

These notes were taken by a student in class, and should be 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

TSEMA valid perception <i>pramana</i>	NAMDREL commentary <i>- varttika</i> (skt.)	<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 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.

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

PURBUCHOK JAMPA	TSULTRIM	GYATSO	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:

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

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

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.

DETA DRUP DANG SUNJIN GYI RIKPAY SHANLUK GANGI SHEY
like that to prove and disprove of logic books that teach anyone who understood
KEPA DENI DZOKPA YI SANGGYE KYI NI TENPA DZIN
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...

GANGSAK GYI GANGSAK GI TSU MISUNG TE NYAMPAR GYUR TARE
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 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 son of the great Jamyang Shepa, the textbook son/daughter logic text 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 your opponent. Approximately 15 incorrect views are presented, then to choke 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

Changing Things

MI-TAKPA
changing thing

Changing thing. Things can be changing in a gross or subtle way. That something breaks right in front of you is its gross changing nature. That almost every kind of object is wearing out moment by moment is its subtle changing nature. In fact, Buddhism says that the very creation of an object is the cause for its destruction.

KECHIKMA
changing instantaneously

Subtle impermanence. That which only lasts for an instant.
This is the correct definition of a changing thing (*mitakpa*).

KAWA, BUMPA
pillar water pitcher

A pillar or stick holding up the roof of a grass hut, and a water pitcher sitting in the corner of the hut. These are the two traditional examples of changing things used in ancient India.

Functioning things

NGUPO
functioning thing

Functioning thing. Anything that does something. This is a synonym for a changing thing (*mitakpa*). Anything in the universe that changes is a working thing.

DUNJE NUPA NGUPUY TSENNYI
to do function functioning definition
something thing

Anything which does something is the definition of a functioning thing. You can call it a working thing.

Is emptiness a working thing? If not, it would have to be an unchanging thing. So what's the point of seeing emptiness if it can't function to get you to enlightenment? Consider that there's a difference between emptiness itself, versus the *perception* of emptiness.

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.

CHI	JEDRAK	“General” and “specific,” or “set” and “subset” are easy simple definitions for <i>chi-jedrak</i> . We will illustrate 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. **RIK CHI**
type, kind **A type or kind, which has individual things which are characteristic of it.** 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
 2. **SHENPA MITUN CHOK**
other thing dissimilar cases
 3. **GELWA MITUN CHOK**
contradiction dissimilar cases
- Non-existing things.** For example, a sky flower which could grow out of thin air, or the horns of a rabbit.
- Something other.** A thing that is too big to be similar to the object being considered. For example, "all existing things."
- 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

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, its 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 its 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

Reasons which Are Correct

TSUL SUM YINPA **That which is the three ways.** This is the definition of a correct way three that which is reason; it means **a reason where the three relationships hold.** 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.

CLASS NOTES

Course XIII: The Art of Reasoning

Class Five, continued

Two Divisions of Mental Things, According to the Logic School

1. **RANG RIK** **Mental things that are self-aware.** The ability of the mind to 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).

2. **SHEN RIK** **Mental things that are aware of something other than itself.**
other to know This category is divided into two types below.

Two Divisions of Things that are Aware of Other Objects

1. **SEM** **Main mind,** primary consciousness, the mind itself.
main mind

2. **SEM JUNG** **Mental functions.** For example: feeling, discrimination, attention, concentration, jealousy, anger, sleep, pride, virtuous states of mind. In the Abhidharma system there are 46 mental functions; in this logic system there are 51 mental functions. These are covered in the topic of Buddhist psychology.

Valid Perceptions: Another Division of Mental Things

1. **TSEMA** **Valid perception.** These include almost all of our moment by moment perceptions.
valid perception

2. **TSE-MIN GYI LO** **A perception which is not valid.** For example, what you see when you are drunk, on LSD, very angry or emotional; also, if you are in a moving boat, and the trees on the shore look like they are moving. These are all invalid perceptions.
valid not of mental
perception event

SARDU MILUWAY RIKPA **A fresh unerring perception** 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).
fresh unerring perception

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 its own nature of reason correct 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.** You must use a scripture that is accepted by both scriptural authority debating parties. For example, among educated Buddhists, the *Abhidharma Kosha* is accepted by virtually all Buddhist schools.
2. **RIK** **Logical proof.**
logic

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

GELN **DREL** **Contradiction and relationship.** These topics are very contradiction relationship important for understanding emptiness and dependent origination.

GELWA **Contradiction.** The study of when two objects are contradictory to contradiction each other.

DRELWA **Relationship.** The study of when two objects share a relationship with contradiction each other.

Two Features of a Contradiction

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

1. **TADE** **Separate, distinct.** The two things must be two separate things, and separate 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.

2. **SHI - TUN** **MEPA** **No one thing can be both things at the foundation** harmony there is no **same time.** *Shitunpa* 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
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

A contradiction where two things are mutually

exclusive. No one object can be entirely both things. This kind is a *real* contradiction. When

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 MENA KYU MEGU** **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.

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.

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!)

NGOooooo 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 and the thing that is defined.** This topic is critical. It
definition thing defined 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 **The definition of a thing.** For example, the definition of a
definition working thing is anything that performs a function.

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

Material and Nominal Existence

DZE-YU **Having material existence,** made of stuff. This term is part of the name of
material 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 **Having only nominal existence,** made up by ideas; it exists only
Nominal 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 Three qualities have to be complete for something to be a definition. Consider this material qualities three complete definition of a *working thing*: it is a **thing that performs a function**.

1. **CHIR TSENNYI YINPA** Generally speaking, it is a definition. It sounds like a definition. For example, generally definition it is a "that thing that performs a function."

2. **RANGGI TSENSHIY TENDU DRUPPA** It should apply perfectly to the classic example. For example, "a its own classic example on top of it exists water pitcher."

3. **SHEN GYI TSENNYI MAYINPA** It can't be a definition for any other thing. It must be precise or airtight, other thing of definition it's not 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

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

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

RIKPAY DROTANG **The format of a debate; how it goes.** This describes the pattern of statements made by the attacker and defender in a debate.
debate the way it goes 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 specific instance of a thing.** It means the act of object-specific of exclusion 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. **BUMPAY DUSU DRUP SINPA**
water pitcher at time of happened already

By the time of the [current] water pitcher it [the present] should have already happened.

2. **BUMPA DANG DU NYAMPA**
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. **BUMPA DUSU KYE SHINPA**
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. **BUMPA DUSU MA KYEPA**
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. **BUMPAY GYU**
water pitcher cause

The cause of the water pitcher. 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. **BUMPAY DREBU**
water pitcher result

The result of the water pitcher. This is also a present object.

3. **NGUPO**
working thing

A working thing. It exists in the present; it is functioning now.

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.