                   |

The definition of the future, relative to the time of a water pitcher, is that time which is in the process of beginning, but hasn't happened yet relative to the present water pitcher.

#### The Cause and Result of a Water Pitcher, and a Working Thing

- |                                                |                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. <b>BUMPAY GYU</b><br>water pitcher cause    | <b>The cause of the water pitcher.</b> This is a present object. You can say the cause of the current water pitcher exists in the present as a thing which is past. |
| 2. <b>BUMPAY DREBU</b><br>water pitcher result | <b>The result of the water pitcher.</b> This is also a present object.                                                                                              |
| 3. <b>NGUPO</b><br>working thing               | <b>A working thing.</b> It exists in the present; it is functioning now.                                                                                            |

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Ten, continued

The following terms describe something which is either 1) the cause of a water pitcher, 2) the result of a water pitcher, 3) a working thing, or 4) non-existent:

1. **KECHIKMA**                      **That which only lasts for an instant:** this is a working thing.  
instantaneously changing      By definition, a working thing only lasts for a moment.
2. **KYE      SHINPA**              **That which is in the act of beginning:** this doesn't exist. It  
beginning    in act of              hasn't happened yet, so it can't exist. It is not a future thing,  
                                                 because the future only exists relative to a specific object.
3. **BUMPA   LA   TU TE      MA-ONGPA**      **That which is future relative to a water**  
water pitcher   relative to   didn't come yet   **pitcher:** this is the result of a water pitcher.
4. **BUMPA              DUSU      DEPA**              **That which is past by the time of a water**  
water pitcher   at time of   already              **pitcher:** this is the cause of a water pitcher.
5. **BUMPAY      MA-ONGPA**              **That which is future for a water pitcher:** this is  
water pitcher   didn't come yet              the cause of a water pitcher. Is the future  
                                                 something which hasn't come yet that you are  
                                                 moving toward, or is the future something you are moving through which then  
                                                 becomes the past? For whom is the pitcher a future thing? For the cause of a water  
                                                 pitcher.
6. **BUMPA      DEPA**              **That which is past for a water pitcher:** this is the result  
water pitcher   past              of a pitcher. The pitcher is past for the result of the  
                                                 pitcher.
7. **JIK              SHINPA**              **That which is in the process of being destroyed:** this is  
destruction   in the process of              a working thing.



## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Ten, continued

### Four Schools' View of Time

The highest school of Buddhism says that all three times – past, present, and future – **do exists and are working things**. They say that a past pen, for example, does exist.

The topic of karma provides the basis for debating whether or not the past and the future do exist. If I do a negative deed today, will it affect me in the future?

- Some logic school proponents would say that although the absolute future does not exist, your future karma does exist.
- The mind-only school says that the karma is stored and carried in a separate mental consciousness called the *kunshi*, or storehouse consciousness, until it meets the conditions that make it ripen.
- The Abhidharmist school says the karma stays in your five heaps as they travel forward into the future.
- The lower madhyamika would say that the seed created by your bad deeds stays in your mental consciousness and floats on from year to year in your mental consciousness.

### Madhyamika Prasangika's View of Time

The madhyamika prasangika school says that karmic seeds do *not* stay in your mind stream. Rather, the karmic streams are carried in “you.” They are carried in person as a *projection*, in the projected person. The reason a million years can go by between hitting someone on the head and being hit ten thousand times on the head is not that the karma sits around for a million years. It's that a mental seed is created which is carried on by the person that you think you see, because you're forced to see that. This gets very subtle. The karma stays with you as you are projected by your mind, forced to do so by your past karma. This is where karma *really* stays. A karma of the past can still affect you because a mental seed is planted in “you” as a projection of your own mind. It is carried in your projection of yourself as you move through time, as you continue to project yourself and those karmic seeds. Madhyamika prasangika accepts the mind-only school's description of how karmic seeds are planted, are carried through replication, and then ripen by meeting the appropriate conditions. However, prasangika doesn't accept that a separate consciousness has to be posited for storing the karmic seeds; the seeds simply stay in “you” as projected by your karma.

The madhyamika prasangika's second answer to the logic school's assertion that the past and future do not exist is called “parallel reasoning.” So how could the past and the future be working things? Consider a pen at the moment of its destruction. Does the destruction of the pen have a cause? Yes. And does the past pen which is destroyed have a cause? Yes. It's destruction is the cause. So if it has a cause it must be a working thing. Therefore, anything that is destroyed must be a working thing and therefore must have had a cause. You can't say there are causes for the birth of a thing, but that there are no causes for the thing itself.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Ten, continued

### Three Types of Incorrect Reasons for Particular Proofs

**TAK TARNANG DE DRUP KYI**      **An incorrect reason for a particular proof.**  
reason    incorrect    in a particular proof

1. **DE DRUP KYI GELWAY TEN-TSIK**      **The quality you're trying to prove**  
in a particular proof    contradiction    reason      **totally contradicts the reason.** For  
example, sound is *not* a changing  
thing because it is made.
2. **DE DRUP KYI MA NGEPA TEN-TSIK**      **The quality you're trying to prove**  
in a particular proof    not    definitive    reason      **is not definitely proven by the**  
**reason.** For example, sound is  
something you can hear because it is  
a changing thing.
3. **DE DRUP KYI MA DRUPPAY TEN-TSIK**      **The reason given is inaccurate.**  
in a particular proof    not    to prove    reason      Something is wrong with the reason.

#### Seven types of inaccurate reasons:

1. **The reason is non-existent:** He is suffering because he's been stabbed by rabbit's horns.
2. **The subject is non-existent:** Consider the horns of a rabbit...
3. **The quality is also the reason:** Sound is a changing thing because it's a changing thing.
4. **The subject is the reason:** Sound is a changing thing because it is sound.
5. **The subject is the quality to prove:** Consider sound; it's sound because it's changing.
6. **The reason does not apply to the subject:** Sound is a changing thing because you can see it with your eyes.
7. **Part of the reason is incorrect:** Trees have minds because at night their leaves curl up and go to sleep.

If the opponent doubts one of the elements to your argument, your reason is incorrect. So the final type of bad reason is called "bad for the particular school you are debating with." The Jains, for example, should not say to Buddhists, "consider a tree; it has a mind, because it dies when you peel the bark off of it," because Buddhists don't believe that a tree "dies" – they believe it just dries up. The point is that we must be logical when defending Buddhism to other Americans. Buddhism says that you can avoid death and reach a tantric paradise in this life if you do your practices well and track your vows regularly. If you don't present Buddhist ideas in a logical and compelling way that others can accept, you have destroyed their chances to avoid death. You must find common ground that they can accept logically. **The world-view of western civilization is wrong, and you can save people's lives if you present Buddhism to them logically.**

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eleven: Course Review

#### Physical Matter and the Dharmadhatu

The real meaning of the term *Dharmadhatu* is the subject of the consciousness of the mind. It's what your mental sense looks at. It's the bunch of stuff that your mind perceives; for example, the thoughts that you hear, or the pictures you make in your mind. Physical form includes the purple that you see in your mind when you hear "purple elephants;" it is a color and is physical form, but you can't perceive it with your five senses. So the definition of physical matter is anything that you can show as physical matter.

Also, there is a distinction between *particulate matter*, which is made up of tiny atoms of stuff, and matter in general. The Buddha's sambhogakaya, which he has in his heaven, is not made up of atoms but it has colors and shapes. You can see it and it's physical matter, but it's not like particulate matter.

#### Meditation on Subtle Impermanence and on Quality and Characteristic

A good meditation to do following the completion of this course is to meditate on subtle impermanence and on quality and characteristic, which were described in classes two and three. It takes a lot of virtue and careful thought to get these topics. You can alternate in meditation on these two topics.

To meditate on quality and characteristic, try to see the difference between car and "car." In English, we can distinguish between car, "car," a car, and the car. If you meditate on these distinctions for a month, you might get very close to seeing dependent origination which is very difficult. We are all using ideation or conceptualization to get to things. Why do you use archetypes or mental images (*dun-chi's*) to perceive things?

To meditate on subtle impermanence, focus on the reason that it's true that the beginning of a thing destroys that thing. Why does the birth of a child kill that child, without any other external forces needed? The creation of a thing destroys that thing without any other intervening factors needed. Also, consider why we say that an object, for example a rosary, has a beginning, a staying, and an ending, but the *emptiness* of the rosary (the fact that it's *not* anything *other* than a projection forced on you by your past karma) is unchanging and it does not begin or end. The rosary is a changing thing (*mitakpa*) but the emptiness of the rosary is an unchanging thing (*takpa*) and you can only say that it comes into being and goes out of being, but doesn't begin nor end. When you destroy the rosary, it's emptiness goes out of existence but it doesn't end. You must meditate on this.

## CLASS NOTES

### Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

#### Class Eleven, continued

### The Validity of Logical Perceptions

The logic school defines valid perception as *a fresh unerring perception*. Valid perceptions are divided into direct perceptions and conceptual perceptions. It is important to realize that conceptual perceptions are just as valid as direct perceptions. We in America tend to focus only on what can be seen, touched and bought. But at this point in our study, we can only perceive the goals and concepts in Buddhism -- such as future lives and different realms -- through logical perception. The initial perceptions of emptiness and future lives can only be believed through logic; then later we will be able to see emptiness and our future lives directly. This is especially true of the secret teachings, which totally operate off of logic. If you trust your emotions or your culture you won't be able to practice them. Your natural instincts and culture reject these things and so much of it is invisible and can't be confirmed with your senses. You must function through your spiritual sense based on logic.

**You have to establish truth by thinking carefully, and not ignore things just because you can't see them directly with your senses.** Death is real and what happens to you after death is real whether or not you can see it right now. *The forces that created this world and are creating your death are invisible but you better figure them out, and you don't have much time.*

### Does Samsara Have an End?

A brief debate:

Because the cycle of pain does have an end.

Wrong.

Are you telling me the cycle of pain doesn't have an end?

Right.

Why not?

Because the cycle of pain has no front end.

That doesn't mean it can't have an end!

Are you telling me the cycle of pain does have an end?

Right.

Why so?

Because the cycle of pain has a back end.

Why so?

Because there is a powerful antidote that will smash our habit of seeing things as self-existent!!!

The tendency to hold things as self-existent has a powerful antidote, which is called the direct perception of emptiness. This proves that you don't have to suffer anymore.